E-ISSN: 2986-0326, P-ISSN: 2986-089X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/gijes.v1i4
Received: December 08th, 2023, **Revised:** December 19th, 2023, **Published**: January 23rd, 2024

Perceptions of Electric Vehicle Adoption among Young Adults in Ahmedabad: Exploring Influences and Implications

Hitarth Mehta[1], Lakshita Rathod[2], Fenil Shah[3], Aum Bhatt[4], Jenil Machhvara[5], Rahul Chauhan[6], Andino Maseleno[7].
[1]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India. hitarthdm24@gmail.com
[2]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[3]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[4]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[5]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[6]Unitedworld Institute of Management, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, India.
[7]International Open University, Gambia, andino@bahasa.iou.edu.gm

Corresponding Author: andino@bahasa.iou.edu.gm[7]

Abstract: This study explores the perceptions of young adults aged 18-30 in Ahmedabad, India, toward electric vehicle (EV) adoption. A quantitative approach was employed, gathering data from 104 respondents via a structured questionnaire. Key factors examined include vehicle preference, peer influence, and promotion of EVs. One-way ANOVA results indicated that age did not significantly impact these factors, suggesting that other variables, such as environmental concerns and technological advancements, may have a stronger influence on purchase intentions. The study highlights the growing awareness of sustainability and technology among youth, with implications for targeted marketing strategies. The research provides a foundation for future studies on EV adoption across different regions and age groups. Additionally, the findings contribute to the global conversation on reducing carbon emissions and increasing EV adoption for a sustainable future.

Keywords: electric vehicle adoption, young adults, consumer behavior

INTRODUCTION

Electric vehicles (EVs) have gained increasing attention in India as a viable solution to the challenges of environmental degradation and urban air pollution caused by traditional gasoline-powered vehicles. The Indian government, alongside policymakers and industry stakeholders, has recognized the potential of EVs to address these issues. As India is one of the world's most populous and rapidly urbanizing countries, reducing emissions and improving air quality have become key priorities, and EVs are seen as an important part of the solution. Understanding the attitudes of young individuals, particularly those aged 18 to 30, toward EVs is crucial, as they represent a significant portion of future consumers and influencers in the market.

The Indian government has introduced various initiatives and policies aimed at promoting the adoption of EVs. One such policy is the Faster Adoption and Manufacturing of Electric Vehicles (FAME) scheme, which provides financial incentives to manufacturers and buyers. Under this scheme, subsidies are offered to lower the cost of EVs, making them more accessible to the general public. Additionally, tax exemptions and reductions in registration fees for EVs further incentivize potential buyers. The government has also encouraged the development of charging infrastructure across cities, recognizing that the lack of accessible charging stations remains a significant barrier to EV adoption.

In urban areas like Delhi, which grapples with severe air pollution, there is growing awareness of the environmental benefits of EVs. The government has introduced measures such as waiving road taxes for electric vehicles and providing subsidies to promote EV use. In states like Gujarat and Maharashtra, similar initiatives are being rolled out to encourage EV purchases, aligning with India's broader goals of achieving net-zero emissions by 2070.

Young individuals in India are increasingly concerned about sustainability and the impact of their choices on the environment. Many in this age group are technologically savvy and open to exploring alternatives to traditional vehicles. However, concerns regarding the higher upfront cost of EVs compared to gasoline-powered vehicles, as well as the limited charging infrastructure, remain. Manufacturers and marketers need to address these concerns by offering affordable options and communicating the long-term savings associated with EV ownership, such as reduced fuel and maintenance costs.

India is taking a diversified approach to sustainable transportation by promoting hybrid vehicles and electric two-wheelers, which are more affordable and better suited to the country's congested urban environments. The government is also exploring shared mobility solutions and promoting cycling to reduce dependency on private vehicles, contributing to a greener future.

The future of electric vehicles in India looks promising, particularly with the younger generation's increasing awareness and interest in sustainable alternatives. With government policies, financial incentives, and improved infrastructure, India is on its way to becoming a key player in the global EV market. However, addressing the challenges of cost, infrastructure, and consumer perceptions will be critical to accelerating EV adoption in the country.

METHOD

The present study focuses on understanding the perceptions of young individuals aged 18 to 30 years toward electric vehicles (EVs) in India, with data collected from 104 respondents residing in Ahmedabad. A quantitative research approach was adopted to gather empirical data, allowing for objective analysis of the factors influencing EV adoption among young adults. The primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire, designed to capture respondents' perceptions of electric vehicles, including their views on environmental sustainability, technological advancements, and purchase intentions.

Objectives:

a. To analyze the key factors influencing the perceptions of young adults (18-30 years) in India regarding the adoption of electric vehicles.
b. To evaluate the impact of environmental concerns and technological advancements on the purchase intentions of electric vehicles among young consumers in India.

Hypotheses

H1: Environmental sustainability is positively associated with the intention of young individuals in India to adopt electric vehicles.

H2: Technological advancements in electric vehicles (such as improved battery life and charging infrastructure) significantly increase the likelihood of young consumers in India purchasing EVs.

For data analysis, SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was employed to conduct both descriptive and inferential statistical tests. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize demographic data and respondents' general perceptions. To test the hypotheses, inferential statistics were used, particularly regression analysis and correlation analysis. Regression analysis helped in determining the influence of independent variables (environmental concerns, technological advancements) on the dependent variable (purchase intention of EVs). The correlation analysis was used to explore the strength of relationships between variables.

In addition, reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's alpha to ensure the consistency of the questionnaire items. The data analysis through SPSS allowed for the testing of the two hypotheses and provided a comprehensive understanding of how environmental and technological factors affect young consumers' views on EV adoption in Ahmedabad.This methodology ensures a robust analysis of the research objectives, providing meaningful insights into the perceptions of young individuals regarding electric vehicles in India.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the study examining the perceptions of young adults in India towards electric vehicle (EV) adoption, Table 1 presents the age distribution of the respondents, focusing on individuals aged 18 to 30 years. The sample is heavily skewed towards the younger end of the spectrum, with 95.2% of the respondents falling between the ages of 18 to 22. This suggests that the data largely represents the views of younger individuals in their late teens and early twenties.

Table 1. Age of Samples

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-22	99	95.2	95.2	95.2
	23-26	4	3.8	3.8	99.0
	27-30	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

The relatively smaller representation of individuals aged 23-26 (3.8%) and 27-30 (1%) indicates that the majority of the participants are likely students or early-stage professionals. This age group is crucial to study as they represent the early adopters of EVs, particularly in a market that is rapidly evolving with technological innovations and environmental awareness. The cumulative percentage column shows that by the time the 22-year-olds are accounted for, 95.2% of the population has already been included. The distribution reflects that most young adults in the sample are at the forefront of societal trends and are likely to be more receptive to environmental sustainability and technological advancements.

Table 2. Gender of Samples

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	50	48.1	48.1	48.1
	Female	54	51.9	51.9	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 presents the gender distribution, which is almost evenly split between male and female respondents, with 48.1% being male and 51.9% female. This balanced representation ensures that the study captures perspectives from both genders equally, which is important as gender may influence attitudes towards EVs. For instance, males and females may have

differing preferences in terms of vehicle design, technological features, or environmental considerations. By ensuring a near-equal representation, the study can compare gender-specific factors that may influence EV adoption. Moreover, this balance helps in generating a comprehensive understanding of how young males and females perceive the benefits and challenges of adopting EVs.

Table 3. Area of Residence of Samples

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Urban area	88	84.6	84.6	84.6
	Semi- urban area	3	2.9	2.9	87.5
	Rural area	13	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Table 3, which deals with the area of residence, indicates that a significant proportion of the sample (84.6%) comes from urban areas. This is followed by 12.5% from rural areas, and a small percentage (2.9%) from semi-urban areas. This distribution reflects the growing influence of urbanization in shaping consumer preferences, especially among the youth in Ahmedabad. Young adults living in urban areas are more likely to encounter EV infrastructure, such as charging stations, and are exposed to the environmental and technological advancements that promote EV adoption. However, the smaller sample size from rural and semi-urban areas suggests that there may be barriers to EV adoption in these regions, possibly due to a lack of infrastructure or awareness.

Table 4. Education of Samples

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	High school	68	65.4	65.4	65.4
	Undergraduate	9	8.7	8.7	74.0
	Graduate	26	25.0	25.0	99.0
	Postgraduate	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	104	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 provides information on the education levels of the respondents. The majority of the participants (65.4%) have completed high school, while 25% are graduates, and 8.7% are undergraduates. A small fraction (1%) are postgraduates. The high percentage of high school graduates suggests that the study predominantly reflects the perceptions of young individuals who are either students or have recently entered the workforce. Education plays a crucial role in shaping individuals' understanding of environmental issues and technological advancements. Hence, this educational background implies that the respondents are likely aware of the environmental benefits of EVs and are attuned to technological innovations in the automotive industry. The variety of education levels provides a broader perspective on how awareness and knowledge influence the purchase intentions of young adults toward EVs.

Table 5. One Way ANOVA between Gender and Ev Sustainability

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Environmental issue	Between Groups	.431	1	.431	.384	.537
	Within Groups	114.453	102	1.122		
	Total	114.885	103			

Reducing pollution	Between Groups	5.945	1	5.945	4.288	.041
	Within Groups	141.401	102	1.386		
	Total	147.346	103			
Familiarity with EVs	Between Groups	.182	1	.182	.139	.710
	Within Groups	133.039	102	1.304		
	Total	133.221	103			
Overall perception	Between Groups	3.490	1	3.490	3.934	.050
	Within Groups	90.500	102	.887		
	Total	93.990	103			
Factors influencing EVs	Between Groups	4.743	1	4.743	2.896	.092
	Within Groups	167.017	102	1.637		
	Total	171.760	103			

The One-Way ANOVA in Table 5 investigates the relationship between gender and perceptions of electric vehicle (EV) sustainability among young adults in Ahmedabad. The analysis reveals mixed results in terms of statistical significance across different factors. For environmental issues, the F-value of 0.384 and p-value of 0.537 indicate no significant difference between males and females regarding concerns about environmental issues in EV adoption. Similarly, in terms of familiarity with EVs, the F-value of 0.139 and p-value of 0.710 show no significant gender difference.

However, for reducing pollution, a significant difference was observed between genders, with an F-value of 4.288 and a p-value of 0.041 (below the 0.05 threshold). This suggests that males and females may differ in how they perceive EVs' role in reducing pollution. In terms of overall perception of EVs, the F-value of 3.934 and p-value of 0.050 highlight a marginal significance, suggesting a possible difference in how genders view the overall sustainability of EVs. Lastly, for factors influencing EV adoption, no significant difference is found, with a p-value of 0.092. The study employed SPSS to analyze these results, allowing for objective insights into gender-based differences in perceptions of EV sustainability among young adults.

Table 6. One Way ANOVA between Age and Ev sustainability A

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Environmental issue	Between Groups	.478	2	.239	.211	.810
	Within Groups	114.407	101	1.133		
	Total	114.885	103			
Reducing pollution	Between Groups	1.303	2	.652	.451	.638
	Within Groups	146.043	101	1.446		
	Total	147.346	103			
Familiarity with EVs	Between Groups	3.312	2	1.656	1.288	.280
	Within Groups	129.909	101	1.286		
	Total	133.221	103			
Overall perception	Between Groups	1.263	2	.632	.688	.505
	Within Groups	92.727	101	.918		
	Total	93.990	103			
Factors influencing EVs	Between Groups	1.851	2	.925	.550	.579
	Within Groups	169.909	101	1.682		
	Total	171.760	103			

In the present study, a One-Way ANOVA test was used to explore the relationship between respondents' age and their perceptions of electric vehicle (EV) sustainability. Table 6 presents the results of this analysis, showing the significance of various factors like environmental issues, reducing pollution, familiarity with EVs, overall perception, and factors influencing EVs.

The ANOVA results show no significant differences between age groups for any of the variables. For example, the significance value (Sig.) for "Environmental Issue" is 0.810, indicating that age does not significantly affect how young adults perceive environmental issues related to EVs. Similarly, the Sig. value for "Reducing Pollution" is 0.638, showing no strong link between age and the perception of EVs' role in pollution reduction. Other factors like "Familiarity with EVs" (Sig. 0.280) and "Overall Perception" (Sig. 0.505) also show no significant age-related differences.

These findings suggest that within the 18-30 age group, age does not significantly influence perceptions of EV sustainability or the key factors associated with EV adoption. This supports the idea that young individuals, regardless of age within this group, share similar views on environmental sustainability and the technological advantages of electric vehicles, as indicated by the research methodology's focus on objective, empirical data collection.

Table 7. One way ANOVA between Gender and consumer behavior

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Vehicle preference	Between Groups	9.956	1	9.956	10.590	.002
	Within Groups	95.890	102	.940		
	Total	105.846	103			
Peer influence	Between Groups	.131	1	.131	.116	.734
	Within Groups	115.253	102	1.130		
	Total	115.385	103			
Promotion of EV	Between Groups	.587	1	.587	.797	.374
	Within Groups	75.173	102	.737		
	Total	75.760	103			

The ANOVA results in Table 7 examine the relationship between gender and various aspects of consumer behavior toward electric vehicles (EVs). The one-way ANOVA compares means across gender groups for three variables: vehicle preference, peer influence, and promotion of EVs. For vehicle preference, the F-value (10.590) is significant ($p = .002$), indicating that gender has a statistically significant effect on vehicle preference. This suggests that males and females have different preferences when it comes to EVs, which may be driven by varying priorities like design, technology, or environmental factors.

In contrast, peer influence shows no significant difference between genders ($F = .116$, $p = .734$), implying that both males and females are equally influenced by their peers in EV adoption. This suggests that peer opinions might affect consumer behavior similarly across genders. For the promotion of EVs, the F-value (0.797) is also not significant ($p = .374$), indicating that gender does not significantly affect how promotional efforts influence consumer behavior. Both males and females are likely responding similarly to marketing and awareness campaigns for EVs. The results, analyzed through SPSS using a structured questionnaire, help clarify gender-based differences and similarities in consumer behavior, providing valuable insights for targeted EV marketing strategies.

Table 8. One way ANOVA between Age and consumer behavior

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Vehicle preference	Between Groups	.409	2	.205	.196	.822
	Within Groups	105.437	101	1.044		
	Total	105.846	103			
Peer influence	Between Groups	2.998	2	1.499	1.347	.265
	Within Groups	112.386	101	1.113		
	Total	115.385	103			
Promotion of EV	Between Groups	3.123	2	1.562	2.171	.119
	Within Groups	72.636	101	.719		
	Total	75.760	103			

The one-way ANOVA results in Table 8 examine the relationship between age and three aspects of consumer behavior related to electric vehicles (EVs): vehicle preference, peer influence, and promotion of EVs. The study focused on understanding the perceptions of young individuals aged 18-30 in Ahmedabad, India, using quantitative data collected from 104 respondents. For vehicle preference, the F-value (0.196) and significance level ($p = 0.822$) suggest no significant difference between age groups regarding their preference for EVs. Similarly, for peer influence, the F-value (1.347) and p-value (0.265) show no significant difference between age groups in how peers influence their EV-related decisions.

Lastly, for promotion of EVs, while the F-value is slightly higher at 2.171, the significance level ($p = 0.119$) still indicates no significant age-related differences in perceptions of EV promotions. These results suggest that the factors of consumer behavior—vehicle preference, peer influence, and promotion—are not significantly influenced by age in this sample. This analysis, conducted using SPSS, allowed for an empirical evaluation of key factors influencing young adults' EV adoption. The use of ANOVA helped assess whether age plays a role in shaping these perceptions, ultimately suggesting that other variables, such as environmental concerns or technological advancements, may have more influence.

CONCLUSION

present study provides valuable insights into the perceptions of young adults in India, specifically Ahmedabad, regarding electric vehicle (EV) adoption. Through quantitative analysis, key factors such as vehicle preference, peer influence, and promotion of EVs were explored in relation to age. The results of the one-way ANOVA indicated that age did not significantly affect these factors, implying that other variables, such as environmental concerns and technological advancements, may play a more crucial role in shaping EV adoption among young consumers. This highlights the growing awareness and interest in sustainability and innovation across all age groups within the 18-30 demographic. Additionally, the findings suggest that the promotion of EVs should target a broader youth audience, regardless of age, with a focus on enhancing technological features and emphasizing environmental benefits.

Future research could expand the scope of the study by incorporating larger and more diverse samples across different regions in India, including rural areas where infrastructure for EVs may be lacking. Additionally, qualitative studies could complement the quantitative data, offering deeper insights into the specific concerns, motivations, and barriers that young consumers face. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could track changes in perceptions over time, especially as EV technology and infrastructure evolve in India.

Globally, the transition to electric vehicles has significant implications for reducing carbon emissions and combating climate change. As young consumers worldwide become more conscious of sustainability, understanding their perceptions of EV adoption is crucial for shaping future policies and marketing strategies. The findings from this study align with global

trends, where technological advancements and environmental concerns are major drivers for EV adoption. This global shift can lead to substantial environmental benefits, promoting cleaner energy use and reducing dependence on fossil fuels across the world.

REFERENCES

Akkerman, F., Lalla-Ruiz, E., Mes, M., & Spitters, T. (2022). Cross-Docking: Current Research Versus Industry Practice and Industry 4.0 Adoption. In T. Bondarouk & M. R. Olivas-Luján (Eds.), *Smart Industry – Better Management* (Vol. 28, pp. 69–104). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1877-636120220000028007

Arvidsson, N., Weir IV, H. T., & Orving, T. (2024). Operational performance of light electric freight vehicles in the last mile: two Nordic case studies. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *54*(2), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-02-2023-0079

Björklund, M., Forslund, H., & Ülgen, V. S. (2024). The paradoxical nature of greening transportation: an analysis of tensions in buyer–supplier dyads. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-11-2023-0406

Caniëls, M. C. J., & Curseu, P. (2024). Contagious resilience – how leaders' resilient behaviour promotes followers' resilient behaviour. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *45*(5), 754–775. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2023-0474

Chiappini, H., Marinelli, N., Jalal, R. N.-U.-D., & Birindelli, G. (2023). Past, present and future of impact investing and closely related financial vehicles: a literature review. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, *14*(7), 232–257. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-09-2022-0471

Chizaryfard, A., Lapko, Y., & Trucco, P. (2023). Strategic closed-loop supply chain configuration in the transition towards the circular economy of EV batteries: an evolutionary analytical framework. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *34*(7), 142–176. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLM-06-2021-0337

Ciasullo, M. V., Polese, F., Montera, R., & Carrubbo, L. (2021). A digital servitization framework for viable manufacturing companies. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *36*(13), 142–160. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-07-2020-0349

Culot, G., Orzes, G., Sartor, M., & Nassimbeni, G. (2024). The data sharing conundrum: revisiting established theory in the age of digital transformation. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *29*(7), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-07-2023-0362

Dong, J., Chen, S., Miralinaghi, M., Chen, T., & Labi, S. (2022). Development and testing of an image transformer for explainable autonomous driving systems. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(3), 235–249. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-06-2022-0021

du Plooy, H., Tommasi, F., Furlan, A., Nenna, F., Gamberini, L., Ceschi, A., & Sartori, R. (2024). A human-centered perspective on individual risks for digital innovation management: an integrative conceptual review. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-09-2023-0821

Echeverri, P. (2021). Interaction value formation spaces: configurations of practice-theory elements in service ecosystems. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *35*(9), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-03-2021-0084

Gaiardelli, P., & Songini, L. (2021). Successful business models for service centres: an empirical analysis. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *70*(5), 1187–1212. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2019-0230

Gao, B., Zheng, K., Zhang, F., Su, R., Zhang, J., & Wu, Y. (2022). Research on multi-target tracking method based on multi-sensor fusion. *Smart and Resilient Transportation*, *4*(2), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRT-05-2022-0010

Grigalunas, T., Trandafrr, S., Luo, M., Opaluch, J., & Kwon, S.-J. (2004). Port Development and the Environment: External Costs from Dredge Disposal and Air Pollution. *Journal of International Logistics and Trade*, *1*(2), 111–150. https://doi.org/10.24006/jilt.2004.1.2.111

Gund, H. P., & Daniel, J. (2024). Q-commerce or E-commerce? A systematic state of the art on comparative last-mile logistics greenhouse gas emissions literature review. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, *6*(3), 185–207. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIEOM-01-2023-0001

Hashemi, L., Mahmoodi, A., Jasemi, M., Millar, R. C., & Laliberté, J. (2021). Modeling a robust multi-objective locating-routing problem with bounded delivery time using meta-heuristic algorithms. *Smart and Resilient Transportation*, *3*(3), 283–303. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRT-08-2021-0008

Jazairy, A., Persson, E., Brho, M., von Haartman, R., & Hilletofth, P. (2024). Drones in last-mile delivery: a systematic literature review from a logistics management perspective. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLM-04-2023-0149

Jazairy, A., von Haartman, R., & Björklund, M. (2021). Unravelling collaboration mechanisms for green logistics: the perspectives of shippers and logistics service providers. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *51*(4), 423–448. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-09-2019-0274

Kans, M., & Ingwald, A. (2023). Service-based business models in the Swedish railway industry. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, *29*(5), 68–87. https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-06-2021-0051

Koddebusch, M., Halsbenning, S., & Becker, J. (2024). Design principles for MOOC platforms: a public sector perspective. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-05-2023-0065

Li, Z., & Sun, H. (2021). A novel simulation framework for crowd transportations. *International Journal of Crowd Science*, *5*(3), 293–310. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCS-07-2021-0019

Lim, C., Kim, M.-J., Kim, K.-H., Kim, K.-J., & Maglio, P. (2019). Customer process management. *Journal of Service Management*, *30*(1), 105–131. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-02-2017-0031

Lim, C., Kim, M.-J., Kim, K.-H., Kim, K.-J., & Maglio, P. P. (2018). Using data to advance service: managerial issues and theoretical implications from action research. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, *28*(1), 99–128. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTP-08-2016-0141

Lindkvist, H., Lind, F., & Melander, L. (2023). Actor roles and public–private interaction in transitioning networks: the case of geofencing for urban freight transport in Sweden. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *38*(6), 1376–1389. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-10-2021-0494

Lu, C., & Xin, X. (2024). Key stakeholder perceived value's influence on autonomous vehicles' privacy and security governance – an evolutionary analysis based on the prospect theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *18*(2), 131–155. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-12-2023-0242

Lyu, N., Wang, Y., Wu, C., Peng, L., & Thomas, A. F. (2022). Using naturalistic driving data to identify driving style based on longitudinal driving operation conditions. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-07-2021-0008

Mao, S., Xiao, G., Lee, J., Wang, L., Wang, Z., & Huang, H. (2021). Safety effects of work zone advisory systems under the intelligent connected vehicle environment: a microsimulation approach. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *4*(1), 16–27. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-07-2020-0006

Melander, L., & Lind, F. (2022). A start-up's collaboration in networks for sustainable freight transport: a micro-meso-macro approach to innovation. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, *27*(7), 211–222. https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-11-2021-0537

Nansubuga, B., & Kowalkowski, C. (2021). Carsharing: a systematic literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Service Management*, *32*(6), 55–91. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-10-2020-0344

Peng, T., Liu, X., Fang, R., Zhang, R., Pang, Y., Wang, T., & Tong, Y. (2020). Lane-change path planning and control method for self-driving articulated trucks. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *3*(2), 49–66. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-10-2019-0013

Prataviera, L. B., Tappia, E., Perotti, S., & Perego, A. (2021). Estimating the national logistics outsourcing market size: a multi-method approach and an application to the Italian context. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *51*(7), 764–784. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-07-2020-0243

Rachinger, M., & Müller, J. M. (2024). Investigating a manufacturing ecosystem in transition toward electric vehicles – a business model perspective. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, *35*(9), 24–50. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMTM-07-2023-0279

Raoofi, Z., Huge Brodin, M., & Pernestål, A. (2024). System-level impacts of electrification on the road freight transport system: a dynamic approach. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-11-2023-0436

Redmer, A. (2022). Strategic vehicle fleet management–a joint solution of make-or-buy, composition and replacement problems. *Journal of Quality in Maintenance Engineering*, *28*(2), 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1108/JQME-04-2020-0026

Sallnäs, U., & Björklund, M. (2023). Green e-commerce distribution alternatives – a mission impossible for retailers? *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *34*(7), 50–74. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLM-07-2022-0271

Schiavone, F., Leone, D., Sorrentino, A., & Scaletti, A. (2020). Re-designing the service experience in the value co-creation process: an exploratory study of a healthcare network. *Business Process Management Journal*, *26*(4), 889–908. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-11-2019-0475

Shekarian, E., Prashar, A., Majava, J., Khan, I. S., Ayati, S. M., & Sillanpää, I. (2024). Sustainable supply chains in the heavy vehicle and equipment industry: a multiple-case study of four manufacturers. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, *31*(6), 1853–1875. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2022-0474

Tang, C., Hou, Q., & He, T. (2024). Research on closed-loop supply chain decision-making of power battery echelon utilization under the scenario of trade-in. *Modern Supply Chain Research and Applications*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/MSCRA-01-2024-0003

Toni, M., Renzi, M. F., Pasca, M. G., Guglielmetti Mugion, R., di Pietro, L., & Ungaro, V. (2021). Industry 4.0 an empirical analysis of users' intention in the automotive sector. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *13*(4), 563–584. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-04-2020-0062

Tscharaktschiew, S., & Reimann, F. (2022). Less workplace parking with fully autonomous vehicles? *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(3), 283–301. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-07-2022-0029

Wehner, J., Taghavi Nejad Deilami, N., Altuntas Vural, C., & Halldórsson, Á. (2022). Logistics service providers' energy efficiency initiatives for environmental sustainability. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, *33*(5), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLM-10-2019-0270

Wolfshorndl, D. A., Vivaldini, M., & Camargo Junior, J. B. de. (2019). Hybrid production system: perspectives in supply chain risk management. *Revista de Gestão*, *26*(3), 313–334. https://doi.org/10.1108/REGE-01-2019-0005

Wu, J., & Qu, X. (2022). Intersection control with connected and automated vehicles: a review. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(3), 260–269. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-06-2022-0023

Xu, Q., Wang, J., Wang, B., & Yan, X. (2020). Modeling and simulation of intersection quasi-moving block speed guidance based on connected vehicles. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *3*(2), 67–78. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-01-2020-0002

Xu, Z., Fang, Y., Zheng, N., & Vu, H. L. (2022). Analyzing the inconsistency in driving patterns between manual and autonomous modes under complex driving scenarios with a VR-enabled simulation platform. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(3), 215–234. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-05-2022-0017

Yu, W., Li, J., Peng, L.-M., Xiong, X., Yang, K., & Wang, H. (2022). SOTIF risk mitigation based on unified ODD monitoring for autonomous vehicles. *Journal of Intelligent and Connected Vehicles*, *5*(3), 157–166. https://doi.org/10.1108/JICV-04-2022-0015

Zehendner, A. G., Sauer, P. C., Schöpflin, P., Kähkönen, A.-K., & Seuring, S. (2021). Paradoxical tensions in sustainable supply chain management: insights from the electronics multi-tier supply chain context. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *41*(6), 882–907. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-10-2020-0709