American Journal of Engineering and Technology Innovations
ISSN: - applied

Advancing Industrial Energy Efficiency: Overcoming Behavioral and Organizational Barriers for Sustainable Development

[1] Dr. Rafael Moretti
[1] University of Bologna, Italy

Received: 20th Oct 2025 | Received Revised Version: 28th Oct 2025 | Accepted: 09th Nov 2025 | Published: 22th Nov 2025

Volume 01 Issue 01 2025 | Crossref DOI: 10.64917/ajeti/V01I01-005

Abstract

Energy efficiency has long been recognized as one of the most cost effective and immediately available pathways for reducing industrial energy consumption, improving competitiveness, and achieving climate and sustainability targets. Yet, despite its proven technical feasibility and strong economic rationale, a persistent gap continues to exist between optimal and actual levels of energy efficiency adoption in firms. This paradox, commonly described as the energy efficiency gap, has been documented across countries, sectors, and organizational sizes. The present study develops an integrated theoretical and empirical narrative that explains this gap by synthesizing behavioral, organizational, institutional, and financial dimensions of energy efficiency decision making. Drawing strictly on the provided scholarly literature, this article advances a comprehensive framework that positions energy efficiency not merely as a technological or financial investment, but as a strategic organizational transformation shaped by institutional pressure, dynamic capabilities, financial slack, managerial cognition, and social norms.

The study builds on foundational economic and behavioral theories of market failures and bounded rationality while also incorporating more recent perspectives from institutional theory, organizational behavior, and energy management science. It demonstrates that barriers to energy efficiency are not isolated obstacles but mutually reinforcing structures that embed inefficiency within everyday industrial practices. These include information asymmetries, hidden costs, capital constraints, perceived risks, organizational inertia, lack of technical skills, and regulatory inconsistencies. Simultaneously, the paper highlights the powerful but underutilized multiple benefits of energy efficiency, such as improved productivity, reduced maintenance costs, enhanced product quality, lower emissions, improved worker safety, and reputational advantages, which often remain invisible in conventional investment appraisals.

Using energy audits, energy management systems, benchmarking tools, and policy instruments as analytical anchors, the article explains how firms can overcome behavioral and structural inertia and unlock these multiple benefits. The evidence reviewed from Europe, Asia, Africa, and emerging economies reveals that when energy efficiency is framed as a strategic capability rather than a peripheral technical issue, firms are more likely to sustain continuous improvement. Institutional pressure, mimetic behavior, and network participation further accelerate diffusion by reshaping norms and expectations. Ultimately, the article argues that closing the energy efficiency gap requires a systemic transformation that integrates technology, finance, management, and policy into a coherent governance structure. By doing so, energy efficiency becomes not only an environmental imperative but also a central pillar of industrial competitiveness and long term economic resilience.

Keywords: Energy efficiency gap, industrial energy management, behavioral barriers, institutional pressure, energy audits, sustainable production.

Cite This Article: Dr. Rafael Moretti. 2025. Advancing Industrial Energy Efficiency: Overcoming Behavioral and Organizational Barriers for Sustainable Development. American Journal of Engineering and Technology Innovations 1, 01, 24-30. https://doi.org/10.64917/ajeti/V01I01-005

1. Introduction

Energy efficiency has emerged over the past several decades as one of the most powerful yet paradoxical instruments in the global transition toward sustainable development. On the one hand, energy efficiency is widely acknowledged as an inexhaustible energy resource, capable of delivering economic growth, environmental protection, and energy security simultaneously (Cengel, 2011). On the other hand, firms across industries and regions consistently fail to adopt energy efficient technologies and practices that are economically rational, technologically feasible, and socially desirable. This persistent divergence between what should be done and what is actually done is known in the literature as the energy efficiency gap (Gerarden et al., 2015; Dunlop, 2019). The existence of this gap suggests that energy efficiency is not merely a technical or financial issue, but a deeply embedded organizational and behavioral phenomenon.

From an economic perspective, energy efficiency investments often deliver high rates of return, short payback periods, and low levels of risk when compared with many conventional capital investments (Russell, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015). Yet, empirical evidence repeatedly shows that firms systematically underinvest in these opportunities (Reddy, 1991; Weber, 1997; Schleich et al., 2016). Traditional neoclassical economics explains this underinvestment primarily through market failures such as imperfect information, principal agent problems, and capital market imperfections (Gerarden et al., 2015). However, such explanations have proven insufficient to fully account for the magnitude and persistence of the gap. As a result, a growing body of research has shifted toward behavioral, organizational, and institutional explanations that recognize firms as socially embedded entities rather than perfectly rational agents (Abrardi, 2019; Cattaneo, 2019; Bensouda and Benali, 2022).

Industrial energy efficiency is especially complex because it intersects with production systems, corporate strategy, workforce skills, regulatory frameworks, and financial structures. Manufacturing firms, for example, often prioritize throughput, quality, and delivery reliability over energy performance, even when energy costs represent a significant share of total operating expenses (Bunse et al., 2011; Svensson and Paramonova, 2017). Energy efficiency measures are frequently perceived as disruptive, risky, or peripheral to core business objectives, leading to organizational resistance and inertia (Soepardi and Thollander, 2018; Johansson and Thollander, 2018). This is further compounded by the fact that energy efficiency projects typically generate multiple benefits that extend far beyond energy cost savings, including reduced maintenance, improved product quality, enhanced worker safety, and environmental compliance, which are rarely captured in standard investment appraisal methods (Killip et al., 2019; Lung et al., 2019).

The literature also reveals that energy efficiency adoption is shaped by institutional pressures, including regulatory requirements, industry norms, customer expectations, and competitive benchmarking (Bensouda and Benali, 2023; Jalo et al., 2021). Firms do not operate in isolation but are embedded in networks of suppliers, customers, regulators, and peers that influence their perceptions of legitimacy and risk. Mimetic pressure, for example, can encourage firms to imitate the practices of perceived leaders, thereby accelerating the diffusion of energy efficient technologies even in the absence of strong financial incentives (Bensouda and Benali, 2022). At the same time, financial slack plays a crucial role in determining whether firms are willing to allocate resources to long term efficiency improvements rather than short term survival (Hill, 2019).

Against this backdrop, this article aims to develop a comprehensive, theoretically grounded, and empirically informed analysis of industrial energy efficiency that goes beyond narrow technical or economic perspectives. By synthesizing insights from energy economics, organizational theory, behavioral science, and policy studies, the paper constructs an integrated framework for understanding how barriers, drivers, and multiple benefits interact to shape energy efficiency outcomes. The central argument is that energy efficiency should be understood as a strategic organizational capability that is cultivated through institutional alignment, managerial commitment, learning processes, and supportive policy environments.

The literature gap that this study addresses lies in the fragmentation of existing research. While many studies focus on specific barriers, sectors, or policy instruments, few offer a holistic explanation of how these elements coevolve within firms and industries. By bringing together diverse strands of research from Europe, Asia, Africa, and beyond, this article seeks to provide a unified conceptual and analytical foundation for advancing both scholarship and practice in industrial energy efficiency.

2. Methodology

The methodology of this study is based on an integrative and systematic synthesis of the peer reviewed and institutional literature provided in the reference list. Rather

than collecting primary empirical data, the research adopts a qualitative meta analytical approach that critically examines and interrelates theoretical models, empirical findings, and policy evaluations across multiple contexts. This approach is particularly appropriate for a topic such as energy efficiency, which spans disciplines, scales, and institutional settings and cannot be adequately captured through a single dataset or method (Della Valle and Bertoldi, 2022).

The first step involved a detailed conceptual mapping of the literature. Foundational works on energy efficiency barriers and the energy efficiency gap, such as those by Reddy (1991), Weber (1997), and Gerarden et al. (2015), were used to establish the economic and behavioral baseline. These were complemented by more recent studies that emphasize organizational, institutional, and managerial dimensions, including those by Cattaneo (2019), Bensouda and Benali (2022), and Dunlop (2019). The purpose of this mapping was to identify the key theoretical constructs that recur across different studies, such as information asymmetry, risk perception, bounded rationality, institutional pressure, and dynamic capabilities.

The second step consisted of a thematic analysis of empirical studies on industrial and organizational energy efficiency. This included sector specific investigations in manufacturing, steel, textiles, pulp and paper, shipping, and water utilities across countries such as Sweden, Indonesia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Morocco, Portugal, China, and Finland (Soepardi and Thollander, 2018; Hasan et al., 2019; Zafar, 2021; Bensouda and Benali, 2023; Cardoso et al., 2023; Vakili et al., 2022). By comparing these diverse contexts, the study identifies common patterns and divergences in how firms perceive and address energy efficiency.

The third step focused on policy and management instruments, particularly energy audits, energy management systems, and benchmarking tools. Seminal works such as Thumann and Younger (2008), Kalantzis and Katole (2016), and Dongellini et al. (2014) provide detailed insights into how audits diagnose inefficiencies and generate actionable recommendations. Studies on audit programs and networks in Sweden and the European Union, including those by Backlund et al. (2015), Andersson et al. (2018), and Jalo et al. (2021), were used to assess the long term impacts of such interventions on firm behavior.

The fourth step examined the multiple benefits of energy efficiency, drawing on Russell (2015), Zhang et al. (2015), Killip et al. (2019), and Lung et al. (2019). These works demonstrate that energy efficiency investments often produce a wide range of non energy benefits that improve overall organizational performance. The methodology here involved tracing how these benefits are conceptualized, measured, and communicated within firms and policy frameworks.

Throughout this process, careful attention was paid to maintaining analytical rigor and conceptual coherence. Rather than merely summarizing individual studies, the methodology seeks to build a cumulative argument that integrates economic, behavioral, and institutional perspectives into a single explanatory framework. This approach allows the study to move beyond descriptive accounts and toward a deeper understanding of why energy efficiency remains underexploited and how it can be more effectively institutionalized within industrial systems.

3. Results

The synthesis of the literature reveals a complex and multi layered set of findings that collectively explain why energy efficiency remains systematically underutilized in industrial and organizational contexts despite its clear advantages. One of the most robust and consistent results across studies is that technical potential alone does not drive adoption. Even when technologies are mature, reliable, and cost effective, firms frequently fail to implement them due to a constellation of behavioral, organizational, and institutional barriers (Cagno et al., 2013; Abrardi, 2019; Johansson and Thollander, 2018).

A central finding is that information asymmetry and cognitive limitations play a critical role in shaping energy efficiency decisions. Many firms lack accurate, timely, and context specific information about their own energy consumption patterns, let alone about the performance of alternative technologies (Lawrence et al., 2019; Blomqvist and Thollander, 2015). Energy use is often embedded in complex production processes, making it difficult for managers to isolate the impact of specific machines or practices. As a result, energy costs are frequently treated as fixed overheads rather than as variables that can be strategically managed. This leads to what Schleich et al. (2016) describe as implicit discount rates, whereby managers demand unrealistically short payback periods because they perceive energy efficiency investments as risky or peripheral.

Another major result concerns the role of organizational structure and culture. Studies across different countries and sectors show that firms with dedicated energy managers,

clear accountability structures, and integrated energy management systems are far more likely to identify and implement efficiency measures than those that treat energy as a secondary issue (Jalo et al., 2021; Lawrence et al., 2018; Johansson and Thollander, 2018). Conversely, when responsibilities are fragmented across departments or when energy issues are relegated to maintenance staff with limited decision making authority, opportunities remain unrealized. This organizational fragmentation is especially pronounced in small and medium sized enterprises, which often lack the technical and managerial resources needed to pursue systematic energy management (European Commission, 2015; Andersson et al., 2018).

Financial constraints and risk perceptions also emerge as decisive factors. While many energy efficiency projects are profitable in the long run, they often compete for capital with core production investments that promise more immediate and visible returns (Hill, 2019). Firms with limited financial slack are particularly reluctant to allocate funds to projects that do not directly increase output or market share (Bensouda and Benali, 2022). Even when external financing is available, uncertainty about future energy prices, regulatory changes, and technological performance can deter investment. The literature shows that these perceived risks are often higher than the actual risks, reflecting a behavioral bias toward the status quo (Weber, 1997; Dunlop, 2019).

Institutional and regulatory environments further shape outcomes. In contexts where energy efficiency is supported by clear standards, audit requirements, and incentive programs, firms are more likely to engage in systematic improvement (Backlund et al., 2015; Koirala and Bohara, 2021). Conversely, inconsistent or non functional regulations can create confusion and reduce motivation, as observed in the Finnish building sector and other contexts (Kangas et al., 2018). Importantly, institutional pressure is not limited to formal regulation. Bensouda and Benali (2023) demonstrate that mimetic and normative pressures, such as industry benchmarks and peer networks, can significantly influence firm behavior by redefining what is considered normal or legitimate.

The results also highlight the powerful but often overlooked multiple benefits of energy efficiency. Across numerous case studies and sectoral analyses, energy efficiency measures are shown to reduce maintenance costs, improve equipment reliability, enhance product quality, and create safer and more comfortable working environments (Russell, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015; Killip et al., 2019). These benefits can sometimes exceed the value of energy savings themselves, yet they are rarely included in investment appraisals or communicated effectively to decision makers. This omission contributes to the undervaluation of energy efficiency and reinforces the perception that it is a marginal rather than strategic concern.

Energy audits and management programs consistently emerge as effective tools for overcoming these barriers. Detailed audit studies show that audits not only identify technical opportunities but also raise awareness, build internal capacity, and legitimize energy efficiency within organizations (Thumann and Younger, 2008; Dongellini et al., 2014; Chiaroni et al., 2017). Longitudinal evaluations of audit programs in Sweden demonstrate that firms continue to implement measures several years after the initial audit, especially when supported by networks and follow up mechanisms (Backlund et al., 2015; Jalo et al., 2021). These findings suggest that audits function as catalysts for organizational learning and change rather than as one off technical exercises.

4. Discussion

The results of this study underscore the need to reconceptualize energy efficiency as a deeply embedded organizational and institutional process rather than as a simple matter of technology adoption. Traditional economic models that treat firms as rational actors responding to price signals and investment returns fail to capture the complex social, cognitive, and structural dynamics that shape real world decision making (Gerarden et al., 2015; Dunlop, 2019). The persistence of the energy efficiency gap thus reflects not a lack of profitable opportunities but a misalignment between the way energy efficiency is framed and the way organizations actually operate.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings support the integration of behavioral economics and institutional theory into energy efficiency research. Behavioral barriers such as bounded rationality, loss aversion, and status quo bias explain why managers demand excessively short payback periods and overestimate risks (Schleich et al., 2016; Abrardi, 2019). Institutional pressures, in turn, explain why firms often follow the practices of their peers rather than optimizing independently, leading to path dependence and slow diffusion of innovation (Bensouda and Benali, 2022; Bensouda and Benali, 2023). When these perspectives are combined, energy efficiency emerges as a socially constructed practice shaped by norms, expectations, and power relations as much as by costs and benefits.

The concept of multiple benefits is particularly important in

this regard. By focusing narrowly on energy savings, firms and policymakers overlook the broader value proposition of efficiency investments (Russell, 2015; Killip et al., 2019). This not only leads to underinvestment but also to missed opportunities for aligning energy efficiency with core business objectives such as quality, reliability, and customer satisfaction. A more holistic accounting framework that captures these co benefits could fundamentally change the way energy efficiency is evaluated and prioritized within organizations.

The role of energy audits and management systems illustrates how organizational learning can overcome inertia. Audits provide a structured process for collecting and interpreting energy data, while also creating a forum for cross functional dialogue and strategic reflection (Thumann and Younger, 2008; Chiaroni et al., 2017). When embedded in broader policy programs and networks, audits can trigger a virtuous cycle of experimentation, benchmarking, and continuous improvement (Backlund et al., 2015; Jalo et al., 2021). However, audits alone are not sufficient. Without follow up, financing mechanisms, and managerial commitment, their recommendations often remain on paper.

There are also important limitations and challenges. Many studies focus on early adopters or firms that participate voluntarily in programs, which may bias results toward more proactive organizations (Andersson et al., 2018). Moreover, the diversity of industrial contexts means that no single policy or management approach can be universally effective. What works in Swedish SMEs may not work in Bangladeshi textile mills or Moroccan manufacturing firms (Hasan et al., 2019; Bensouda and Benali, 2022). This underscores the need for adaptive, context sensitive strategies that account for local institutional, cultural, and economic conditions.

Looking ahead, future research should deepen the analysis of how digitalization, data analytics, and artificial intelligence can support energy management by making energy flows more visible and actionable. It should also explore how financial instruments and de risking platforms, such as those promoted by DG Energy (2021), can mobilize private capital for efficiency investments. Most importantly, scholars and practitioners must continue to bridge the gap between technical potential and organizational reality by embedding energy efficiency into the strategic fabric of firms.

5. Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that industrial energy efficiency is not simply a matter of installing better equipment or responding to energy prices, but a complex socio technical transformation that requires changes in cognition, organization, and institutions. The persistent energy efficiency gap reflects the failure of conventional economic and managerial frameworks to capture the true value and nature of efficiency investments. By synthesizing insights from a wide range of empirical and theoretical studies, this research has shown that barriers to energy efficiency are deeply intertwined with organizational structures, financial constraints, behavioral biases, and institutional pressures.

At the same time, the analysis highlights the enormous untapped potential of energy efficiency as a source of competitive advantage, environmental improvement, and social benefit. The multiple benefits of efficiency investments extend far beyond energy cost savings and include improved productivity, reliability, safety, and corporate reputation. When these benefits are recognized and integrated into decision making, energy efficiency can become a central pillar of sustainable industrial strategy.

Energy audits, management systems, benchmarking tools, and policy programs play a crucial role in catalyzing this transformation by making energy use visible, building internal capabilities, and aligning incentives. However, their effectiveness depends on being embedded within supportive institutional environments and organizational cultures that value learning and long term performance. Ultimately, closing the energy efficiency gap requires a shift from viewing energy as a passive input to seeing it as a strategic resource that can be actively managed to create enduring value for firms and society alike.

References

1. Abrardi, L. Behavioral barriers and the energy efficiency gap: A survey of the literature. Journal of Industrial and Business Economics, 2019, 46, 25–43.
2. Andersson, E., Arfwidsson, O., and Thollander, P. Benchmarking energy performance of industrial small and medium sized enterprises using an energy efficiency index: Results based on an energy audit policy program. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2018, 182, 883–895.
3. Backlund, S., Thollander, P., Backlund, S., et al. Impact after three years of the Swedish energy audit program. Energy, 2015, 82, 54–60.
4. Bagodi, V., Sinha, D., and Naik, S. Energy conservation in a SME cluster: a system dynamics study. Energy Efficiency, 2022, 15.

5. Bensouda, M., and Benali, M. Overcoming risk aversion regarding energy efficiency practices through mimetic pressure and financial slack: Findings from the Moroccan manufacturing sector. Sustainability, 2022, 14, 16261.
6. Bensouda, M., and Benali, M. Behavioral barriers to energy efficiency and policy interventions: A survey of the literature. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 2022, 12, 305.
7. Bensouda, M., and Benali, M. The role of institutional pressure and dynamic capabilities in promoting energy efficiency practices: Evidence from the Moroccan manufacturing sector. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 2023, 13, 352.
8. Blomqvist, E., and Thollander, P. An integrated dataset of energy efficiency measures published as linked open data. Energy Efficiency, 2015, 8, 1125–1147.
9. Bunse, K., Vodicka, M., Schonsleben, P., et al. Integrating energy efficiency performance in production management gap analysis between industrial needs and scientific literature. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2011, 19, 667–679.
10. Cagno, E., Worrell, E., Trianni, A., and Pugliese, G. A novel approach for barriers to industrial energy efficiency. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2013, 19, 290–308.
11. Cardoso, B. J., Gomes, A., and Gaspar, A. R. Barriers and drivers to energy efficiency in the Portuguese water sector: Survey analysis. Applied Energy, 2023, 333, 120630.
12. Cattaneo, C. Internal and external barriers to energy efficiency: Which role for policy interventions. Energy Efficiency, 2019, 12, 1293–1311.
13. Cengel, Y. A. Energy efficiency as an inexhaustible energy resource with perspectives from the US and Turkey. International Journal of Energy Research, 2011, 35, 153–161.
14. Chiaroni, D., Chiesa, V., Franzo, S., Frattini, F., and Manfredi Latilla, V. Overcoming internal barriers to industrial energy efficiency through energy audit: A case study of a large manufacturing company in the home appliances industry. Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 2017, 19, 1031–1046.
15. Della Valle, N., and Bertoldi, P. Promoting energy efficiency: Barriers, societal needs and policies. Frontiers in Energy Research, 2022, 9, 804091.
16. Dongellini, M., Marinosci, C., and Morini, G. L. Energy audit of an industrial site: A case study. Energy Procedia, 2014, 45, 424–433.
17. Dunlop, T. Mind the gap: A social sciences review of energy efficiency. Energy Research and Social Science, 2019, 56, 101216.
18. European Commission. User guide to the SME definition. 2015.
19. Gerarden, T. D., Newell, R. G., Stavins, R. N., and Stowe, R. C. An assessment of the energy efficiency gap and its implications for climate change policy. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2015.
20. Hasan, A. M., Rokonuzzaman, M., Tuhin, R. A., Salimullah, S. M., Ullah, M., Sakib, T. H., and Thollander, P. Drivers and barriers to industrial energy efficiency in textile industries of Bangladesh. Energies, 2019, 12, 1775.
21. Hill, D. R. Energy efficiency financing: A review of risks and uncertainties. Proceedings of the Energy Challenges for the Next Decade, 2019.
22. Jalo, N., Johansson, I., Andrei, M., Nehler, T., and Thollander, P. Barriers to and drivers of energy management in Swedish SMEs. Energies, 2021, 14, 6925.
23. Jalo, N., Johansson, I., Kanchiralla, F. M., and Thollander, P. Do energy efficiency networks help reduce barriers to energy efficiency. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2021, 151, 111579.
24. Johansson, M. T., and Thollander, P. A review of barriers to and driving forces for improved energy efficiency in Swedish industry. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2018, 82, 618–628.
25. Kalantzis, F., and Revoltella, D. Do energy audits help SMEs to realize energy efficiency opportunities. Energy Economics, 2019, 83, 229–239.
26. Kangas, H. L., Lazarevic, D., and Kivimaa, P. Technical skills, disinterest and non functional regulation: Barriers to building energy efficiency in Finland viewed by energy service companies. Energy Policy, 2018, 114, 63–76.
27. Killip, G., Fawcett, T., Cooremans, C., Wijns Craus, W., Subramani, K., and Voswinkel, F. Multiple benefits of energy efficiency at the firm level: A literature review. European Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, 2019.
28. Koirala, B. S., and Bohara, A. K. Do energy efficiency building codes help minimize the efficiency gap in the US. Energy and Environment, 2021, 32, 506–518.
29. Lawrence, A., Thollander, P., and Karlsson, M. Drivers, barriers, and success factors for improving energy management in the pulp and paper industry. Sustainability, 2018, 10, 1851.
30. Lawrence, A., Thollander, P., Andrei, M., and Karlsson, M. Specific energy consumption in energy

management for improving energy efficiency in industry. Energies, 2019, 12, 247.

31. Lung, B., Nimbalkar, S. U., and Wenning, T. Multiple benefits of industrial energy efficiency lessons learned and new initiatives. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2019.

32. Reddy, A. K. Barriers to improvements in energy efficiency. Energy Policy, 1991, 19, 953–961.

33. Russell, C. Multiple benefits of business sector energy efficiency. American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, 2015.

34. Schleich, J., Gassmann, X., Faure, C., and Meissner, T. Making the implicit explicit: A look inside the implicit discount rate. Energy Policy, 2016, 97, 321–331.

35. Soepardi, A., and Thollander, P. Analysis of relationships among organizational barriers to energy efficiency improvement: A case study in Indonesias steel industry. Sustainability, 2018, 10, 216.

36. Svensson, A., and Paramonova, S. An analytical model for identifying and addressing energy efficiency improvement opportunities in industrial production systems. Journal of Cleaner Production, 2017, 142, 2407–2422.

37. Thumann, A., and Younger, W. J. Handbook of Energy Audits. The Fairmont Press, 2008.

38. Vakili, S. V., Ballini, F., Dalaklis, D., and Olcer, A. I. A conceptual transdisciplinary framework to overcome energy efficiency barriers in ship operation cycles. Energies, 2022, 15, 2098.

39. Weber, L. Some reflections on barriers to the efficient use of energy. Energy Policy, 1997, 25, 833–835.

40. Zafar, S. S. Barriers involve in the energy efficiency in the manufacturing industries of Pakistan. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 2021, 11, 293–299.

41. Zhang, S., Worrell, E., and Crijns Graus, W. Mapping and modeling multiple benefits of energy efficiency and emission mitigation in Chinas cement industry. Applied Energy, 2015, 155, 35–58.