I Z A Institute
of Labor Economics
Initiated by Deutsche Post Foundation

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 15842

Does Access to Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Reduce Women Household Burden? Evidence from India

Qinghe Su
Mehtabul Azam

DECEMBER 2022

I Z A Institute
of Labor Economics

Initiated by Deutsche Post Foundation

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

IZA DP No. 15842

Does Access to Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Reduce Women Household Burden? Evidence from India

Qinghe Su
Oklahoma State University

Mehtabul Azam
Oklahoma State University and IZA

DECEMBER 2022

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ISSN: 2365-9793

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Schaumburg-Lippe-Straße 5–9
53113 Bonn, Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Email: publications@iza.org

www.iza.org

ABSTRACT

Does Access to Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Reduce Women Household Burden? Evidence from India

Using the nationally representative Indian Time Use Survey, we study whether the use of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) as cooking fuel affects the time spent in cooking and employment activities for Indian rural women. We instrument use of LPG by a leave-one-out spatial instrument constructed by taking the average level of LPG use in the village where the average is calculated leaving the concerned household. We find no impact of LPG on the probability of women participating in cooking activities. However, use of LPG reduces (increases) time spent in cooking (employment) activities. We also find evidence of rebound effect where use of LPG leads to marginally more cooking events in a day. We find that LPG impact on time spent in cooking and employment is mostly driven by married women.

JEL Classification: J22, O12, O13, O33

Keywords: access to LPG, time use, instrument variable, women, India

Corresponding author:
Mehtabul Azam
Department of Economics
376 Business Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater
Oklahoma 74078
USA

E-mail: mazam@okstate.edu

1 Introduction

In this paper, we examine whether the use of Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) reduces the domestic cooking burden for women in rural India. This is an important question in general as nearly 2.6 billion people worldwide do not have access to clean cooking fuel in 2019 as opposed to 3 billion in 2010 (IEA et al., 2021). However, its importance is attenuated in the Indian context where the female labor force participation rate (FLFPR) remains very low compared to other countries and has witnessed a considerable decline over time. The FLFPR in India among 15+ age group declined from 31 percent in 2001 to 19 percent in 2021. In contrast, China's and world's FLFPR stands at 61 percent and 46 percent, respectively in 2021 (World Development Indicators). Given that rural women in age group 18-60 spend about 23.6 percent of their non-sleeping time on food preparation and management in contrast to only 0.6 percent of non-sleeping time for rural men, access to efficient time-saving modern energy can potentially free up women's time away from cooking activities and increase the potential time available for employment activities.[1] For example, Greenwood, Seshadri, and Yorukoglu (2005) find that technological changes in home production, e.g. washing machines, refrigeration, saved time spent on domestic chores, and increased women's labor supply in developed countries. Similarly, electrification of rural households in South Africa enabled large, immediate shifts in home production technology, increased female employment and plausibly stimulated net labor supply increase (Dinkelman, 2011).

Ex-ante, it is not clear that access to LPG will will reduce the time devoted to cooking activities. Since LPG is more efficient in cooking compared to biomass, use of LPG should decrease time spent on cooking assuming that the quantity of cooking women does remains the same. At the same time, since women are becoming efficient in cooking, they may increase the frequency (or/and quantity) of cooking commonly known in literature as "rebound effect."[2] For example, they may increase the variety of foods cooked or increase

[1] Authors calculation from Indian Time Use Survey, 2019.

[2] Rebound effect is the phenomenon where improving energy efficiency may save less energy than expected due to a rebound of energy use.

the frequency of tea/snacks preparation. It may contribute to an increase in time spent on cooking activities by women considering women do almost all cooking in Indian rural households.[3] Hence, conceptually, the impact of LPG on total time devoted to cooking remains ambiguous and is an empirical question.

Even in 2019, more than 50 percent of rural Indian households reported biomass as their main source of cooking in spite of considerable attempt by the Government of India to increase the use of LPG.[4] The health and environmental benefits of using LPG over biomass is well-documented (Agarwal, 1986; Bruce et al., 2000; Pillarisetti et al., 2019).[5] However, there are only few studies in developing countries context that look into time-saving aspect of access to modern cooking energy such as LPG.[6] Moreover, the existing studies are mostly based on small samples or experiments carried out in specific context on limited number of households. For example, Williams et al. (2020) use data from randomized trial on 180 adults, non-pregnant women between the ages of 25–64 residing in the high-altitude region of Puno, Peru. Half of the sample (90 women) were provided with the treatment (intervention) under which they received a three-burner locally-produced LPG stove, free continuous LPG refills delivered directly to their home for one year, and behavioral training and reinforcement for LPG use; control participants continued their baseline cooking practices. They find that exclusive use of LPG results in between 3.2 and 3.9 fewer hours cooking and 1.9 fewer hours collecting biomass fuel per week, for a total of up to 5.8 hours saved per week. In a

[3]According to Indian Time Use Survey-2019, 90 percent of women in 18-60 age group living in rural India reported spending some time in a day in cooking activities defined as preparation of meals/snacks, while only 3.8 percent of rural men in age group 18-60 reported spending any time in cooking activities.

[4]The Indian Federal Government started a scheme known as Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojna (PMUY) in 2016 with the aim of providing 50 million LPG connections to below poverty line (BPL) families with a support of Indian Rs.1600 per connection in the next three years. By December 2018, 58 million new LPG connections were distributed (source: Sharma, Anshu, "Government expands eligibility criteria to meet Pradhan Mantri Ujjwala Yojana target", CNBC TV18, 19 December 2018).

[5]Imelda and Verma (2019) use the fuel-switching program from kerosene to LPG in Indonesia to study the impact of LPG. They find that access to LPG leads to a significant improvement in women's health, particularly among those who spend most of their time indoors doing housework.

[6] Krishnapriya et al. (2021) points out that "the time savings and productivity benefits from enhanced energy access have perhaps been ignored because time-use data are expensive and difficult to collect." A few studies have looked at whether switching to cleaner stoves can reduce time spent on cooking and collecting fuel. However, most of them have focused on improved biomass stoves that intend to reduce biomass fuel consumption through improved heat transfer efficiency (Rehfuess et al., 2014).

close context to ours, Afridi et al. (2022) conduct an experiment in one district in Central India where they divide randomly selected villages from the district into three groups. They provide information on health benefits of LPG in one group of villages, while providing information on both health benefits of LPG and government subsidy for LPG to the second group of villages. For the third group of villages no information was provided. Thus their treatment status is based on the information campaign to improve LPG uptake of households, and they look at the impact of the information campaign on time spent in household chores. The find that the health and subsidy information treatment reduces time spent in cooking by a marginally significant 5 minutes per day (with control group mean 198 minutes), however, no significant change for the treatment where only health benefits information is provided.

In this paper, we use nationally representative Indian Time Use Survey 2019 (TUS-2019) to address whether the use of LPG leads to a reduction in time spent on cooking activities by adult women residing in rural India. First, we use the OLS to estimate the impact of LPG on the time spent for food management and preparation, and employment activities controlling for a large set of individual's, household's, and village observable characteristics including district fixed effects. Recognizing that the estimate for LPG may suffer from the omitted variable bias, we instrument household-level LPG using the fraction of households in the village that reported LPG as main source of cooking where the concerned household is excluded in calculation of the average. We control for village level characteristics in addition to the districts fixed effects to ensure that out instrument is conditionally uncorrelated with village level geographical differences that may affect individual women time use outcome independently. We also use unconditional quantile regression to capture the heterogeneous impact of LPG based on the total time spent in food management and preparation activities.

Our paper contributes to literature in the following ways. First, to our best knowledge, ours is the first paper that looks at the impact of LPG on time spent on cooking activities using a nationally representative household survey data. In addition, we also look at the time spent on total employment activities. As previously stated, the existing studies that

looked at the time spent in cooking activities are mostly based on small surveys or some experiments with the limited number of households. A few studies that look at the impact of LPG are based on small surveys from selected sites, and focus mainly on the time saving due to decreased time burden of collecting biomass. The cooking time channel remains relatively unexplored, especially using a nationally representative data.[7] Since cooking activities are repetitive and involve almost universal participation from women irrespective of economic status, time saved in cooking activities will have a much larger impact for the economy. For example, about 90 percent of women in rural India not only reported involvement in cooking activities, but also spent considerable time in cooking activities. Hence, cooking activities channel is much more important.[8]

The main findings of the paper are the following. We find that having LPG as the main cooking fuel has no impact on the extensive margin as far as cooking activity is concerned, i.e., women's involvement in cooking activities does not depend on LPG use. This is not surprising given very high participation in cooking activities by adult women in rural India. We find that having LPG as the main cooking fuel reduces the total time spent by women in food management and preparation by 6 minutes per day. This decline is about 2.8 percent of the average time of 212 minutes spent in food management and preparation by women per day. Looking at the different activities of food preparation and management, we find use of LPG reduces actual cooking time by 2.5 minute which is 1.8 percent of the average time of 136.5 minutes spent on actual cooking per day. We find some evidence of rebound effect mitigating the impact of LPG on actual cooking time. The women who use LPG are more likely to cook meal/snacks more than 3 times a day, while the average time spent

[7]For the Indian context, Afridi et al. (2022) also presents propensity score matching estimate for the impact of LPG access on cooking time using their baseline experimental survey; however, their data comes from a single district in Central India.

[8]In comparison, firewood may be collected by women once every 3-7 days, and may involve children or adult males also. In our data which captures the activities for one day, only 5 percent of the women in 18-60 age group in rural India reported collecting firewood. It is possible that the 5 percent is under counting the women participation in fuel collection because of infrequent nature of the activity. However, given the nature of nationally representative data, one could infer that at any random day only 5 percent of the women in age group 18-60 were involved in fuel collection compared to 90 percent women being involved in cooking activities in rural India.

per cooking activity is lower with LPG use. We also find LPG use reduces time spent on cleaning (related to food management and preparation), storing, and other food related activities, but increases time spent for serving meals/snacks. Importantly, we find that women residing in household that use LPG as the main cooking fuel are likely to work 6.7 minutes more compared to women who reside in household that do not report LPG as main cooking fuel. Although in terms of minutes, this is not a large gain. However, given that on average, rural Indian women spend around 84.6 minutes on employment activities, this is about 8 percent increase in time spent in employment activities. Our unconditional quantile regression estimates do not suggest heterogeneity in the impact of LPG at different quantiles.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the empirical methodology. Section 3 describes the data. Section 4 presents the results. Section 5 concludes.

2 Empirical Methodology

Our objective is to estimate the causal effect of use of LPG on the time spent in cooking activities by women, hence, we estimate the following equation:

$$Y_{ihvd} = \alpha + \delta LPG_{hvd} + \beta X_{ihvd} + \varsigma X_{vd} + \eta_d + d_\tau + \varepsilon_{ihvd} \tag{1}$$

where Y_{ihvd} denotes the time spent in cooking activities by women i, residing in household h, in village v of district d. X_{ihvd} is a matrix of both women's and household's observed characteristics and time spent in other unpaid domestics work, and care activities[9], while X_{vd} contains village characteristics. η_d are districts fixed effects, d_τ represents fixed effects for the day of the week when household time use information was collected, and ε_{ihvd} is the randomly

[9]Other unpaid domestics work, and care activities consists of categories captured under International Classification of Activities for Time Use Statistics 2016 (ICATUS) major division 3: Unpaid domestic services for household members excluding the subcategory (division) 31: Food and meals management and preparation; and ICATUS major division 4: Unpaid caregiving services for household members. Time spent in other unpaid activities may affect the time spent in direct food management and preparation activities.

distributed error. LPG_{hvd} is the binary indicator that captures whether household's main source of cooking is LPG, and δ is our main interest parameter that captures the impact of LPG on the outcome variable. We first estimate the Equation (1) using the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS).

One potential issue with the use of OLS is that the outcome variable is zero for a significant proportion of women, especially when we consider some sub-categories of cooking activities. In the case of censoring, alternative remains a Tobit model. Frazis and Stewart (2012) argue that OLS models are preferred in the analysis of time allocation decisions given that the estimation techniques for limited dependent variables which assume a nonlinear functional form, such as the Tobit model, will be inconsistent if one wants to estimate means of long-run time use from a sample of daily observations. Stewart (2013) finds that zero time usage is not caused by censorship, but by a discrepancy between the data reference period (diary days) and the period of interest (usually much longer than a day), and the Tobit model estimation will be inconsistent, but OLS estimates are unbiased. Gershuny (2012) asserts that there is a problem with too many zeros originating from single-day diaries, but traditional diary studies can accurately estimate the mean times in activities for samples and subsamples. Moreover, Foster and Kalenkoski (2013) find that the qualitative conclusions are similar for Tobit and OLS methods when analyzing the time allocated to childcare activities. Hence, we chose OLS over Tobit model for simplicity and ease of interpretation.

2.1 Instrument Variable Framework

The OLS estimate provides an unbiased estimate of the impact of LPG use on time spent on cooking activities if the choice of LPG is not correlated with the error term after controlling for other observables. Although we control for a large set of characteristics including household demographics and income (proxy by per capita consumption expenditure), village characteristics, and district fixed effects, it is difficult to rule out some unobserved factors that may be correlated with both the outcome and LPG use. Hence, the endogeneity of

LPG cannot be ruled out.

To address the issue of the potential endogeneity of the LPG variable, we adopt an instrument variable (IV) strategy.[10] We use the fraction of households in the village that reported LPG as main source of cooking where the concerned household is excluded in calculating average.[11] There are many studies that have used similar leave-one-out or spatial instrument, i.e., they instrument person i's endogeneous variable with the average of endogenous variable among person i's peers, excluding i himself or herself in this average (for example, Fruehwirth et al., 2019; Khandker et al. 2014; Persson and Tabellini, 2009). Using village level average LPG use as an instrument, we estimate the following two-stage least square model:

$$LPG_{ihvd} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 . meanLPG_{-(ih),vd} + \gamma_2 X_{ihvd} + \gamma_3 X_{vd} + \eta_d + d_\tau + \vartheta_{ihvd} \tag{2}$$

$$Y_{ihvd} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \widehat{LPG_{ihvd}} + \pi_2 X_{ihvd} + \pi_3 X_{vd} + \eta_d + d_\tau + \sigma_{ihvd} \tag{3}$$

where $meanLPG_{-(ih),vd}$ is the fraction of households in the village v that reported LPG as their main source of cooking, where the concerned household is excluded in calculating average for the village. There are two identifying assumptions here. First, average LPG use in a village must be correlated with the household use of LPG, i.e., $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ in Equation (2). The second condition, known as the exclusion restriction, implies that $meanLPG$ affects the outcome Y_{ihvd} only through LPG use by the household.

The fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking is expected to serve as an instrument because peer pressure or demonstration effect is likely to affect a household's decision to use LPG as households tend to follow their neighbors or other associates in the village. If neighbors obtain LPG, then a household without LPG can signal lower socioeconomic standing, which households would be expected to avoid if they can

[10] If the unobservables that drives LPG use are positively (negatively) correlated with cooking time, the OLS will be upwards (downwards) biased.

[11] We also use average use of LPG where average is based on all households as an instrument, and results are similar.

afford it. There is a large body of literature on peer effects. For example, Arcidiacono and Nicholson (2005) and Jackson and Bruegmann (2009) analyze the peer effect in the context of students' academic achievement. Krauth (2003) incorporates both peer effects and selection effects to investigate the youth's decision to smoke. Cornelissen et al. (2017) focus on estimating the effect of the long-term or predetermined quality of a worker's current peers on the current wage. Nicoletti et al. (2018) provide empirical evidence that the increase in mothers' working hours is amplified through the influence of family peers. Thus, we postulate that the higher the percentage of households using LPG in a village, the greater the likelihood that a household living in that village will adopt LPG.

The second condition is also expected to hold as the incidence of LPG use at the village level should not directly impact the time devoted by women to cooking activities that are primarily based on individual household needs.[12] While the first identifying assumption can be validated in the data, the exclusion restriction is debatable. One potential issue with our IV is that it may be correlated with other omitted village level geographical characteristics, and the impact on cooking time is through the correlation with omitted village level variables. To mitigate the concerns, we not only control for district fixed effects but also a set of village level characteristics. We believe that conditional on all the explanatory variables included in the estimation, only route through which village average LPG use affects individual women's time spent in cooking activities is through the influence on the household use of LPG.

3 Data

We use the Time Use Survey (TUS) 2019 collected by the Indian National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO). It is the first survey of its kind to be conducted by NSSO to collect

[12]Given the outcome variable that is time spent in food preparation (which is very household specific) and endogenous variable (LPG use), it is reasonable to rule out spillover impacts where the village level average LPG use affects the household time spent in cooking directly after a large set of household and village characteristics are controlled for. Spillover (or general equilibrium) impacts are discussed in the case of economic outcome variables (such as income) and endogenous variable (electricity supply) in Sedai et al. (2020, 2021, 2022).

detailed information on how individuals spend their time on paid activities, unpaid activities, learning, socializing, leisure activities, self-care activities, etc (Government of India, 2018, p C-1). The survey is nationally representative and covers 1,38,799 households in both rural (82,897 households) and urban (55,902 households) India. The survey provides detailed information on time use collected over 24 hours starting from 4:00 A.M. on the day before the date of interview to 4:00 A.M. on the day of the interview. Thus, the diary time frame is 24 consecutive hours and is divided into 30-minute intervals.[13] If multiple activities are performed during the 30-minute slot, time used in each activity is documented. The Indian TUS uses the International Classification of Activities for Time Use Statistics 2016 (ICATUS 2016) to record 3-digit codes for different activities carried out by an individual in 30-minute slots over 24 hours. Overall, the TUS has detailed time use information of 4,47,250 persons of age six years and above (rural: 2,73,195 and urban: 1,74,055).

Appendix Table A1 presents the distribution of households based on the main cooking fuel used. About 86.2 percent of urban households reported LPG as main source of cooking compared to only 51.5 percent of rural households. Since our main objective is to look at the impact of LPG use on cooking time, we restrict our sample to rural India as most of the households in urban India report use of LPG as main cooking fuel source. A household is classified as using LPG if the main cooking fuel is LPG or other natural gas. Non-LPG fuel include firewood and chips, dung cake, coke or coal, and charcoal.[14]

Given that the main burden of cooking falls on women, we restrict our sample to rural women in age 18-60 and exclude students.[15] So, our final sample consists of 86,970 non-

[13]Charmes (2015) points out that nationally-representative time use diaries are one of the best ways to capture patterns of time use for individuals, but such surveys tend to exist for only a handful of developing countries. To our best knowledge, Indian TUS-2019 survey is the only nationally representative time use survey for India till date.

[14]About 0.68 percent of the households in rural India reported using electricity, gobar gas, other bio gas, or other fuels as their main fuel source. We exclude those households from our sample. In addition, we also exclude 0.46 percent of the households from our sample who do not report cooking.

[15]In rural India, 90 percent of the women in age group 18-60 report spending some time in a day in cooking activities defined as preparation of meals/snacks, while only 3.8 percent of rural men in age group 18-60 reported spending any time in cooking activities. Hence, the probability of intra-household substitution of cooking activities across genders remains extremely low. Therefore, we do not consider men sample in our analysis.

student women in age group 18-60 residing in rural India.[16] Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the time spent in the activities of interest for this study. The employment activities consist of activities categorized under ICATUS 2016 major division 1: employment and related activities. This category contains both paid employment and self-employment including employment in household enterprises. On average, women (18-60 age group) in rural India spend about 3 hour and 33 minutes on food management and preparation activities that constitute about 14.8 percent of the total time available in 24 hours. However, once we exclude the sleeping time, this constitutes a staggering 23.6 percent of non-sleeping time. In contrast, the average time spent on employment activities is only 1 hour and 25 minutes which is about one third of time spent on food management and preparation activities. Actual cooking activity (preparing meals/snacks) accounts for 64 percent of the total time spent on food management and preparation. On average, women spend about 2 hours and 17 minutes for cooking during a day. Women in rural India on average cook 2.7 times in a day, and each cooking event takes about an hour.

Insert Table 1 here

Insert Table 2 here

Table 2 provides summary statistics for the control variables used in the regression analysis. The control variables include individual characteristics such as education, age, marital status, employment types, and time spent in other unpaid domestics work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household level characteristics such as monthly per capita expenditure, religion, caste, household demographic composition, house type, household head's education, gender, and employment types. The explanatory variables also include village characteristics such as log of mean consumption expenditure, employment rate, percentage of population with higher secondary or above education, percentage

[16]The survey day are coded "normal day" and " the other day". The normal days are the days on which a household member mainly pursues their routine activities, whereas the day on which the regular activities of a household member are altered for any reason is treated as "other day". We only use the data if individual reported the survey day as typical normal day.

of upper castes in the population, percentage of households which contain a regular salaried member, and percentage of households living in mud house.

4 Results

Panel A of Table 3 presents OLS estimates for the impact of LPG use estimated using Equation (1). The first column of the Table 3 looks at the probability of a woman involved in cooking. As argued earlier, the ease of use for LPG compared to biomass may provide an incentive for some to get involved in cooking, i.e., the cooking increases at extensive margin. In rural India, women involvement in cooking activities is very high as 90 percent of the women in our sample report spending some time in a day in cooking activities defined as preparation of meals/snacks. The OLS estimate from column (1) suggests no impact of LPG use by household on the probability of women's involvement in the cooking activities implying that LPG has no impact on the extensive margin. This is not surprising as access to more efficient cooking methods is more likely to affect cooking time on intensive margin in a society where cooking is primarily considered as women's responsibility and a large share of women already report being involved in cooking activities.

Column (2) of Table 3 provides estimates for the impact of LPG use on total time spent on food preparation and management activities. Although the OLS estimate suggests a negative impact of LPG on total time spent, the magnitude of the impact remains small, i.e., about a 2 minutes reduction on an average of 212.5 minutes spent in a day in food preparation and management activities that translates into about 1 percent decline in time spent on food preparation activities. Hence based on OLS estimate, one could argue that the impact of LPG on freeing up time from the kitchen activities is limited.[17] In column (3) of Table 3,

[17]In literature, one of the potential channels for time saving discussed is through reduced burden of collection of firewood and dungs. This is captured in our data by ICATUS code 241: Gathering firewood and other natural products used as fuel for own final use. We do not consider the time spent on collecting firewood as separate outcomes, as only 5 percent of women (and 1.2 percent of men) in age group 18-60 in rural India reported spending time in collection of firewood. As stated earlier, it is possible that the 5 percent of women participation in firewood collection may be understating the true participation because of

we consider different activities under food preparation and management activities. Column (3A) looks at the actual time spent in cooking. Given the superiority of LPG in providing heat, one would expect a reduced time in actual cooking assuming that the quantity/type of food cooked is not affected by LPG use. We find no impact on total time spent in cooking activities. Since LPG provides quick cooking start and heating compared to traditional biomass in addition to the higher thermal heat, it is surprising that there is no impact of LPG on time spent in actual cooking.[18] We find a statistically significant negative impact on time spent on cleaning up, storing food, and other food related activities. However, minutes saved in those activities remain small to have any considerable impact on total time spent on food management and preparation. In column (4), we look at the impact of LPG on time spent in employment activities. Although the coefficient for LPG is positive, it is not statistically significant. Moreover, the magnitude of impact is economically small.

Insert Table 3 here

4.1 Instrument Variable Estimates

As discussed in the empirical strategy section, OLS estimates may be biased because of omitted variables. To address the endogeneity concerns, we implement the instrumental variable strategy. Appendix Table A2 presents estimates for the first stage regression, where we regress the indicator variable LPG on the meanLPG and other variables discussed earlier. The first stage results confirm a strong relationship between LPG use by the household and

24 hour recall period for the survey and infrequent nature of firewood collection activity. However, the survey is representative of the population activity on a given day, so on any given day only 5 percent of women participate in firewood collection. Another source of discrepancy may be because of the target population of small surveys, mostly poor residing around forest areas. The firewood collection participation is higher in poor and population residing closer to forest areas.

[18]Bruce et al. (2017) find that the reported thermal combustion efficiency of LPG is in the range of 45-60 percent depending on the stove used. They also find that, when tested in the laboratory, although some fan-assisted advanced biomass cookstoves can reach efficiency of 30-55 percent but their efficiency is quite low in everyday use. Muralidharan et al. (2015) found that the in-home efficiency of two types of advanced biomass fan stove is between 17 to 25 percent. WLPGA (2018) models the potential for mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and finds that annual per capita cooking requires 43 kg LPG instead of 400 kg of wood.

average of LPG use by other households in the village. The point estimate suggests that a ten-percentage point increase in the fraction of LPG usage in the village is associated with a 8.4 percentage point increase in the probability of LPG use by the household.

In Table 4, we report the results of the Durbin and Wu-Hausman tests that examine whether LPG variable can be treated as an exogenous variable in the outcome equation. For all the time outcomes except time spent in storing, we reject the null of exogeneity of LPG variable at 5% significance level. For binary variable-involvement in cooking activities, exogeneity of LPG cannot be rejected. Given that exogeneity of LPG is rejected for majority of our outcomes, we proceed with IV estimation and report IV estimates for all outcomes. However, recall that OLS estimates will be efficient in the case LPG variable is exogenous.

Insert Table 4 here

Panel B of Table 3 reports the IV estimates for all outcomes. IV estimate also suggests that having LPG as the main cooking source will not affect the probability of a woman involved in cooking, and IV estimate is similar in magnitude to OLS estimate. Hence, one can conclude that having LPG as main cooking fuel does not affect cooking activities on extensive margin. Column (2) in panel B, Table 3 indicates that the total time spent on food management and preparation is reduced because of use of LPG as main cooking fuel source. Recall that, we reject the null of exogeneity of LPG variable in the case of aggregated time spent in food management and preparation, hence, the IV estimate is preferable. Although, the signs of both OLS and IV estimates are negative suggesting a reduction in time spent, the magnitude of the IV estimate larger compared with the OLS estimate. This suggests positive omitted variable bias in the OLS estimate reducing the negative impact of LPG. The IV estimate suggests that use of LPG reduces time spent on food management by about 6 minute per day that translates into 2.8 percent reduction in time spent on food management activities per day. In terms of practical impact, this suggests reduction of 42 minutes in a week, which may not seem a large impact for an individual but given 93 percent participation of rural women in food preparation and management activities, it will translate into a large

number of absolute hours saved for the entire economy which could be used alternatively.

Column (3A) of Table 3 presents IV estimate for the time spent in preparing meal/snacks. Compared to OLS estimate, the magnitude of the IV estimate is considerably larger, and the IV estimate is statistically significant. The IV estimate suggests saving of 2.5 minutes on the mean 136.5 minutes which translates into 1.8 percent reduction in time spent on actual cooking activities. Although, our estimate of the time reduction in cooking activities due to LPG is lower than the estimate found by Afridi et al. (2022), it confirms Afridi et al. (2022) finding of limited impact of LPG on cooking time using a nationally representative data. Based on propensity score model, Afridi et al. (2002) find that having LPG access reduces the time spent in cooking by 6.2 minute on a control group mean of 202 minutes, i.e., about 3 percent reduction in time spent in cooking activities. Besides the difference in methodology, our estimate is based on a nationally representative data compared to Afridi et al. (2022) sample that comes from a single district. Moreover, while our sample includes all adult women, Afridi et al. (2022) sample consists of women who are primary cook.

The limited impact on actual cooking time is a little bit puzzling given the superiority of LPG on biomass in generating heat. It is entirely plausible that the women who use LPG cook more items that is not captured in data. In appendix Table A3, we check for the rebound effect. We find that women with LPG access are 1.9 percentage points more likely to cook more than three times in a day. The women with LPG access on average cook 0.06 times more in a day where the average number of cooking events are 2.73. While on average per cooking activity takes about 57.6 minutes, having access to LPG reduces average time by 3.0 minutes per cooking activity. This is about 5 percent reduction in time per cooking activity which is larger than the overall 1.8 percent reduction in cooking time. Thus, there is some evidence of rebound effect where women with LPG access cook marginally more times although spend less time per cooking activity. This potentially contributes to smaller effect on total time spent in cooking activities in a day.

The time spent in serving meals/snacks increased by about 2.8 minutes (column 3B,

panel B of Table 3). The ease to start fire to prepare meals also implies LPG users may have tea/coffee or other snacks more easily than traditional biomass users probably driving the positive impact.[19] IV result for cleaning up outcome suggests that women who use LPG spend less time in cleaning up perhaps because the pots and pans are no longer covered in soot from cooking over a wood fire (Clancy et al., 2012). Similarly, LPG users spend less time in storing and other food management activities. Importantly, IV estimate for time spent in employment activity suggest positive impact of LPG (panel B, column (4) of Table 3). Women who use LPG are likely to spend 6.7 minutes more in employment activities per day compared to women who use biomass. Although in terms of minutes spent in employment activities, 6.7 minutes per day do not seem large, but given a very low employment rate in women, this translates into a 8 percent increase in time devoted to employment activities on an average time of 84.5 minutes.

4.2 Heterogeneity in LPG impact

The discussion so far looks at the impact of LPG on average time spent without distinguishing among LPG users. However, we do not expect that every LPG user will benefit similarly, irrespective of their cooking needs. To capture the heterogeneity in the impact of LPG, we use unconditional quantile regression (Firpo, Fortin, and Lemieux, 2009) and focus on total time spent in food management and preparation, since quantiles for other outcomes are not well defined in the presence of a large fraction of the outcome being zero. For the total time spent on food management and preparation activities, zero values only account for about 7 percent of rural women. For unconditional quantile regression, we do not instrument LPG use because of computational issues. Frolich and Melly (2013) propose a IV implementation of the quantile regression, and a STATA routine 'ivqte' is available to implement their strategy. However, the Frolich and Melly (2013) approach requires use of indicator variable as an

[19] A positive affect of LPG on serving meals/snack suggests that probably LPG users have marginally higher frequency of snacks, however, we cannot test this in our data. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily increase the burden on women as other activities under food management and preparation are negatively associated with LPG use leading to reduction in total time devoted to food management and preparation.

instrument, and our instrument is a continuous variable. Khandker et al. (2014) converts their IV which is continuous average village level electrification to binary IV by using a 50 percent electrification rate as cut off. Importantly, incorporation of survey weights in the IV implementation of the quantiles is not discussed in Frolich and Melly (2013), and not incorporated in 'ivqte'. Given that the time use survey we use in our paper is a stratified sample, an unweighted IV implementation of quantiles will not provide the right answer.

In Table 5 we present the results of the unconditional quantile regressions for total time spent on food management and preparation. We considered all observations in column (1). In column (2), we dropped the observations where the reported total time spent in food management and preparation is zero. We do not find evidence of heterogeneous impact across quintiles. The time reductions differ only marginally across quintiles. .

Insert Table 5 here

Insert Table 6 here

The impact of LPG on time spent in food management activities may differ based on marital status. In the Indian context, the custom of patrilocal marriage shifts a woman from her natal family to being part of her husband's household, hence single woman are more likely to be daughters of the households while married women are more likely to be daughters-in-law of the households. Pepin, Sayer, and Casper (2018) find that marital status differentiated housework and the number of employment hours. To capture the impact of LPG based on marital status, we carried out our analysis separately for married women and single women. Panel A and Panel B of Table 6 report the IV results for married women and single women, respectively.[20] It is interesting that while LPG access has no impact on the involvement in cooking for married women, it increases the probability of involvement in cooking for single women by 4.5 percentage points. It is important to point out that while 93 percent of married women reported participation in cooking compared to only 71

[20]OLS estimates and Hausman test for exogeneity of LPG variables are presented in Appendix Table A5 and A6, respectively.

percent of single women. While the participation of single women or daughters is higher with LPG use, there is no impact of LPG on time spent in food management activities or employment activities for single women. In contrast, we see 7.4 minutes decrease in time spent on food management for married women. Similarly, for married women time spent in employment activities increased by 8.7 minutes which 11.8 percent increase in total time spent in employment activities.

5 Conclusion

We address the question of whether use of LPG reduces the time burden of cooking for rural Indian women and free up time for employment activities using the nationally representative Time Use Survey collected in 2019 by the Indian National Sample Survey Organization. To address the endogeneity of LPG, we use a leave-one-out spatial instrument constructed through taking mean level of LPG use in the village where the mean is calculated excluding the concerned household. The OLS and IV estimates are similar in sign, however, the magnitude of IV estimates turn out larger than the OLS estimates. We find that the LPG does not influence the probability of women's involvement in cooking activities. However, the use of LPG reduces the time spent in food management and preparation activities. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the reduction in time spent in food management and preparation activities remains low. We find that the use of LPG reduces time spent on food management by about 6 minute per day that translates into 2.8 percent reduction in 212 minutes spent on food management activities per day. Moreover, the actual cooking time is only reduced by 2.5 minutes on a mean of 136 minutes per day. We find some evidence of rebound effect where women with LPG access cook marginally more times potentially mitigating some of the time reducing effect of LPG on total time spent in cooking. LPG users spent about 5 percent less time per cooking event, however, the total cooking time per day is reduced only by 1.8 percent. If we use the 6 minutes of time saved on food management and preparation

activities because of LPG use, this is only 42 minutes per week. Moreover, given that cooking activities are more likely be daily events, it may not be feasible for women to bundle all of these small daily time savings into a single day. Thus, from pure quantitative view, the limited impact of LPG on time spent in cooking does not seem to add much for women empowerment, however, the ease of use of LPG compared to biomass, which is not captured in data, cannot be ignored.

We also find positive but limited impact of LPG use on employment activities. The use of LPG increases time spent in employment activities by married women by 8.7 minutes per day. Although in terms of minutes, it does not seem large, however, given the low amount of time spent in employment activities by married women, this translates into 11.8 percent increase in time spent in employment activities. Given that 93 percent of married women in rural India are involved in cooking with about half of them with no access to LPG, this small gain in terms of minutes in employment activities suggests a potential for huge amount of additional employment hours for the economy.

Time saved (or increased) in cooking (employment) activities is one dimension of potential benefits of LPG use. There are other benefits, such as environmental and health benefits, of LPG use which are well documented. The benefits of increased employment time and reduced burden (although limited) of cooking activities add to the potential benefits of LPG for the society, and reinforce the urgency shown by Indian policymakers in ensuring LPG access to majority of Indian population.

There are a few caveats with our study. Our LPG use is based on the question about the main source of household cooking fuel. LPG being main source of cooking fuel does not guarantee exclusive use of LPG. It is possible and probably expected that rural households engage in fuel stacking behavior potentially reducing the impact. For example, Cheng and Urpelainen (2014) use two rounds of NSS data collected in 1987-88 and 2009-10, and find that stacking of LPG and traditional biomass has grown rapidly in India over 1987 and 2010. In this context, Sedai et al., (2022) points out "although the use of Liquified Petroleum

Gas (LPG) has been widely discussed as the alternative to clean cooking, the principal constraint to widespread adoption has been the fuel cost (Gould and Urpelainen, 2018), poor infrastructure, especially in rural areas (Allcott et al., 2016), coupled with weak bargaining power of women in rural households for having LPG connections (Bansal et al., 2013)." Based on qualitative and quantitative research in rural north India, Vyas et al. (2021) find that the gender norms and attitudes prevalent in this region encourage women to preserve gas, promote women's work that facilitates the use of solid fuels, and hinder communication between the cook and the decision-maker regarding LPG refills. In a separate study covering six Indian states, Jain et al. (2018) document that an increase in LPG ownership between 2015 and 2018 was accompanied by an increase in fuel stacking. Thus, in the absence of exclusive use of LPG, the impact of LPG on time saved, presented in this paper, will be an underestimation.

References

[1] Afridi, F., Debnath, S., Dinkelman, T., and Sareen, K. (2022). Time for clean energy? cleaner fuels and women's time in home production, IZA DP No. 15120.

[2] Agarwal, B. (1986). Cold hearths and barren slopes: The wood fuel crisis in the Third World. New Delhi: Zed.

[3] Allcott, H., Collard-Wexler, A., and O'Connell, S. D. (2016). How do electricity shortages affect industry? evidence from India. American Economic Review, 106(3), 587–624.

[4] Arcidiacono, P., and Nicholson, S. (2005). Peer effects in medical school. Journal of public Economics, 89(2-3), 327–350.

[5] Bansal, M., Saini, R., and Khatod, D. (2013). Development of cooking sector in rural areas in India—a review. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 17, 44–53.

[6] Bruce, N. G., Aunan, K., and Rehfuess, E. A. (2017). Liquefied petroleum gas as a clean cooking fuel for developing countries: implications for climate, forests, and affordability. Materials on Development Financing, 7, 1-44.

[7] Bruce, N., Perez-Padilla, R., and Albalak, R. (2000). Indoor air pollution in developing countries: a major environmental and public health challenge. Bulletin of the World Health organization, 78, 1078-1092.

[8] Charmes .J. (2015). Time Use Across the World: Findings of a World Compilation of Time Use Surveys. New York.

[9] Cheng, C. Y., and Urpelainen, J. (2014). Fuel stacking in India: Changes in the cooking and lighting mix, 1987–2010. Energy, 76, 306-317.

[10] Clancy, J., Winther, T., Matinga, M., and Oparaocha, S. (2012). Gender equity in access to and benefits from modern energy and improved energy technologies: world

development report background paper. Gender and Energy WDR Background Paper, 44.

[11] Coen-Pirani, D., Le´on, A., and Lugauer, S. (2010). The effect of household appliances on female labor force participation: Evidence from microdata. Labour Economics, 17(3), 503–513.

[12] Cornelissen, T., Dustmann, C., and Schönberg, U. (2017). Peer effects in the workplace. American Economic Review, 107(2), 425–56.

[13] Dinkelman, T. (2011). The effects of rural electrification on employment: New evidence from south africa. American Economic Review, 101(7), 3078–3108.

[14] Firpo, S., Fortin, N. M., and Lemieux, T. (2009). Unconditional quantile regressions. Econometrica, 77(3), 953-973.

[15] Foster, G., and Kalenkoski, C. M. (2013). Tobit or OLS? An empirical evaluation under different diary window lengths. Applied Economics, 45(20), 2994-3010.

[16] Frazis, H., and Stewart, J. (2012). How to think about time-use data: What inferences can we make about long-and short-run time use from time diaries?. Annals of Economics and Statistics/Annales d'économie et de statistique, 231-245.

[17] Frölich, M., and Melly, B. (2013). Unconditional quantile treatment effects under endogeneity. Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 31(3), 346-357.

[18] Fruehwirth, J.C., Iyer, S., and Zhang, A. (2019). Religion and Depression in Adolescence, Journal of Political Economy, 127(3), 1178-1209.

[19] Gershuny, J. (2012). Too many zeros: a method for estimating long-term time-use from short diaries. Annals of Economics and Statistics, 247-270.

[20] Gould, C. F. and Urpelainen, J. (2018). LPG as a clean cooking fuel: Adoption, use, and impact in rural India. Energy Policy, 122, 395–408.

[21] Government of India. (2018). Time Use Survey, January 2019-December 2019: Design, Concepts, Definitions and Procedures, Volume I, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, N, Delhi.

[22] Greenwood, J., Seshadri, A., and Yorukoglu, M. (2005). Engines of liberation. The Review of Economic Studies, 72(1), 109-133.

[23] IEA, IRENA, UNSD, World Bank, and WHO. (2021). Tracking SDG 7: The Energy Progress Report. World Bank, Washington DC.

[24] Imelda, I., and Verma, A. P. (2019). Clean Energy Access: Gender Disparity, Health, and Labor Supply (No. 29397). Universidad Carlos III de Madrid. Departamento de Economía.

[25] Jackson, C. K., and Bruegmann, E. (2009). Teaching students and teaching each other: The importance of peer learning for teachers. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 1(4), 85–108.

[26] Jain, A., Tripathi, S., Mani, S., Patnaik, S., Shahidi, T., & Ganesan, K. (2018). Access to clean cooking energy and electricity: Survey of states 2018 (CEEW Report). New Delhi, India: Council on Energy, Environment and Water (CEEW).

[27] Khandker, S. R., Samad, H. A., Ali, R., and Barnes, D. F. (2014). Who benefits most from rural electrification? Evidence in India. The Energy Journal, 35(2).

[28] Krauth, B. (2003). Peer effects and selection effects in youth smoking. Manuscript, Dept. Econ., Simon Frasier Univ., Burnaby, BC.

[29] Krishnapriya, P. P., Chandrasekaran, M., Jeuland, M., & Pattanayak, S. K. (2021). Do improved cookstoves save time and improve gender outcomes? Evidence from six developing countries. Energy Economics, 102, 105456.

[30] Muralidharan V, Sussan T.E, Limaye, S., Koehler, K., Williams, D.L., Rule, A.M., Juvekar, S., Breysse, P.N., Salvi, S., and Biswal, S. (2015). Field testing of alternative cookstove performance in a rural setting of western India. International journal of environmental research and public health, 12(2), 1773-1787.

[31] Nicoletti, C., Salvanes, K. G., and Tominey, E. (2018). The family peer effect on mothers' labor supply. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 10(3), 206–34.

[32] Pepin, J. R., Sayer, L. C., and Casper, L. M. (2018). Marital status and mothers' time use: Childcare, housework, leisure, and sleep. Demography, 55(1), 107-133.

[33] Persson, T., and Tabellini, G. (2009). Democratic Capital: The Nexus of Political and Economic Change. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 1(2), 88-126.

[34] Pillarisetti, A., Ghorpade, M., Madhav, S., Dhongade, A., Roy, S., Balakrishnan, K., and Smith, K. R. (2019). Promoting LPG usage during pregnancy: A pilot study in rural Maharashtra, India. Environment international, 127, 540-549.

[35] Rehfuess, E. A., Puzzolo, E., Stanistreet, D., Pope, D., and Bruce, N. G. (2014). Enablers and barriers to large-scale uptake of improved solid fuel stoves: a systematic review. Environmental health perspectives, 122(2), 120-130.

[36] Sedai, A. K., Nepal, R., and Jamasb, T. (2020). Flickering lifelines: Electrification and household welfare in India. Energy Economics, 1049-75.

[37] Sedai, A. K., Nepal, R., and Jamasb, T. (2022). Electrification and socio-economic empowerment of women in India. The Energy Journal, 43(2).

[38] Sedai, A. K., Vasudevan, R., Pena, A. A., and Miller, R. (2021). Does reliable electrification reduce gender differences? evidence from India. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 185:580–601.

[39] Stewart, J. (2013). Tobit or not tobit? Journal of economic and social measurement, 38(3), 263–290.

[40] Vyas, S., Gupta, A., and Khalid, N. (2021). Gender and LPG use after government intervention in rural north India. World Development, 148, 105682.

[41] Williams, K. N., Kephart, J. L., Fandiño-Del-Rio, M., Condori, L., Koehler, K., Moulton, L. H., and CHAP trial Investigators. (2020). Beyond cost: Exploring fuel choices and the socio-cultural dynamics of liquefied petroleum gas stove adoption in Peru. Energy Research and Social Science, 66, 101591.

[42] WLPGA (2018). Substituting LPG for wood: Carbon and Deforestation impacts: https://www.wlpga.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Substituing-LPG-for-Wood-Carbon-and-Deforestation-Impacts-Updated.pdf.

Table 1: Time spent in different activities (*in minutes*) by household cooking fuel

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	LPG	*non-LPG*	Difference	
Employment and related activities	89.01	79.63	9.38	84.56
	(170.90)	(162.02)		(166.81)
Food management and preparation	206.72	218.91	-12.19***	212.51
	(109.16)	(114.29)		(111.79)
Preparing meals/snacks	131.52	141.97	-10.45***	136.48
	(75.35)	(79.83)		(77.69)
Serving meals/snacks	24.54	24.05	0.48**	24.31
	(33.95)	(32.51)		(33.28)
Cleaning up after food preparation	40.01	40.24	-0.23	40.12
	(36.59)	(37.39)		(36.97)
Storing, arranging, preserving Food	3.29	3.39	-0.09	3.34
	(14.36)	(16.07)		(15.19)
Other activities of food management	7.36	9.26	-1.90***	8.26
	(22.37)	(25.99)		(24.18)
Number of Observation	44770	41200		85970

Note: Averages are constructed using sample of women aged 18-60 residing in rural India and accounting for survey weights. Standard deviations are in parenthesis. Column (3) reports whether the difference is statistically significant (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1).

Table 2: Summary Statistics (mean)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Individual level controls	*LPG*	*non-LPG*	*Difference*	All
Age	37.16	36.57	0.59***	36.88
Married (1/0)	0.86	0.86	0.00**	0.86
Primary School (1/0)	0.13	0.14	-0.01	0.14
Middle School (1/0)	0.16	0.14	0.02***	0.15
Secondary (1/0)	0.14	0.08	0.06***	0.11
Higher Secondary (1/0)	0.09	0.05	0.04***	0.71
Graduate and above (1/0)	0.07	0.02	0.05***	0.50
self-employed (1/0)	0.13	0.15	-0.02***	0.14
wage or salary employed (1/0)	0.04	0.02	0.02***	0.03
casual wage labor (1/0)	0.09	0.09	0.00***	0.09
Minutes spent in unpaid domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities	166.05	164.61	1.44*	165.37
Household level controls				
LPG				0.53
meanLPG (Fraction of households in village with LPG)[$$]	0.73	0.27	0.46***	0.51
Household size	4.35	4.50	-0.15***	4.42
Log of monthly per capita expenditure	8.98	8.77	0.21***	8.88
Number of age group 0-14	1.13	1.32	-0.19***	1.22
Number of age group 15-64 (male)	1.45	1.42	0.03***	1.44
Number of age group 15-64 (female)	1.59	1.59	0.00	1.59
Muslim (1/0)	0.10	0.14	-0.04***	0.12
Scheduled Tribe (1/0)	0.08	0.17	-0.09***	0.12
Scheduled Caste (1/0)	0.20	0.22	-0.02***	0.21
Other backwards Classes (1/0)	0.46	0.41	0.05***	0.44
Small family land (1/0)	0.08	0.07	0.01***	0.07
Medium family land (1/0)	0.05	0.04	0.01***	0.05
Large family land (1/0)	0.03	0.02	0.01***	0.03
Semi-pucca house (1/0)	0.26	0.34	-0.08***	0.30
Pucca house (1/0)	0.66	0.44	0.22***	0.55
Head age	47.23	46.10	1.13***	46.69
Female head (1/0)	0.14	0.14	0.00*	0.14
Head education level				
Primary School (head) (1/0)	0.14	0.16	-0.02***	0.15
Middle School(head) (1/0)	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.17
Secondary(head) (1/0)	0.15	0.09	0.06***	0.12

Higher Secondary(head) (1/0)	0.09	0.04	0.05***	0.07
Graduate and above(head) (1/0)	0.07	0.02	0.05***	0.05
Self-employed (head) (1/0)	0.48	0.46	0.02***	0.47
Wage or salary employed (head) (1/0)	0.12	0.07	0.05***	0.10
Casual wage labor (head) (1/0)	0.24	0.33	-0.09***	0.28
Village Level Controls				
log of village men per capita expenditure	7.60	7.44	0.16***	7.52
Employment rate	0.38	0.36	0.02***	0.37
Proportion of high caste in population	0.25	0.22	0.03***	0.23
Proportion of population with higher secondary or above education	0.14	0.10	0.04***	0.12
Proportion of population living in mud house	0.11	0.20	-0.09***	0.15
Proportion of households with salaried member	0.19	0.14	0.05***	0.17
Number of Observation	44770	41200		85,970

Note: The table reports the explanatory variables used in the analysis. Column (3) reports whether the difference is statistically significant (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1). $$: Instrument Variable.

Table 3: Impact of LPG use on women's time allocation in different activities (in minutes), Rural India

	(1)	(2)	(3)					(4)
			(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	
	Involved in cooking (1/0)	Food management and preparation	Preparing meals/snacks	Serving meals /snacks	Cleaning up	Storing, arranging preserving Food	Other activities of food management	Employment and related activities
Panel A: OLS								
LPG	0.001	-2.024***	-0.445	0.890***	-1.015***	-0.319***	-1.134***	1.013
	(0.002)	(0.755)	(0.537)	(0.235)	(0.280)	(0.121)	(0.186)	(0.854)
Mean	0.899	212.505	136.453	24.304	40.123	3.339	8.261	84.557
Observations	85,969	85,969	85,969	85,969	85,969	85,969	85,969	85,969
R-squared	0.207	0.342	0.310	0.277	0.171	0.088	0.145	0.621
Panel B: IV								
LPG	0.002	-5.954***	-2.462**	2.783***	-2.131***	-0.642***	-3.503***	6.721***
	(0.005)	(1.532)	(1.090)	(0.478)	(0.568)	(0.245)	(0.378)	(1.734)
Observations	85,962	85,962	85,962	85,962	85,962	85,962	85,962	85,962
R-squared	0.207	0.342	0.309	0.276	0.171	0.088	0.143	0.621

Note: The instrument variable used is the fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking where average is constructed excluding the concerned household. The OLS/IV regressions control for (see Table 2) women' age, marriage status, education level, employment status, time spent in other domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household demographic composition, religion and caste of household, amount of land owned by household, type of house construction, and monthly per capita consumption expenditure; household head' education, gender, and employment status and day of the week when survey was conducted, village characteristics, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: Hausman Test for Exogeneity of LPG

H0: the variable under consideration (LPG) can be treated as exogenous		
IV= Fraction of household in village with LPG		
	Durbin	WU
Involvement in cooking activities (1/0)	0.106	0.105
	(0.745)	(0.746)
Food management and preparation	8.676***	8.605***
	(0.003)	(0.003)
Preparing meals/snacks	4.508**	4.471**
	(0.034)	(0.034)
Serving meals /snacks	20.692**	20.526***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Cleaning up after food preparation	5.071**	5.029**
	(0.024)	(0.025)
Storing, arranging preserving Food	2.280	2.261
	(0.131)	(0.133)
Other activities of food management	51.883***	51.486***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employment and related activities	14.283***	15.168***
	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: *p*-values are in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 5 : Unconditional Quantile Regression

	(1)	(2)
percentile	Food management and preparation	Food management and preparation (non-zero)
10th	0.478	-5.726***
	(1.884)	(1.411)
25th	-9.923***	-8.618***
	(1.296)	(1.023)
50th	-8.825***	-9.834***
	(1.051)	(1.197)
75th	-12.183***	-9.848***
	(1.396)	(1.311)
90th	-11.491***	-11.077***
	(1.752)	(1.706)

Note: The first column uses all observations while the second column drops the observations where the reported total time spent in food management and preparation is zero (About 7 percent of the women have reported zero). Only the coefficient of LPG variable is reported. The regressions also control for a set of variables described in Table 2 and day of survey. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 6: Impact of LPG use on time allocation in different activities, Rural India, IV estimates

	(1)	(2)	(3)					(4)
			(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	
	involved in cooking	Food management and preparation	Preparing meals/snacks	Serving meals /snacks	Cleaning up	Storing, arranging preserving Food	Other activities of food management	Employment and related activities
Panel A: Married Women								
LPG	-0.004	-7.364***	-3.773***	2.825***	-2.349***	-0.612**	-3.454***	8.710***
	(0.004)	(1.606)	(1.143)	(0.525)	(0.612)	(0.261)	(0.401)	(1.786)
Mean	0.930	225.178	144.733	26.474	42.116	3.449	8.406	74.444
Observations	73678	73678	73678	73678	73678	73678	73678	73678
R-squared	0.155	0.310	0.282	0.274	0.164	0.094	0.155	0.603
Panel B: Single Women								
LPG	0.049**	1.742	5.682*	1.658*	-1.183	-1.390*	-3.026***	-8.527
	(0.020)	(4.598)	(3.293)	(1.008)	(1.510)	(0.713)	(1.101)	(5.822)
Mean	0.706	134.18	85.45	10.899	27.813	2.66	7.358	147.054
Observations	12284	12284	12284	12284	12284	12284	12284	12284
R-squared	0.263	0.280	0.259	0.236	0.210	0.120	0.166	0.685

Note: The instrument variable used is the fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking where average is constructed excluding the concerned household. The IV regressions also control for (see Table 2) women' age, marriage status, education level, employment status, time spent in other domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household demographic composition, religion and caste of household, amount of land owned by household, type of house construction, and monthly per capita consumption expenditure; household head' education, gender, and employment status and day of the week when survey was conducted, village characteristics, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A1: Distribution of households by cooking fuels

	Rural	Urban	Total
Firewood and chips	42.82	6.62	31.35
LPG	51.53	86.18	62.51
Other natural gas	0.23	1.14	0.51
Dung cake	3.83	0.23	2.69
Kerosene	0.19	0.74	0.36
Coke or coal	0.25	0.34	0.28
Gobar gas	0.07	0	0.05
Other biogas	0.01	0	0.01
Charcoal	0.21	0.22	0.21
Electricity	0.03	0.17	0.08
No cooking	0.46	3.63	1.47
Others	0.38	0.73	0.49

TableA2: First Stage Regression for IV Estimates

Dependent variable: LPG (1/0)	
MeanLPG	0.837***
	(0.005)

Note: meanLPG is the fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking where average is constructed excluding the concerned household. The regression also control for (see Table 2) women' age, marriage status, education level, employment status, time spent in other domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household demographic composition, religion and caste of household, amount of land owned by household, type of house construction, and monthly per capita consumption expenditure; household head' education, gender, and employment status and day of the week when survey was conducted, village characteristics, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A3: Regression Results for the Cooking Time

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Cooking times	Cooking more than 3 times per day	Average time per cooking
Panel A: OLS Regression			
LPG	0.039***	0.013***	-1.295***
	(0.008)	(0.003)	(0.176)
Mean	2.733	0.206	58.406
Observations	77117	77117	77117
R-squared	0.243	0.209	0.368
Panel B: Instrumental Analysis: IV=MeanLPG			
LPG	0.063***	0.019***	-3.009***
	(0.016)	(0.006)	(0.358)
Observations	77110	77110	77110
R-squared	0.243	0.209	0.367

Note: The instrument variable used is the fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking where average is constructed excluding the concerned household. The OLS/IV regressions control for (see Table 2) women' age, marriage status, education level, employment status, time spent in other domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household demographic composition, religion and caste of household, amount of land owned by household, type of house construction, and monthly per capita consumption expenditure; household head' education, gender, and employment status and day of the week when survey was conducted, village characteristics, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A4: Hausman Test for Exogeneity of LPG (Castes)

H0: the variable under consideration can be treated as exogenous		
IV= Fraction of household in village with LPG (meanLPG), meanLPG interacted with SC, ST, and OBC indicators		
	Durbin	WU
Involvement cooking activities	4.759	1.180
	(0.313)	(0.317)
Food management and preparation	35.971***	8.922***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Preparing meals/snacks	10.941**	2.713**
	(0.027)	(0.028)
Serving meals /snacks	25.774***	6.392***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Cleaning up after food preparation	50.224***	12.459***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Storing, arranging preserving Food	17.677***	4.383***
	(0.001)	(0.002)
Other activities of food management	57.950***	14.377***
	(0.000)	(0.000)
Employment and related activities	20.542***	5.094***
	(0.000)	(0.000)

Note: *p*-values in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table A5: Impact of LPG use on women's time allocation in different activities (in minutes), OLS

	(1)	(2)	(3)					(4)
			(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	
	Involved in cooking	Food management and preparation	Preparing meals/snacks	Serving meals /snacks	Cleaning up	Storing, arranging preserving Food	Other activities of food management	Employment and related activities
Panel A: Married women								
LPG	0.001	-1.995**	-0.465	1.039***	-1.138***	-0.333**	-1.098***	0.922
	(0.002)	(0.799)	(0.568)	(0.261)	(0.304)	(0.130)	(0.199)	(0.888)
Mean	0.930	225.178	144.733	26.474	42.116	3.449	8.406	74.445
Observations	73684	73684	73684	73684	73684	73684	73684	73684
R-squared	0.155	0.311	0.282	0.275	0.164	0.094	0.157	0.603
Panel B: Single women								
LPG	0.002	-3.336	-0.488	-0.697	-0.900	-0.295	-0.956*	1.069
	(0.009)	(2.182)	(1.562)	(0.478)	(0.717)	(0.338)	(0.522)	(2.762)
Mean	0.707	134.161	85.449	10.888	27.804	2.658	7.362	147.069
Observations	12285	12285	12285	12285	12285	12285	12285	12285
R-squared	0.265	0.280	0.260	0.238	0.210	0.121	0.168	0.685

Note: The instrument variable used is the fraction of households in village that reported use of LPG as main source of cooking where average is constructed excluding the concerned household. The OLS/IV regressions control for (see Table 2) women' age, marriage status, education level, employment status, time spent in other domestic work (excluding food management and preparation) and care activities; household demographic composition, religion and caste of household, amount of land owned by household, type of house construction, and monthly per capita consumption expenditure; household head' education, gender, and employment status and day of the week when survey was conducted, village characteristics, and district fixed effects. Standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A6 Hausman Test for Exogeneity of LPG (Married & Single Women)

H0: the variable under consideration can be treated as exogenous				
IV= Fraction of household in village with LPG	*Married Women*		*Single Women*	
	Durbin	WU	Durbin	WU
Involvement cooking activities	1.837	1.820	7.307***	6.895***
	(0.175)	(0.177)	(0.007)	(0.009)
Food management and preparation	14.807***	14.668***	1.550	1.462
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.213)	(0.227)
Preparing meals/snacks	11.108***	11.003***	4.464**	4.212*
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.035)	(0.040)
Serving meals /snacks	15.327***	15.182***	6.950***	6.558**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.008)	(0.010)
Cleaning up after food preparation	5.189**	5.139**	0.044	0.042
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.833)	(0.838)
Storing, arranging preserving Food	1.515	1.500	2.997*	2.827*
	(0.218)	(0.221)	(0.083)	(0.093)
Other activities of food management	45.716***	45.305***	4.492**	4.238**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.034)	(0.040)
Employment and related activities	25.203***	24.969***	3.454*	3.258*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.063)	(0.071)

Note: *p*-values in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.