Household Level Fuel Switching in Rural Hubei

Peng Wuyuan, Hisham Zerriffi, Pan Jihua

Working Paper #79

August 2008

PESD STANFORD | PROGRAM ON ENERGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The Program on Energy and Sustainable Development at Stanford University is an interdisciplinary research program focused on the economic and environmental consequences of global energy consumption. Its studies examine the development of global natural gas markets, the role of national oil companies, reform of electric power markets, international climate policy, and how the availability of modern energy services, such as electricity, can affect the process of economic growth in the world's poorest regions.

The Program, established in September 2001, includes a global network of scholars—based at centers of excellence on five continents—in law, political science, economics and engineering. It is based at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies.

Program on Energy and Sustainable Development
Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies
Encina Hall East, Room E415
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6055

http://pesd.stanford.edu

About the Authors

Wuyuan Peng is on the faculty of the China University of Geosciences and is currently a China and Sino-American Fulbright Scholar in the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development at Stanford University. **Hisham Zerriffi** is an Assistant Professor and the Ivan Head South/North Research Chair in the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia. **Jiahua Pan** is Director of the Research Centre for Sustainable Development in the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing.

Household Level Fuel Switching in Rural Hubei

Peng Wuyuan, Hisham Zerriffi, Pan Jihua

Abstract

Based on an analysis of a rural household survey data in Hubei province in 2004, we explore patterns of residential fuel use within the conceptual framework of fuel switching using statistical approaches. Cross sectional data show that the transition from biomass to modern commercial sources is still at an early stage, incomes may have to rise substantially in order for absolute biomass use to fall, and residential fuel use varies tremendously across geographic regions due to disparities in availability of different energy sources. Regression analysis using logistic and tobit models suggest that income, fuel prices, demographic characteristics, and topography have significant effects on fuel switching. Moreover, while switching is occurring, the commercial energy source which appears to be the principal substitute for biomass in rural households is coal. Given that burning coal in the household is a major contributor to general air pollution in China and to negative health outcomes due to indoor air pollution, further transition to modern and clean fuels such as biogas, LPG, natural gas and electricity is important. Further income growth induced by New Countryside Construction and improvement of modern and clean energy accessibility will play a critical role in the switching process.

INTRODUCTION

China has the largest population in the world, and more than half of its population lives in rural areas. The majority of rural residents are dependent on traditional fuels, which include various forms of biomass[1]., More than 250 million tons coal equivalent of biomass was burned for cooking fuel in 2002 (Tsinghua University, 2004). For many, this barely allows fulfillment of basic needs for cooking and space heating. Moreover, heavy reliance on biomass has raised pressing concerns over environmental consequences such as deforestation and soil erosion (Jiang and O'Neill, 2004). Speeding up the switch from biomass to modern energy is therefore of importance in China.

However, even some basic features of fuel switching remain unclear, and the literature on this topic is plagued by definitional issues as well as by emphases on alternative explanatory variables and processes. Until a decade ago, researchers had often attempted to understand the dynamics of energy use in families of varying incomes by reference to the "energy ladder" as a model for household decisions to substitute or to switch between available fuels (Leach, 1992). However, a growing body of empirical studies on household energy use reveals that multiple fuel use is common and that fuel switching does not occur as a series of simple, discrete steps,. With increasing affluence, households adopt new fuels and technologies that serve as partial, rather than perfect, substitutes for more traditional ones (Masera, et al., 2000). This "fuel stacking" model integrates four factors demonstrated to be essential in household decision making under conditions of resource scarcity or uncertainty: economics of fuel and stove type and access conditions to fuels; technical characteristics of cook stoves and cooking practices; cultural preference; and health impacts.

Studies in Mexico (Sheinbaum et al., 1996), China (Wang and Feng, 1997), South Africa (Davis, 1998), India (Reddy, 2003), and Guatemala (Heltberg, 2005) all find evidence of fuel switching in both urban and rural settings. However, there is no consensus on the consequences of the switching for the absolute amount of different types of energy use. Regarding the consumption of biomass energy in particular, Leach (1992) argues that a basic feature of economic growth is the substitution of modern fuels for traditional biomass fuels, and hence a decline in absolute biomass use. However, while increasing evidence suggests that such a transition is rapidly occurring in urban areas of developing countries, the present situation and prospects for rural areas are much more uncertain. For example, Foley (1995) argues that substitution is not a major feature of fuel switching in rural households.

Regarding the determinants of fuel switching, the literature has reached some consensus but important questions remain. Studies tend to agree that income is a key determinant of both the switch to new energy sources and total energy demand, although even here studies can be difficult to interpret and compare due to the use of different measures of income. Due to the absence of income data, many studies linking household income to energy consumption use expenditure as a proxy for income. While income and expenditure indeed tend to move in the same direction, correlation between the two is far from perfect. For example, a survey of rural Chinese household by Jiang and O'Neill (2003) found the correlation coefficient (R2) between income and expenditure to be only 0.516. All studies find that household size is another key determinant of demand, with per capita energy use smaller in larger households due to economies of scale. Changes in Mexican household size were even more important than income in determining per capita energy demand between 1970 and 1990 (Sheinbaun et al., 1996). Beyond these basic determinants, some researchers emphasize the importance of infrastructure for modern fuel distribution (Leach, 1992). However, a study in South Africa found that infrastructure has been of little importance (Davis, 1998).

Given that the process of fuel switching in rural household is not well understood, and the

[1] In this paper biomass refers to firewood and straw.

important health and environmental implications for China of this process, it is important to have a clear picture of current conditions and a well-grounded outlook for the future. In this paper, we will first determine the applicability of energy ladder versus fuel stacking models in China; then which type of fuel will probably substitute for biomass if substitution is occurring; and finally the determinants of fuel switching. The focus in this paper is biomass because it is the main cooking fuel and information regarding its use is usually unavailable due to little market transaction.

Existing analyses in China are based on aggregated statistics (Wang and Feng, 2001) or on surveys conducted in either one county or province in the eastern area (Wang and Feng, 1997; Wang et al., 1999, 2002) or in several counties (China Academy of Forest Research, 2003; ESMAP, 1996). In this paper we undertake an analysis of survey of representative rural households in Hubei province of central China to describe patterns of rural energy use in the context of conceptual framework of fuel switching.

The energy ladder model proposes that as families gain socioeconomic status, they abandon technologies that are inefficient, less costly and more polluting, such as biomass. Fuel stacking happens when new fuels are added, but even the most traditional systems are rarely abandoned. So, we can judge the two models by the share of households who abandoned biomass. Under conditions of resource scarcity or uncertainty, economics and access to fuels is an essential factor in household decision making. In China, coal is abundant, much cheaper than other commercial energy, and easily accessed, so it will probably become the main substitute of biomass. Income, household size, fuel prices, topography and other factors are hypothesized to be the main determinants of fuel switching.

In the next section, we describe the survey. Following that we present a descriptive analysis focusing on patterns of energy use by income level, then a regression analysis of the determinants of biomass energy use and the proportion derived from biomass. Finally, we summarize conclusions.

2. RURAL SURVEY

The survey was conducted for several reasons. The principal goal, given that very little data exist at household level on rural fuel, was to collect up-to-date and accurate primary data on rural household fuel consumption for an evaluation of current fuel consumption patterns. A related objective was to estimate the relationship between fuel switching and possible explanatory variables, such as income, fuel prices, family size, and so on. Finally, dissemination of this information will allow policy makers to better predict fuel switching patterns and, in doing so, maximize the efficiency of energy intervention programs.

2.1 Choice of Hubei Province

Hubei province is located in central China and covers about 180 thousand square kilometers. There were about 60 million people in Hubei and the urbanization rate was one-third in 2004. Its economic development is very close to the national average and the net income of rural residents was about 2900 yuan per capita in 2004 (Hubei Statistical Bureau, 2005).

There are 72 counties of which 30 counties are in mountainous areas, 21 in hilly areas and 21 in the plains. Mountainous areas are least developed and the plains much better developed. There are no coal resources in the plains and hilly areas and very little in mountainous areas. Most of the coal used in Hubei is imported from neighboring provinces. There are wide variations in the level of economic development and local resource conditions in Hubei, which enables an analysis of rural energy.

Counties were sampled using proportional stratified random sampling with a two-step process. The stratification factors were topography first and then economic development level. The sample consisted of 20 counties, 6 are in plain (Caidian, Yincheng, Tianmen, Jiayu, Shishou, Xiaochang), 6 in hilly (Tuanfeng, Huangmei, Guangshui, Yidu, Laohekou, Zhongxiang) and 8 in mountainous areas (Badong, Lichuan, Wufeng, Yunxian, Baokang, Yingshan, Nanzhang, Danjiangkou) respectively (Figure 1).

Figure 1 Map of the counties selected in Hubei province

2.2 Design of the Questionnaire

The Hubei rural household energy survey questionnaire contains a list of questions that the enumerators used to interview family heads or key family members. The questionnaire consisted of several parts. It measured socioeconomic and demographic status through questions on name, sex, age, occupation, net-income and educational level of the responding family head. Also included were questions on family type, size, output of cereal and cash crop, worker wages and bonuses, etc. A section on household energy consumption included questions such as nature, quantity, and source of energy used by the responding household during a one year period. In addition, information was collected on price, transport distance, and labor utilized to obtain firewood. For household cooking, questions were asked on stove uses and the major kinds of energy used for cooking.

2.3 Household Sampling Method

Once the counties were selected, household were sampled in a three-step process. The first and second steps were to select the township and village by random sampling. Two townships in each county were selected, and then two villages in each township were selected by random sampling. The last step was to select the households by system sampling, with five households in each village selected. The only departure from the random selection procedure was one household without electricity access. This selection method was used to ensure that households with different energy resource were included in the survey. In all, 401 farming household were selected in Hubei province.

2.4 Survey Implementation

A major feature of the survey was to involve the Hubei Information Centre under the Hubei Statistical Bureau in both the training and implementation in 2005. All the data collected are for 2004.

2.5 Summary Statistics of Households

The Hubei rural energy survey provides much information that can be used to understand rural fuel pattern in China. The 20 counties chosen for the detailed household energy survey are at quite different levels of development. The counties can be considered as fully representative of Hubei province (Table 1) but cannot be considered as fully representative of China. However, they do cover a broad spectrum of economic and resource development. The 8 counties in mountainous regions, where travel is difficult, are among the least developed (Figure 2). The 6 counties in the plains are much more advanced due to the rapidly growing rural industries. The 6 counties in hilly areas provide an example of a moderate level of development and offer an opportunity to assess the effects of differences in income on rural fuel consumption.

Table 1 Basic Indicator for Rural Households in Hubei

Indicator	Average
Household size[2]	3.69
Net income (yuan/household/year)	11 550.87
Of which, worker wages and bonuses, etc	4789.40
Sale of grain, oil bean plants and livestock	3099.59
Sideline occupation	1669.31
Government subsidy or remittance from relatives	423.95
Other	1533.01
Expenditure (yuan/household/year)	9885.84
Of which, housing	2067.40
Education	2060.69
Food and clothing	1503.23
Medical care	1104.78
Living appliance	642.62
Traffic	321.87
Entertainment	84.23
Other	2285.69

[2] There are two statistical approaches for rural residents in China. One is the Hukou system, based on official records. The other is based on surveying households to determine occupancy. In this paper, we use the latter. The difference between them is not trivial since so many rural laborers migrate to the urban areas for work without changes being recorded in the Hukou system.

Figure 2 Average income per capita by topography in rural Hubei



For the household energy consumption situation, there are several major features to be mentioned. The first was that 99% rural household have electricity access (Table 2), slightly higher than the national average level; the second is that the availability of wood resource is a significant determinant of the amount and kind of fuel used; the third was that coal is used extensively as cooking fuel in rural areas; finally, farmers also are using considerable amounts of liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), and other oil products (especially petrol, for transport).

Table 2 Household energy situation for consumption

Energy type	Share of household using	Unit average price	Yearly amount used per household
Electricity	98.8%	0.511 yuan/kWh	417.34 kWh
LPG	39.8%	5.56 yuan/kg	14.81 kg
Biogas	5.5%	NA	NA
Coal	72.5%	0.43 yuan/kg	548.63 kg
Kerosene	11.0%	5.73 yuan/kg	0.35 kg
Diesel	2.7%	4.56 yuan/kg	0.66 kg
Petrol	19.2%	3.54 yuan/litre	15.64 litre
Firewood	76.5%	0.25 yuan/kg	1398.80 kg
Straw	65.3%	NA	815.63 kg
Charcoal	19.0%	2.04 yuan/kg	9.98 kg

The percentages of households using various combinations of fuel have been calculated (Table 3). Households using a single type of fuel are rare. More than 99% of households use at least two types of fuel. Electricity plus coal and biomass is the most common combination. Fifteen percent of households use this mix, a figure that rises to 61.4% if households that also use LPG (13.2%), charcoal (5.7%), kerosene, diesel or petrol (14.5%), or both LPG and charcoal (4.0%) and all other types (9.0%) are included. Significantly, roughly one third of households use both biomass and LPG (often considered with electricity as the cleanest and most modern of rural cooking fuels), with a number of those households also using coal. This is a clear indication that the fuel stacking model explains the rural household energy mix quite well.

Table 3 Percentage of households by type of fuel used

Fuel type	%	Fuel type	%
Electricity only	0.2	Electricity+Kerosene+Diesel +Petrol+Coal+Biomass	14.5
Electricity+Coal	0.7	Electricity+LPG+Coal+Charcoal+Biomass	4.0
Electricity+ LPG+Coal	2.2	Electricity+Coal+Charcoal+ Biomass	5.7
Electricity+ LPG+Coal+Charcoal	0.7	Electricity+LPG+Kerosene+ Diesel+Petrol+Biomass	3.0
Electricity+LPG+Biogas+Kerosene+Diesel+Petrol+Coal	2.7	All types	9.0
Electricity+Biomass	8.0	Electricity+Kerosene+Diesel +Petrol+Biomass	7.0
Electricity+Coal+Biomass	15.0	Electricity+LPG+Biomass	4.0
Electricity+LPG+Coal+Biomass	13.2	Others	10.1
Total	100.0		

The growth of electricity use in rural China has been very rapid (Peng and Pan, 2006). The percentages of people who have access to the electricity grid are much higher largely because of the rural grid renovation. Nevertheless, access to electricity does not tell the whole story. It is necessary to make a distinction between accessibility and consumption, because many of the households with electric service can experience frequent power shutdowns. Electricity consumption is related to the appliance stock in rural households (Table 4). As incomes increase and electricity service improves, households add more appliances, including additional lights, cooking appliance, televisions, fans, washing machine, water heaters, and even air conditioner and refrigerator. Cooking with electricity is common in rural Hubei.

Table 4 Type and capacity of the electric equipment

Type of electrical appliances	Share of household having	Average capacity per household with the appliance (watt)	Average capacity per household (watt)
Electric light	98.8%	212.25	210.13
Air conditioner	2.0%	1765.00	35.30
Electric fan	85.8%	95.73	82.09
Electric cooking appliance	62.5%	941.66	588.54
Water heater	10.0%	535.30	53.53
TV	95.0%	97.66	92.78
VCD/DVD	40.3%	34.32	13.83
Washing machine	21.3%	420.61	89.59
Refrigerator	13.5%	145.56	19.65

3. ENERGY CONSUMPTION PATTERN IN RURAL HUBEI

Analysis of the 2004 rural Hubei household survey data shows that the average household total energy consumption was 426 standard coal equivalents (kgce). Table 5 shows the decomposition of average total energy use by fuel type, indicating that biomass is still the main source, accounting for 65.1% of total energy use. Since the electricity is not just for cooking and heating, and petrol and diesel are almost always for transport, the share of biomass in cooking fuels is much higher.

Table 5 Rural household energy consumption by energy type in 2004 Unit: kgce/head

	Electricity	Kerosene, diesel and petrol	LPG	Biogas	Coal	Charcoal	**Subtotal**	Straw	Firewood	**Subtotal**	**Total**
Access rate (%)	98.8	38.2	39.8	5.5	72.5	19.0		65.3	76.5		
Consumption	40.5	5.8	6.1	NA	93.9	2.4	**148.7**	84.3	193.0	**277.3**	**426.0**
%	9.5	1.4	1.4		22.0	0.6	**34.9**	19.8	45.3	**65.1**	**100**

Out of the 401 households investigated, only 39 (9.7%) had abandoned the use of biomass. The general picture of fuel consumption for rural households in Hubei is provided in Figure 3. It suggests that the use of all types of commercial energy increased, and use of biomass declined only at higher income levels. So, the fuel stacking model is more close to the reality of rural Hubei.

Figure 3 Fuel consumption per household versus income quintiles



According to the energy ladder and fuel stacking models, the different types of fuel consumption is correlated with income level. Plotting the fuel consumption as individual lines (Figure 4) allows us to look at the individual energy trends more clearly. It shows that the consumption of firewood declined at relatively high income levels, but the decreasing trend of straw consumption was not clear. This is because straw is mostly collected when harvesting, representing almost zero opportunity cost, but for firewood, it is collected at the cost of additional labor. However, firewood also exhibits the interesting property that middle income households appear to consume significant amounts. This fits with the idea that overall energy consumption initially rises as household gain more income but don't necessarily have access to more efficient energy sources or technologies. For commercial energy, the use of coal increased faster than electricity and LPG, especially for cooking. So the firewood will mainly be substituted by coal. Compared to LPG and electricity, initial stove costs and the price of coal is much lower.

Figure 4 Fuel consumption by income quintiles in rural Hubei household



Besides income level, resource conditions and transport infrastructure are also relevant to energy consumption. The mountainous residents use more firewood and less straw than plain and hilly counterparts (Figure 5). In average, the people in plain use more coal and LPG than elsewhere. Perhaps both income and topography are important, but without conducting the regression analysis it is difficult to know the importance of these two factors.

Figure 5 Fuel consumption per household versus topography versus income quintile



Therefore, judging by the statistics from the rural household survey in 2004, the fuel switching among rural households in present day Hubei is still at an early stage. With further socioeconomic development and increase in income, biomass will likely be substituted by commercial energy, but this process may be slow, especially for straw. Currently, the data suggest that income increases may have to be substantial (into the top deciles of current income) before the absolute amount of biomass use declines. This conclusion must be tentative, based as it is on cross-sectional analysis.

4. DETERMINANTS OF ENERGY DEMAND

We further investigate the main driving forces of fuel switching in rural households. Here the focus is the use of biomass since it is the main fuel currently. We carry out a two-step regression analysis. Firstly, we model the use (versus non-use) of biomass using logistic regression models. Next, we explore determinants of energy use by constructing tobit regression models that estimate the share of biomass in total fuel use. Because the use of electricity for cooking is difficult to separate from other uses of electricity, total energy consumption is used as a proxy variable for cooking fuel consumption since they move in the same direction. Furthermore, it is the share, not the total amount, of biomass that is chosen because the substitution of biomass is not always complete and new fuels are sometimes simply added into the consumption mix. Instead, its share declined when more new fuels are added.

4.1 Use (Versus Non-use) of Biomass

To use or not use biomass is a binary choice. We can estimate it by using a logistic model. Logistic modeling is a regression technique used to explain the behavior of a dichotomous dependent variable. The logistic model is

$$P(Y) = 1/(1+e^{-Y}) \qquad (1)$$

Where P is the probability that a household abandons the use of biomass, and Y=1 if the household abandoned the use of biomass and 0 if it did not. The explanatory variables were income, household size, time length of electricity access, topography, coal price and education. The price of coal in Hubei is determined by market forces, and the prices of LPG and electricity are administered and have no variation. So the coal price is selected as the substitute energy price and the electricity price is eliminated from the equation (Peng and Pan, 2008).

We assume that Y is linearly related to the variables shown below:

$$Y_i=\beta_0+\delta_1 D_1+\delta_2 D_2+\delta_3 D_3+\beta_1 X_1+\beta_2 X_2+\beta_3 X_3+\beta_4 X_4+\delta_4 D_4+error \quad (2)$$

Where Y_i =1 if non-use of biomass, 0 otherwise; β_0 is constant; D_1, D_2, D_3 refer to topography and is plain, hilly or mountainous areas respectively; X_1 is the net income per capita per year; X_2 refers the household size; X_3 is the length of time since the household received access to electricity and represents the level of infrastructure development; X_4 refers to coal price. D_4, the education level of household head, is a dummy variable and equals to 1 if high school and above, otherwise 0.

In a logit model all the regressors are involved in computing the changes in probability, and the rate of change in the probability is given by $\beta_j P_i(1-P_i)$, where β_j is the coefficient of the jth repressors. In rural areas, higher income is associated with a significant move away from traditional fuels into modern energy; household size and duration of electricity access have positive effect on the likelihood of abandoning biomass; coal price is negatively related to abandoning biomass.

The data base that we use includes information for 401 households, of which 39 households did not use biomass. Table 6 provides a brief description of all of the variables used for estimation.

Table 6 Sample statistics for logistic regression

Variable	Description	Observations
Y	Use biomass or not by household，Dummy，D=1,not use; D=0, use	D=1 ，39 observations； D=0 ，362 observations
D_1	Plain, Dummy	D_1=1 ，120 observations
D_2	Hilly, Dummy	D_2=1 ，120 observations
D_3	Mountainous, Dummy	D_3=1 ，161 observations
X_1	Net income per capita (yuan/capita)	401
X_2	Household size	401
X_3	Time since electricity access (years)	401
X_4	Coal price (yuan/kgce)	401
D_4	Education level of household head, Dummy, D4=1 if high school and above; D4=0 otherwise	D_4=1, 56 observations

The coefficients are estimated by maximizing the likelihood function and the empirical results are given in Table 7.

Table 7 Logistic regression analysis of the use versus non-use of biomass by rural households

Independent variable	Coefficient
Intercept	-3.1334**
Plain (D_1)	0.1280**
Hilly (D_2)	-2.2551***
Mountainous (D_3)	-1.0068***
Net income per capita (X_1)	0.0004***
Household size (X_2)	0.3552***
Time since electricity access (X_3)	0.0547**
Coal price (X_4)	-4.0917***
Education level (D_4)	-0.1208
AIC: 0.5359	

Note: (1) QML (Huber/White) standard errors & covariance estimator;

(2) *significant at 10%, ** 5%, ***1% level.

All of the independent variables except the education level have the expected signs and are significant. The coefficients values can be used to interpret the effect of independent variables on probability of dependent variable. With the increase of income, household tends to abandon the use of biomass. Household size and time length of electricity access also have positive effect due to scale economy and infrastructural construction. The price increase of coal has negative effect on the probability of household to abandon the use of biomass. The residents in plain areas tend not to use biomass because there is much less biomass resource than hilly and mountainous area. The residents in hilly areas tend not to abandon the use of biomass because they are positioned to have access to forest sources and agricultural residues, making biomass more accessible than either the mountains or the plains.

4.2 Share of Biomass in Total Energy

The fuel switch can be defined as a decrease in the proportion of household energy derived from biomass, although the biomass substitution is not a major feature of the fuel switching in rural households. Because 39 out of 401 households abandoned the use of biomass, it is a right censored dataset. For this censored data, we use the tobit model and its specification is

$$Y=\beta_0+\delta_1D_1+\delta_2D_2+\delta_3D_3+\beta_1X_1+\beta_2X_2+\beta_3X_3+\beta_4X_4+\delta_4D_4+\text{error} \quad \text{if RHS}>0$$
$$=0, \text{ otherwise} \qquad (3)$$

Where Y is the share of biomass; RHS is the right hand side. The definition and sample statistics of explanatory variables are the same as model (2) and Table 6.

The method of maximum likelihood is used to estimate the parameters of model (3) and the results are given in Table 8. The slope is calculated by '$\beta \times P(Y > 0)$'.

Table 8 Estimation output of household biomass share in total energy
Dependent Variable: Share of biomass in total energy
Method: ML-Censored Normal (TOBIT)

Independent variable	Coefficient	Slope
Constant	0.6886***	0.6216***
Plain (D_1)	-0.1799***	-0.1624***
Hill (D_2)	0.0444	0.0401
Mountain (D_3)	0.0452	0.0408
Net income per capita (X_1)	-5.86E-05***	-5.29E-05***
Household size (X_2)	-0.0500***	-0.0451***
Time since electricity access (X_3)	-0.0012	-0.0011
Coal price (X_4)	0.5269***	0.4757***
Education level (D_4)	-0.0845**	-0.0763**
AIC: 0.477		

Note: * is significant at 10% level, and ** at 5%, and *** at 1%.

All of the variables have the expected signs. Increasing levels of income tends to result in a decrease in the share of biomass in total energy consumption. House size is negatively related to biomass share due to economies of scale. When the resident's education level is higher, they use less biomass or more commercial fuel because their opportunity cost of biomass collection is increasing. Coal is the competing fuel with biomass, so increasing coal price leads to more consumption of biomass. The amount of time since the household received electricity access has the expected sign but is not significant. As expected, the residents in the plains area tend to use less biomass.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Cross-sectional data from rural Hubei households show that the transition from biomass to modern commercial sources is still at an early stage, given that biomass still accounts for about two-thirds of the total energy used by rural households. Fuel stacking is more suitable than the energy ladder model in rural Hubei because less than 10% of households abandoned the use of biomass. Data show that biomass use falls in absolute terms only at much higher levels of household income. This suggests that decline in biomass use may be slow, and incomes may have to rise substantially in order for absolute biomass use to fall. The Chinese government is undertaking a number of measures to both improve rural livelihoods and to expand access and availability of modern and clean energy services. For example, the New Countryside Construction program has a number of elements (such as phasing out taxes on agricultural products to increase the net income of farmers) and the National Development and Reform Commission has funded projects for improving rural electricity grids and expanding rural access. Such measures, if they can raise incomes and ensure greater availability will play a crucial role in the switching process. Moreover, while the switch away from biomass is occurring, the commercial energy source which appears to be the principal substitute for biomass in rural households is coal. Given that burning coal in the household is a major contributor of air pollution in China, further switching to modern and clean fuels such as biogas, LPG, natural gas and electricity is important.

Finally, regression analysis suggests that besides income, fuel prices, household size, infrastructure, and topography have significant effects on fuel switching; education can also play a role on biomass share decreasing. Thus, as changes occur in education level of rural residents, additional shifts in fuel use should be expected.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development of Stanford University's Freeman Spogli Institute for their financial support in conducting the survey. In particular, we would like to thank David Victor, Director of the Program, Becca Elias, Chi Zhang and Robert Sherman for their assistance in the project. We would also like to thank our colleagues at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences for their input during the survey design and testing phase and the Hubei Statistical Office for their services in carrying out the survey.

REFERENCES

China Academy of Forest Research (2003) 'The fifth investigation of forest resource'. 14 August, 2003, http://211.144.19.144/dataquery/.

Davis, M. (1998) 'Rural household energy consumption: the effects of access to electricity-evidence from South Africa'. *Energy Policy* 26: 207-217.

ESMAP (1996) *Energy for Rural Development in China: an Assessment Based on a Joint Chinese/ESMAP Study in Six Counties*, Report No. 183/96, The World Bank, Energy Sector Management Assistance Program, Washington, D.C.

Foley, G. (1995) 'Photovoltaic applications in rural areas of the developing world', *ESMAP Technical Paper 009*, The World Bank, Energy Sector Management Assistance Program, Washington, D.C.

Heltberg, Rasmus (2005) 'Factors determining household fuel choice in Guatemala'. *Environment and Development Economics* 10: 337-361.

Hubei Statistical Bureau (2005) *Hubei Statistical Yearbook,* Chinese Statistical Press.

Jiang L., B. O'Neill (2004) 'The energy transition in rural china', *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, Vol. 21.

Leach G, (1992) 'The energy transition'. *Energy Policy* (Februrary), pp 116-123.

Masera, O.R., B.D. Saatkamp, and D.M. Kammen (2000) 'From linear fuel switching to multiple cooking strategies: a critique and alternative to the energy ladder model'. *World Development* 28: 2083-2103.

Peng Wuyuan, Jiahua Pan (2006) 'Rural electrification in China: history and institution', *China and World Economy,* Vol. 1, pp.71-84.

Peng Wuyuan, Jiahua Pan (2008) 'Determinants to demand for electricity in rural China'. *Chinese Rural Economy (in Chinese),* Vol. 6, pp.66-80.

Reddy, B.S. (2003) 'Overcoming the energy efficiency gap in India's household sector', *Energy Policy,* Vol. 31, pp. 1117-1127.

Sheinbaum, C., Martinez, M. and Rodriguez, L. (1996) 'Trends and prospects in Mexican residential energy use', *Energy,* Vol. 21, No. 6, pp.493-504.

Tsinghua University (2004) *Energy outlook in China*, Institute of Nuclear and New Energy, Tsinghua University Press (in Chinese).

Wang X. and Feng, Z. (1997) 'Rural household energy consumption in Yangzhou County of Jiangsu Province in China', *Energy*, Vol. 22, No. 12, pp. 1159-1162.

Wang, X. and Feng, Z. (2001) ‘Rural household energy consumption with the economic development in China: stages and characteristics indices’, *Energy Policy*, Vol. 29, pp.1391-1397.

Wang, X., Dai, X. and Zhou, Y. (2002) ‘Domestic energy consumption in rural China: a study on Sheyang County of Jiangsu Province’, *Biomass & Bioenergy*, Vol. 22, pp.251-256.

Wang, X., Feng, Z. and Ding, Q. (1999) ‘Increased energy use in Jiangsu Province of China with protection of the environment’, *Energy*, Vol.24, pp.413-417.

Notes

1) Energy use in this paper means primary energy use, i.e. the heat content of the fuel used to produce the final energy.
2) Yuan: Unit of Chinese currency Renminbi, 1 US Dollar equals to about 8.1 yuan in 2004.

Appendix

Table 8 Index of standard coal efficiency conversion of all types of energy

Energy Type	Electricity	Oil	LPG	Biogas	Coal	Charcoal	Straw	Firewood
Unit	kWh	kg	M3	M3	kg	kg	kg	kg
Standard coal efficiency (kgce/unit)	0.404	1.46	1.71	0.71	0.71	1.00	0.43	0.57

Source: Statistics Reporting System on Energy, 1986, China State Statistical Bureau.