

TABLE 4—EFFECTS OF ELECTRIFICATION ON EMPLOYMENT: CENSUS COMMUNITY DATA

	$\Delta$ , female employment rate							
	OLS regression coefficients				IV regression coefficients			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Eskom project	−0.004 (0.005)	−0.001 (0.005)	0.000 (0.005)	−0.001 (0.005)	0.025 (0.045)	0.074 (0.060)	0.090* (0.055) [0.05; 0.3]	0.095* (0.055) [0.05; 0.3]
<i>A. R. 95 percent C.I.</i>								
Poverty rate		0.029*** (0.011)	0.033*** (0.010)	0.031*** (0.010)		0.027** (0.012)	0.032** (0.013)	0.031** (0.013)
Female-headed HHs		0.042** (0.019)	0.051*** (0.019)	0.047** (0.020)		0.014 (0.031)	0.036 (0.026)	0.033 (0.026)
Adult sex ratio		0.019** (0.009)	0.017** (0.008)	0.020*** (0.007)		0.033** (0.014)	0.029** (0.012)	0.032*** (0.012)
Baseline controls?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
District fixed effects?	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
$\Delta$ , other services?	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
<i>N</i> communities	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816

*Notes:* Robust standard errors clustered at subdistrict level. Eskom project is instrumented with mean community land gradient. See Table 3 for full list of control variables. The last two columns provide confidence intervals (C.I.) from the Anderson-Rubin (A.R.) test for the coefficient on Eskom project. The test is robust to weak instruments and implemented to be robust to heteroskedasticity.

\*\*\*Significant at the 1 percent level.

\*\*Significant at the 5 percent level.

\*Significant at the 10 percent level.

TABLE 5—EFFECTS OF ELECTRIFICATION ON EMPLOYMENT: CENSUS COMMUNITY DATA

	$\Delta$ , male employment rate							
	OLS regression coefficients				IV regression coefficients			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Eskom project	−0.017** (0.007)	−0.015*** (0.006)	−0.009 (0.006)	−0.010* (0.006)	−0.063 (0.073)	0.069 (0.082)	0.033 (0.064) [−0.05; 0.25]	0.035 (0.066) [−0.05; 0.25]
<i>A. R. 95 percent C.I.</i>								
Poverty rate		0.062*** (0.020)	0.064*** (0.018)	0.063*** (0.018)		0.059*** (0.022)	0.064*** (0.019)	0.062*** (0.019)
Female-headed HHs		0.217*** (0.029)	0.233*** (0.030)	0.227*** (0.030)		0.187*** (0.042)	0.227*** (0.034)	0.220*** (0.034)
Adult sex ratio		0.018* (0.011)	0.012 (0.011)	0.017 (0.011)		0.034* (0.019)	0.018 (0.015)	0.023 (0.015)
Baseline controls?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
District fixed effects?	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
$\Delta$ , other services?	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
<i>N</i> communities	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816	1,816

*Notes:* Robust standard errors clustered at subdistrict level. Eskom project is instrumented with mean community land gradient. See Table 3 for full list of control variables. The last two columns provide confidence intervals (C.I.) from the Anderson-Rubin (A.R.) test for the coefficient on Eskom project. The test is robust to weak instruments and implemented to be robust to heteroskedasticity.

\*\*\*Significant at the 1 percent level.

\*\*Significant at the 5 percent level.

\*Significant at the 10 percent level.

community-level controls and district fixed effects in columns 2 and 3 increases the coefficient on electrification slightly, with the female employment effect still not significantly different from zero and male employment becoming less negative and less statistically significant. The positive, significant coefficients on poverty rate, sex