

Pro-Poor Growth, Poverty and Inequality in Rural Vietnam: The Welfare Gap between the Ethnic Majority and Minority

Woojin Kang

University of Manchester

This present study explores the effects of Vietnam's transition on the welfare of the ethnic majority (defined as the Kinh and the Chinese) and minority groups in rural Vietnam. It draws upon five rounds of household surveys. The first finding is that the pace of poverty reduction for the minority group, where poverty is still concentrated, has surpassed that for the richer Kinh and Chinese over the period 2002 to 2006. Secondly, the disparity in living standards has been widening. In particular, the contribution of inequality between the majority and minority to total inequality has doubled over this period. Thirdly, the study shows that the effect of economic growth on poverty would have been greater if inequality had not increased. Finally, we undertake a decomposition which indicates that the ethnic minorities are poorer not only because they hold less endowments than the majority, but because also because of lower returns. Policy implications of this analysis are that programmes of the government and development agencies that only aim to enhance the endowment of the minority while ignoring the lower returns may be less effective than other approaches. For example, an anti-poverty programme to address the existing structural differences such as improving the quality of their endowments is vital for further poverty reduction and this requires precise investigation of the different socio-economic circumstances affecting the minority groups.

1. Introduction

Vietnam is a multi-ethnic society, consisting of 54 ethnic groups. The Kinh Vietnamese account for 86% of national population and they, along with the Chinese (Hoa), who account for 1.1%, are usually classified together as the majority. The remaining 52 smaller ethnic groups are referred to as the minorities. The minorities tend to populate the less productive areas. Geographically these are remote or mountainous areas, often with poor access to infrastructures or health and education facilities. The minorities tend to have lower living standards than the majority and account for a large share of the poor. Their geographic location, however, explains only part of the disparities in the living standards between the two groups (van de Walle and Gunewardena, 2001; Swinkels and Turk, 2006; Baulch, Chuyen, Haughton and Haughton, 2007; Baulch, Pham and Reilly, 2008; World Bank, 2008).

Previous studies seeking to explain the welfare gap between the ethnic majority and minorities applied the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition to analyse the wage gap between the two groups. This decomposition allowed a distinction to be drawn between differences due to socio-economic characteristics and those due to structural differences in the returns to these characteristics (Blinder, 1973; Oaxaca, 1973). Using the 1993 Vietnam Living Standard Survey (VLSS), van de Walle and Gunewardena (2001) find that there are systematic differences in characteristics and the returns to those characteristics, most of which are in favour of the majority group. Baulch et al. (2007) using VLSS1998 and Imai and Gaiha (2007) using VHLSS 2002 and 2004 not only find similar results to van de Walle and Gunewardena (2001) but also confirm that the structural component, in general, became larger. None of these studies, however, has explored how economic growth, inequality and poverty in Vietnam have interacted during the transition period.

2. Data

The present study makes use of the Vietnam Living Standard Surveys (VLSS) 1993 and 1998, and Vietnam Household Living Standard Surveys (VHLSS) 2002, 2004 and 2006. Together these cover almost the entire transition period. Both VLSSs and VHLSSs were designed to collect detailed data on households and communes (and market prices only for VLSSs), and were implemented by the Vietnam Government Statistical Office (GSO) with donor funding and technical support. Both VLSSs and

VHLSSs are multi-topic household surveys using nationally representative household samples¹²: The household component covers a wide range of issues, including household composition and characteristics, expenditures on food, non-food items, health and education, income by source (e.g. wage and salary, farm or non-farm production), employment and labour force participation, housing, ownership of assets and durable goods. The commune component of the survey collects information on rural infrastructure and commune characteristics. The total sample sizes of the VHLSS 2002, 2004 and 2006 are 30,000, 9,300 and 9189 households with all topics including income and consumption expenditure data (this is the small sample version)³. Due to our focus on rural Vietnam and because there are missing observations, the present study relies on the final sample size of 3,590 in 1993, 3,615 in 1998, 22621 in 2002, 6,737 in 2004 and 5,493 households in 2006.

3. Poverty, Growth and Inequality

3.1. Incidence of Poverty between 1993 and 2006

Overall poverty in Vietnam has shown a rapid and continuous fall, with head count ratios of 57.1 % in 1993, 37.3 % in 1998, 28.8 % in 2002, 19.5 % in 2004, and 16.0 % in 2006. Table 1 shows that the urban poverty rate has been stabilised or appear to have slightly increased in the most recent survey as it approaches zero. In contrast, the rural sector has maintained the rapid pace of reducing poverty though it has slightly slowed down, reporting 4.5 percentage point per year in 1990s and 3.8 percentage point per year in 2000s.

(Table 1 here)

One notable trend with regards to Vietnam's poverty reduction relates to ethnic minorities. The annual rate of decline in poverty during the 1990s for this group had been much lower than for the majority; the majority benefitting relatively far more from the economic growth in the initial stage of transition. However, the pace of poverty reduction for the minorities group has surpassed the majority

¹ While the VLSSs were widely recognised as high quality, they required additional surveys, called Multi-Purpose Surveys (MPHS), to provide estimates at provincial level due to the relatively small sample sizes; the total sample size of VLSS 1993 and 1998 are 4,800 and 6,000 households respectively. In 2002, VLSSs and MPHS were merged into VHLSSs to cover the larger sample of household with some simplification of the questionnaires to minimize measurement errors (Imai, Gaiha and Kang, 2007).

² The VHLSSs, in particular 2002 survey, has often been criticised for its sampling method (e.g. lack of information with regard to migrants in urban areas). See Pincus and Sender (2006) Evans and Harkness (2008)

³ Although VLSSs and VHLSSs were designed to constitute panel households in consecutive year, such a panel dataset cannot be constructed between VLSS and VHLSS.

over the period 2002 to 2006 (4.5 vs. 3.9 percentage points per year), although more than half of the ethnic minorities population still lack the resources to satisfy their minimum basic needs. This rapid decline might be partly explained by the government's national target programmes (NTPs). Two of the most outstanding NTPs that targeted poverty alleviation are the Programme 135 (P135) and the Hunger Eradication and Poverty Reduction (HEPR). P135 was established in 1998 with the aim of improving the living standards of the people, mainly ethnic minorities, who lagged behind the majority in terms of their gains from economic growth. HERP was established in 1996 to provide the poor, as defined by the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA), with various kinds of social support including credit, health care and education.⁴ However, the rapid decline should not be attributed solely to the effects of the government's interventions. Rather, it might be more plausible to argue that while the ethnic majority had been able to adapt themselves to the new market economy quickly because of socio-economic as well as geographical advantages, the minorities have taken longer to become incorporated into the system.

3.2. Pro-Poor Growth

It is evident that the prominent achievement in sustained poverty reduction for both the majority and minorities in rural Vietnam has been accompanied by similarly sustained economic growth. A question that arises is to what extent the gains from economic growth were distributed in favour of the poor. This sub-section examines how economic growth has had different effects on the living standards of the households according to their ethnicity. One way of investigating this question is by calculating summary measure of the rates of pro-poor growth that take account of the extent to which the poor have benefitted from the economic boom over a certain period. Ravallion and Chen (2003) define a "Growth Incidence Curve" (GIC) which shows how the growth rate for the p^{th} percentile varies across population ranked by income (or expenditure) and propose a rate of pro-poor growth as the mean growth rate for the poor⁵.

The GIC over the period 1 to 2 can be calculated as follows:

⁴ The current second phase of P135 as a five year programme (2006-2010) targets the poorest and the most disadvantaged ethnic minorities in 1,644 poor and mountainous communes. It consists of four broad components: 1) Market-oriented agricultural production, 2) Community infrastructure, 3) Capacity building and 4) Improved socio-cultural livelihoods.

⁵ There are a number of different definitions of pro-poor growth. See Kakwani, Khandker and Son (2004) for the summary of the existing measures of pro-poor growth.

$$g_{1,2}(p) = \left[\frac{y_2(p)}{y_1(p)} \right] - 1 = \frac{\mu_2 L_2'(p)}{\mu_1 L_1'(p)} - 1$$

where $y_t(p)$ is the income of the p^{th} percentile at time t ; μ_t and $L_t(p)$ represent respectively mean income and a Lorenz curve that shows the cumulative proportion of the population and the cumulative proportion of income ($L_t'(p)$ is the slope of the Lorenz curve).

The rate of pro-poor growth is defined as follows:

$$\text{Pro-Poor Growth} = \frac{\int_0^{H_1} g_{1,2}(p) dp}{H_1}$$

where H_1 is the head count index of poverty at time 1.

Table 2 provides the estimated rates of the pro-poor growth for the overall population and the 10th, 20th and 30th percentiles of the population while Figure 1 plots the annual consumption growth rate by consumption expenditure percentiles.

(Table 2 here)

(Figure 1 here)

As shown in Table 2, the lower than average estimates of growth for the 10th, 20th and 30th percentiles indicate that the economic growth occurring during the transition to the market economy were pro-rich in a relative sense. The rich people in “Vietnam”, in the “Rural” areas, the “Majority” group and in the “Minorities” group all benefited from relatively higher growths than average for each of the respective populations. However it is only in the “Minorities” group where the poorest percentiles also showed a much higher growth rate than average growth rate in their group. Limiting the focus solely to the minorities group, economic growth in Vietnam, can be seen to have been not only pro-rich but also pro poor. It is the middle expenditure groups within the minorities who gained relatively less and it is important to note that relative to the population as a whole these groups are still poor.

3.3. Inequality

In this section we look at how economic growth has changed inequality since 1993. As measures of inequality, we use the Gini coefficient, which is based on the Lorenz curve and two versions of the Generalised Entropy (GE) measure.

The Gini coefficient is defined as follows:

$$Gini = \frac{1}{2N^2\bar{y}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N |y_i - y_j|$$

where \bar{y} is mean income (or consumption expenditure) and N is the number of households in the sample.

The Gini coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, representing perfect inequality with 1. Although the coefficient is a popular measure of inequality, it cannot be easily decomposed and decomposability is one of desirable properties that a measure of inequality should possess.⁶

As an alternative to the Gini coefficient, we also calculate Theil's L index, a kind of the General Entropy (GE) measure. This measure satisfies the desirable properties mentioned in footnote 8. It is defined as:

$$GE(0) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{\bar{y}}{y_i}$$

Under this GE (0) measure, total inequality, I , can be decomposed into a component of inequality between different sub-groups of the population or different regions, I_b and the remaining within group component, I_w .

$$I = I_w + I_b = \sum_{j=1}^k v_j^\theta w_j^{1-\theta} GE(\theta)_j + \frac{1}{\theta(\theta-1)} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k w_j \left(\frac{\bar{y}_j}{\bar{y}} \right)^\alpha - 1 \right]$$

where v_j is the income share of group j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$); w_j is the population share of group j and \bar{y}_j is the mean income of group j .

Table 3 reveals that rural Vietnam has shown, using both measures, a moderate increase in inequality in per capita consumption expenditure between 1993 and 2006.

(Table 3 here)

While there was a decline in inequality in the first period (1993-1998), both the Gini coefficient and GE measures have gradually risen since 2002. This increasing inequality is an expected result of the transition towards a market economy. On the other hand, by decomposing the GE(0) index it is also observed that rising total inequality is more likely to be attributed to rising inequality between the ethnic

⁶ The criteria for a desirable measure of inequality: Income Scale Independence, Principle of Population, Anonymity, Decomposability. See Litchfield (1999) for the excellent summary of Inequality measure.

majority group and the minorities group. The share of “between” inequality has increased and even doubled during the transition period, accounting for 14% of total inequality in 2006. Furthermore, in contrast to the majority group, where the change in inequality is moderate though the extent is high, inequality within the ethnic minorities has significantly worsened over the period between 1993 and 2006.

In the earlier section, one reason that was mentioned for the recent declining poverty ratio for minorities group was their increasing integration into the new economic system. We might interpret the relatively worsening inequality in ethnic minorities above as result of the different socio-economic behaviour according to ethnic origin. Among 52 minorities, certain ethnic minority groups still retain their own culture, economic behaviour and even their own language whereas others are relatively homogeneous and/or are more assimilated with the Kinh majority (and the Chinese Vietnamese). It, therefore, is possible that groups have been able to benefit from the transition in an order. First come the majority and then the more assimilated minorities, the unassimilated minorities lagging behind.⁷

3.4. Decomposition of Changes in Poverty

The change of poverty is the result of the change in mean income or the change in the distribution or from changes in both mean income and distribution. For example, we could see that there would be decline in poverty with no economic growth in a certain period if redistribution in favour of the poor took place.

There are several frameworks that decompose changes in poverty into growth and redistribution components. Datt and Ravallion (1992) devised a method which uses the initial period as the reference anchor point and then decomposes the change of poverty into growth, redistribution and a residual component. A key question, when following Datt and Ravallion’s decomposition, is what is the meaning of the residual term? In particular, the possibly large size of this residual that sometimes bigger than other components have led to the use of alternative methods.

Kakwani (1997) developed an alternative methodology using an axiomatic approach in which the residual term vanishes and argued that using an average of the components is a better way to do the decomposition. Another alternative is a Shapley-valued based decomposition, proposed by Shorrocks (1999). Although these alternative methods adopt different terminologies in decomposing poverty changes into the effects of growth and redistribution components, they produce essentially the same

⁷ Baulch *et al.* (2007) provides some descriptive statistics to illustrate this.

results. They yield exact decompositions which are symmetrical. The underlying idea used by these alternatives is to compute the effect of each component by taking an average of the corresponding components based on the initial and the terminal year (Duclos and Araar, 2006). Formally:

$$\Delta P = P_1 - P_0 = G + D$$

$$G = \frac{1}{2} \left[P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_1}, L_0 \right) - P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_0}, L_0 \right) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_1}, L_1 \right) - P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_0}, L_1 \right) \right]$$

$$D = \frac{1}{2} \left[P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_0}, L_1 \right) - P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_0}, L_0 \right) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_1}, L_1 \right) - P \left(\frac{z}{\mu_1}, L_0 \right) \right]$$

where G and D represent the growth and redistribution effects respectively; z is the poverty line; μ_t is the mean income at period t ; L_t is the Lorenz curve representing the structure of relative income inequalities at period t ⁸.

Our estimates for this exercise in poverty decomposition are reported in Table 4⁹.

(Table 4 here)

As shown in Table 4, in most cases, poverty would have declined further as a result of economic growth if inequality had not changed; that is while the real poverty decline was -0.392 if there had been no redistribution, the poverty decline resulting from the pure growth component would have been -0.412 during 1993-2006.

While inequality within the ethnic majority group has offset the growth impact to a certain extent during each period, the contribution of inequality within minorities group to total poverty change has declined. Moreover, poverty reduction for the minorities during 2004-2006 was driven not only by economic growth (-0.07) but also by redistribution (-0.017).

4. Regression Analysis

Many studies have explored the welfare gap between Vietnamese ethnic majority and minorities groups (van de Walle and Gunewardena, 2001; Baulch et al., 2007; Imai and Gaiha, 2007; Baulch et al.,

⁸ Datt (1998) provides computational tools for poverty measurement. The poverty measure is homogenous of degree zero in μ_t , and z , meaning that poverty will remain unchanged if both indicators change by the same portion. If an expected function of the Lorenz curve is chosen from either Beta or General Quadratic (GQ) forms, one can calculate the poverty measures (the head count index, the poverty gap index, and the squared poverty gap index) using the formulas in Datt (1998). See Datt (1998) for more details.

⁹ For poverty decomposition, the present study use Distributive Analysis Stata Package (DASP). Araar and Duclos (2007).

2008). One common methodology adopted in the studies was the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition¹⁰ (Blinder, 1973; Oaxaca, 1973). The present study also takes advantage of this methodology to examine the welfare gap between the two groups.

In investigating the determinants of household's consumption for ethnic majority and minorities, it is crucial to allow for geographic effects on the level of living standards since the location of a household might be an important exogenous factor determining the household's living standards. Molini and Wan (2008), for instance, find that the most important determinant of inequality in rural Vietnam during 1993-1998 was location¹¹. Thus omitting the controls to capture the location of a household could result in biased estimates (van de Walle and Gunewardena, 2001; Gang, Sen and Yun, 2008). In fact, despite increasing flows of domestic migration during 1990s, which was strictly controlled by the household registration system (*ho Khau*), those migrants are mainly observed in three biggest cities – Hanoi, Da Nang, and Ho Chin Minh City and mobility between rural areas is still rather limited. (Gunewardena, 2001; Niimi, Pham and Reilly, 2008)

We, therefore, estimate the log of per capita consumption expenditure for i^{th} household of ethnic group j in k^{th} commune ($\ln c_{ijk}$) taking into account a vector of household characteristics (X_{ijk}), commune fixed effects (η_{ij}) and a random error term (ε_{ijk})

$$\ln c_{ijk} = \alpha_j + X_{ijk} \beta_j + \eta_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ijk}$$

where α_j is a constant error term and ε_{ijk} is a random error term.

Household characteristics (X_{ijk}) include the age, gender and marital status of the head of household, the relative number of female members, the dependency burden, the highest educational attainment of any one of the household members, the proportion of household members who are working in the industrial sector, the area of agricultural, forest and aquacultural land. We also include a dummy variable to indicate

¹⁰ The application of Blinder-Oaxaca type of decomposition to Vietnam can also be found from Glewwe, Gragnolati and Zaman (2002), Takahashi (2007), and O'Donnell, Doorslaer, Wagstaff and Lindelow (2008) (Chapter 12), though these studies do not examine ethnicity.

¹¹ Molini and Wan (2008) investigate the determinants of total inequality in rural Vietnam during 1993-1998. Their approach, proposed by Wan (2004), is appealing in that it quantifies the contributions of fundamental variables to total inequality, while the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition decomposes the welfare gap between two population groups.

whether or not a household receives remittances from a household member who has left home, and dummy variables describing the form of tenure over the residency.

As mentioned earlier, we implement the Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition (1973) for the mean difference in consumption per capita between majority and minorities. The method can be expressed as follows:

$$\ln \bar{c}_{ma} - \ln \bar{c}_{mi} = (\bar{X}_{ma} - \bar{X}_{mi}) \hat{\beta}_{ma} + \bar{X}_{mi} (\hat{\beta}_{ma} - \hat{\beta}_{mi})$$

The first term on the right hand side indicates the contribution of different household's characteristics or endowments to the mean difference of the dependent variable. This is called the "Characteristic" component (C). The second term represents the contribution of different returns to those household's characteristics. This is termed the "Structural" component (S). While the characteristic component could reflect discrimination itself (e.g. a lower endowment for ethnic minorities), the structural component could be non-zero even if there is no discrimination against one group as returns could be lower due to a locational disadvantage (e.g. a lower returns to land) (Imai and Gaiha, 2007).

5. Result

We observe a similar pattern for ethnic majority and minorities across the surveyed years¹². For example, higher educational attainment, higher ratio of working members in industry, having a large amount of land and owning either a permanent or a semi-permanent house, in general, all tend to increase a household's per capita consumption level. These are statistically significant in most cases for both groups. By contrast, having a family member aged below 15 or above 65 year-old is likely to affect negatively a household's living standard and is always statistically significant for both groups in every year. Similarly, the higher female share is, the lower consumption expenditure is likely to be, though it is statistically insignificant in some year. Household age has a positive and significant effect on household consumption for the majority, but becomes negative for the minorities and is statistically insignificant in most years. While the magnitude of most covariates for the ethnic majority and minorities differs from year to year, the effects of the ratio of household members working in industry and on aquacultural land ownership appear to be significantly larger in minorities than in majority for the whole period.

¹² The regression results are available from the author upon request.

Our decomposition analysis confirms that the welfare gap can be attributed more to the difference in the structural components. This is consistent with the findings of the previous studies.

(Table 5 here)

A few key findings may be summarised. First, the disparity in consumption expenditure per capita between the ethnic majority and minorities groups in rural Vietnam had sharply increased during 1993-1998 and the gap has since fluctuated around a roughly constant level. This could correspond to the idea that the majority were in a better position to be able to take advantage of the economic boom arising from the early stage of the transition and the minorities, only later were able to benefit. Secondly, the mean difference in per capita consumption expenditure between the ethnic majority and minorities can be explained more by the difference in the returns to characteristics than difference in a household's endowments. Moreover, the relatively larger contribution of the structural component has considerably increased over time (except 2004 where the share had slight fall). For example, while the structural component was 66.8% in 1993, by 2006 it had risen to 78.7%.

6. Conclusion

The present study has examined the change of poverty and inequality in rural Vietnam during the rapid economic growth of the transition period. We have focused on ethnicity and attempted to explain the welfare disparity between the ethnic majority and minorities groups. It is noticeable from our estimates of poverty that although half of the minorities population still fail to meet the basic needs for their life, the pace of annual poverty reduction for the group has surpassed that of the majority group over the period 2002 to 2006. Vietnam's growth has benefited the ethnic majority first and then later started to promote the living standards of the minorities group. The economic growth during the transition period, in general, has been pro-rich.

Our estimates of inequality also support the same conclusion. We have observed more increasing inequality within ethnic minorities group (than within ethnic majority group) as well as an increasing contribution of inequality between the ethnic majority and minorities ("between" inequality) to total inequality. The households in the ethnic minorities group who have most closely assimilated with the ethnic majority seem to have taken advantage of the economic opportunities created by the economic reform. Those more isolated from the ethnic majority society, have lagged behind. For poverty decomposition, the relative contribution of inequality within the minorities group to total poverty

reduction has declined whereas inequality within the majority group continued to offset the growth impact to some extent throughout the period under study.

Finally, our regression decomposition analysis confirms that the ethnic minorities group is poorer not necessarily because they hold a smaller endowment than the majority, but because they have lower returns to their endowments. The share of difference arising from the structural component has increased over time. This suggests that the programmes of the government and development agencies that aim to enhance the endowment of the minority may be less effective than other approaches. Rather, government interventions improving the quality of the minorities' endowments are essential for increasing ethnic minorities' households' welfare. This should perhaps be delivered after a more precise research of the different socio-economic circumstances surrounding each ethnic minority group.

Reference

- Araar, A. and Duclos, J-Y., User Manual DASP version 1.4, Distributive Analysis Stata Package, 2007.
- Baulch, B., Chuyen, T.T.K., Haughton, D.H. and Haughton, J., Ethnic Minority Development in Vietnam, *Journal of Development Studies*, **43**(7), 2007, pp. 1151-1176.
- Baulch, B., Pham, H.T. and Reilly, B., Ethnicity and Household Welfare in Rural Vietnam, 1993 - 2004, A Draft, Institute of Development Studies, 2008, University of Sussex.
- Blinder, A.S., Wage Discrimination: reduced form and structural estimates, *Journal of Human Resources*, **28**, 1973, pp. 279-296.
- Chaudhuri, S., Jalan, J. and Suryahadi, A., Assessing Household Vulnerability to Poverty from Cross-Sectional Data: A Methodology and Estimates from Indonesia, Discussion Paper, 2002, Columbia University.
- Datt, G., Computational Tools for Poverty Measurement and Analysis, FCND Discussion Paper No.50, 1998, International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Datt, G. and Ravallion, M., Growth and Redistribution Components of Changes in Poverty Measures: A Decomposition with Applications to Brazil and India in the 1980s, *Journal of Development Economics*, **38**, 1992, pp. 275-295.
- Dollar, D. and Litvack, J., Macroeconomic Reform and Poverty Reduction in Vietnam, in Dollar, D., Glewwe, P. and Litvack, J. (eds) *Household Welfare and Vietnam's Transition*, 1998, Washington, D.C: The World Bank.
- Duclos, J-Y. and Araar, A. (2006) *Poverty and Equity: Measurement, Policy, and Estimation with DAD*, Springer and The International Development Research Centre.
- Evans, M. and S. Harkness, Social Protection in Vietnam and Obstacles to Progressivity, *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, **2**, 2008, pp. 30-52.
- Gang, I.N., Sen, K. and Yun, M.-S., Poverty in Rural India: Caste and Tribe, *Review of Income and Wealth*, **54**(1), 2008, pp. 50-70.
- Glewwe, P., Gragnolati, M. and Zaman, H., Who Gained from Vietnam's Boom in the 1990s?, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, **50**(4), 2002, pp.773-792.
- Imai, K. and Gaiha, R., Poverty, Inequality and Ethnic Minorities in Vietnam, Discussion Paper Series, EDP-0719, 2007, University of Manchester.
- Imai, K., Gaiha, R. and Kang, W., Vulnerability and Poverty Dynamics in Vietnam, Discussion Paper Series, EDP-0708, 2007, University of Manchester.

- Jain, L.R. and Tendulkar, S.D., The Role of Growth and Distribution in the Observed Change in Head-Count Ratio-Measure of Poverty: A Decomposition Exercise for India, *Indian Economic Review*, Vol.XXV No.2, 1990, pp.165-205.
- Kakwani, N., On Measuring Growth and Inequality Components of Poverty with Applications to Thailand, *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 2000, The University of New South Wales.
- Kakwani, N., Khandker, S. and Son, H., Pro-Poor Growth: Concepts and Measurement with Country Case Studies, International Poverty Centre Working Paper No.1, 2004, UNDP.
- Klump, R., Pro-Poor Growth in Vietnam: Miracle or Model?, in Besley, T. and Cord, L.J. (eds) *Delivering On the Promise of Pro-Poor Growth: Insights and Lessons from Country Experiences*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, Washington, D.C.: Basingstoke.
- Litchfield, J., Inequality: Methods and Tools, mimeo, 1999.
- Molini, V. and Wan, G., Discovering Sources of Inequality in Transition Economies: A Case Study of Rural Vietnam, *Economic Change and Restructuring*, **41**(1), 2008, pp. 75-96
- Niimi, Y., Pham, T.H. and Reilly, B., Determinants of Remittances: Recent Evidence Using Data on Internal Migrants in Vietnam, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4586, 2008.
- Oaxaca, R., Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labour Markets, *International Economic Review*, **14**, 1973, pp. 693-709.
- O'Donnell, O., Doorslaer, E.V., Wagstaff, A. and Lindelow, M., *Analyzing Health Equity Using Household Survey Data: A Guide to Techniques and Their Implementation*, World Bank, 2008, Washington, D.C.
- Pincus, J. and Sender, J., Quantifying Poverty in Viet Nam: Who Counts?, *Journal of Vietnamese Studies*, **3**(1), 2008, pp. 108-150.
- Swinkels, R. and Turk, C., Explaining Ethnic Minority Poverty in Vietnam: a summary of recent trends and current challenges, mimeo, 2006.
- Takahashi, K., Source of Regional Income Disparity in Rural Vietnam: Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition, Discussion Paper No.95, 2007, Institute of Developing Economies.
- Wan, G., Accounting for Income Inequality in Rural China: A regression Based on Approach, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, **32**(2), pp. 348-363.
- World Bank, Vietnam Development Report 2004: Poverty, World Bank, 2004, Hanoi.
- World Bank, Vietnam Development Report 2008: Social Protection, World Bank, 2006, Hanoi.

Table 1. Change in Poverty Head Count Ratio during 1993-2006

Poverty head count ratio	1993	1998	2002	2004	2006	Annual % point change (1993-2006)
Vietnam	57.1	37.3	28.8	19.5	16.0	-3.2
Urban	19.7	9.1	6.5	3.6	3.9	-1.2
Rural	67.8	45.4	35.5	25.0	20.4	-3.6
			Rural			
Majorities	64.7	38.7	29.0	17.8	13.5	-3.9
Minorities	86.2	76.2	72.1	62.7	54.0	-2.5

Source: Author's calculation based on VLSS 1993, 1998 and VHLSS 2002, 2004, 2006

Table 2. Rates of Pro-Poor Growth and Mean Overall Growth Rate between 1993-2006

Percentile	Vietnam	Rural	Majorities	Minorities
10	3.82	3.71	4.56	4.53
20	4.05	3.87	4.71	3.88
30	4.16	4.07	4.84	3.60
Overall population (average)	5.16	5.02	5.31	3.80

Source: Author's calculation based on VLSS 1993 and VHLSS 2006

Table 3. Inequality Measures in Rural Vietnam during 1993 - 2006

	1993	1998	2002	2004	2006
Gini coefficient	0.280	0.271	0.281	0.295	0.302
GE(0) – Theil's L	0.129	0.120	0.128	0.143	0.151
Decomposition of GE(0) (Ethnic majorities/minorities)					
GE(0) within	0.120	0.108	0.114	0.125	0.130
GE(0) between	0.009	0.012	0.014	0.018	0.021
(Contribution of "Between" inequality, %)	(7.0)	(10)	(10.9)	(12.6)	(13.9)

Source: Author's calculation based on VLSS 1993, 1998 and VHLSS 2002, 2004, 2006

Table 4. Poverty Decomposition into Growth and Inequality during 1993-2006

		1993-1998	1998-2002	2002-2004	2004-2006	1993-2006
Vietnam	Poverty Change	-0.179	-0.085	-0.093	-0.035	-0.392
	Growth	-0.195	-0.121	-0.099	-0.028	-0.412
	Redistribution	0.016	0.036	0.006	-0.007	0.020
Rural	Poverty Change	-0.192	-0.099	-0.105	-0.046	-0.443
	Growth	-0.184	-0.117	-0.119	-0.059	-0.460
	Redistribution	-0.008	0.018	0.014	0.013	0.017
Majorities	Poverty Change	-0.226	-0.097	-0.111	-0.044	-0.478
	Growth	-0.209	-0.113	-0.125	-0.058	-0.484
	Redistribution	-0.017	0.016	0.014	0.014	0.006
Minorities	Poverty Change	-0.083	-0.042	-0.094	-0.087	-0.306
	Growth	-0.112	-0.049	-0.094	-0.070	-0.326
	Redistribution	0.029	0.007	0	-0.017	0.021

Source: Author's calculation based on VLSS 1993, 1998 and VHLSS 2002, 2004, 2006

Table 5. Decomposition of differences in log(consumption)

	1993		1998		2002		2004		2006	
Consumption gap	0.306		0.510		0.494		0.568		0.503	
	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S	C	S
Decomposition	0.102	0.204	0.128	0.381	0.114	0.380	0.159	0.409	0.107	0.396
(Contribution, %)	(33.2)	(66.8)	(25.2)	(74.8)	(23.0)	(77.0)	(28.1)	(71.9)	(21.3)	(78.7)

Figure 1. Growth Incidence Curve between 1993-2006

