Discussion Paper Series

RIEB

Kobe University

DP2015-01

Does Non-Farm Sector Employment Reduce Rural Poverty and Vulnerability? Evidence from Vietnam and India*

Katsushi S. IMAI
Raghav GAIHA
Ganesh THAPA

January 5, 2015

Research Institute for Economics and Business Administration
Kobe University
2-1 Rokkodai, Nada, Kobe 657-8501 JAPAN

Does non-farm sector employment reduce rural poverty and vulnerability? Evidence from Vietnam and India

Katsushi S. Imai *
School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, UK & RIEB, Kobe University, Japan

Raghav Gaiha
Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, India

Ganesh Thapa
International Fund for Agricultural Development, Rome, Italy

This Draft: 2nd January 2015

Abstract

The present study examines whether rural non-farm employment has any poverty and/or vulnerability-reducing effect in Vietnam and India. To take account of sample selection bias associated with it, we have applied treatment-effects model. It is found that log per capita consumption or log mean per capita expenditure significantly increased as a result of access to the rural non-farm employment in both Vietnam and India - which is consistent with its poverty reducing role of accessing - with the aggregate effect larger in Vietnam than in India. Access to the rural non-farm employment significantly reduces vulnerability too in both countries, implying that diversification of household activities into non-farm sector would reduce such risks. When we disaggregate non-farm sector employment by its type, we find that poverty and vulnerability reducing effects are much larger for sales, professionals, and clerks than for unskilled or manual employment in both countries. However, because even unskilled or manual non-farm employment significantly reduces poverty and vulnerability in India and poverty in some years in Vietnam, this has considerable policy significance as the rural poor do not have easy access to skilled non-farm employment.

Key Words: Poverty, Vulnerability, Non-farm sector, Treatment Effects Model, Vietnam, India
JEL Codes: C21, C31, I32, O15

Contact Address
Katsushi S. Imai (Dr) Economics, School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, Arthur Lewis Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK; Telephone: +44-(0)161-275-4827, Fax: +44-(0)161-275-4812 Email: Katsushi.Imai@manchester.ac.uk.

Acknowledgements
This project was funded by IFAD. The authors are grateful to (then) Director of Asia and the Pacific Division, Thomas Elhaut, for his guidance and support. The authors acknowledge valuable comments and advice from Samuel Annim, Md. Azam, Md. Faruq Hassan, Woojing Kang, Armando Barrientos, Takahiro Sato and two anonymous referees. They thank Woojin Kang for preparing VHLSS Data sets at the early stage of the project. The second author would like to acknowledge the support and guidance of David Bloom at Harvard School of Public Health during the completion of this study. The views expressed are, however, those of the authors' and do not necessarily represent those of the organisations to which they are affiliated.

Does non-farm sector employment reduce rural poverty and vulnerability? Evidence from Vietnam and India

1. Introduction

Across the developing world, it is well recognized that rural economies are not purely agricultural and farm households earn an increasing share of their income from non-farm activities. Traditionally, rural non-farm economy (RNFE hereafter) was considered to be a low-productivity sector diminishing over time where agricultural households simply supplemented their income. But, since the late 1990s, its role in economic growth and poverty reduction began to be increasingly recognised given the growing share of RNFE across developing countries (e.g. Reardon et al., 1998, 2000, Lanjouw and Lanjouw, 2001, van de Walle and Cratty, 2004, Haggblade, et al., 2010, Himanshu et al., 2013) The share of income from RNFE in total rural income varies - from 34% in Africa, to 47% in Latin America and 51% in Asia (Thapa et al., 2013), but it is recognised that RNFE is becoming increasingly important in terms of its share and growth as well as potential roles in poverty reduction in Asia, particularly in emerging countries, such as China and India. Although most of the low and middle-income Asian countries traditionally relied on agriculture, they have undergone structural changes in recent years, due to industrialisation and globalisation as well as commercialisation of agriculture.

Within Asia, the share of income from RNFE varies from over 70% for the Philippines and Sri Lanka to below 40% for China, India and Nepal (Thapa et al., 2013). With constraints on farm expansion and continuing growth of rural population, greater attention is thus being given to non-farm activities. Policy interest in RNFE arises not just because of its significance in generating incomes, but also because of its increasing importance in creating employment, especially for rural women and the poor.

Among Asian countries, the present study focuses on Vietnam and India, both of which experienced impressive economic growth but varying poverty reduction in recent years. These two countries are characterised by high average GDP per capita growth rate in 1990-2010 (Vietnam 5.8%; India 4.9%) and a decreasing share of agricultural value added in GDP in the same period (Vietnam 39% to 20%; India 29% to 16%) (World Bank, 2014). Poverty indices have declined during this period, but there is a variation in the speed of poverty reduction. While Vietnam experienced a faster poverty reduction in terms of headcount ratio based on US$1.25 (64% in 1993 to 21% in 2006, further down to 13% in 2008), the speed of poverty reduction has been relatively slow in India (45% in 1994, 37% in 2005, 32% in 2009) (Himanshu and Sen, 2014). As shown by Imai et al. (2012, 2014) and Gaiha et al. (2012, 2014), the speed of improvement in nutritional indicators has been slow in India in recent years despite the country's economic growth. There is a need for investigating the reasons for diverse progress in income and non-income poverty focusing on household's livelihood strategies, including the choice of farm and non-farm employment. The present study aims to provide insights into varying pace of poverty reduction and vulnerability in these two countries.

The main hypothesis we examine is whether access to rural non-farm employment reduces poverty and vulnerability - defined as a probability of falling into poverty in the next period - in rural areas in Vietnam and India. We focus only on rural areas because rural economy is distinct from urban economy in its structure and rural poverty is still predominant in these countries. We will use Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey (VHLSS) in 2002, 2004 and 2006 for Vietnam and National Sample Survey (NSS) Data in 1993-4 and 2004-5 for India. Given the sample selection bias associated with access to RNFE or non-farm sector employment and the data structure where only large

cross-sectional data are available and the panel data are not available[1], we will apply treatment effects model, a variant of Heckman two-step sample selection model (Heckman, 1979). We also examine whether the effect of reducing poverty and vulnerability is different among different types of non-farm sector employment, namely, "unskilled manual work", "production", "sales", and "professionals/ clerk".

While the farm or agricultural sector has played a central role in these countries, the share of non-farm activities has increased significantly in recent years. However, detailed empirical studies estimating the direct and/or indirect effects of rural non-farm income or employment on poverty remain limited and the present study seeks to fill this gap.

Our empirical analysis of the role of rural non-farm employment in reducing household poverty can be placed in a large literature of growth and development theories. Our basic assumption is that overall economic growth is beneficial for the poor and their escape from poverty can further promote overall economic growth (e.g. Dollar and Kraay, 2002). This basic assumption can be theoretically justified as follows.[2] First, the poor - typically the unskilled labour – can benefit from the increase in wage rate, which is enabled by physical capital accumulation by the rich during the growth process. The poor can then invest in assets and education, which further reinforces development (Galor and Moav, 2004)). Furthermore, an increase in the amount of skilled labour increases the wage rate of unskilled labour, strengthening the positive correlation between ability and intergenerational mobility (Maoz and Moav, 1999). Non-farm employment - particularly skilled - can thus have a substantial poverty-reducing effect. The second justification can be made in terms of the connection between the division of labour and the economic growth, which originated in Adam Smith's (1776) emphasis on the role of the division of labour in the increase in labour

[1] It is possible to construct a small panel based on the intersections of different rounds of household cross-sectional data of VHLSS in Vietnam, but attrition bias is serious as only a small subset of the total households were revisited.

[2] We are grateful to one of the reviewers for this valuable suggestion.

productivity or its further extensions. For instance, Becker and Murphy (1992) examined the process of specialization and the division of labour and showed that a more extensive division of labour raises productivity. Kim (1989) in a similar vein analysed the impact of human capital investment decisions on the depth and breadth of skills and showed that workers invest more in skill depth than skill breadth as the size of the labour market increases. Our empirical results on the role of skilled employment in RNFE are in line with these studies.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The next section reviews extant studies of the effects of non-farm sector on poverty in Vietnam and India. Section 3 briefly summarises the data sets we will use. Sections 4 and 5 discuss the specification of econometric models and results, respectively. Concluding observations are offered in the final section.

2. Literature Review

While the farm or agricultural sector has played a central role in Vietnam and India, the share of non-farm has increased significantly in recent years. However, formal empirical studies to estimate the direct and/or indirect effects of income or employment in non-farm sector employment on poverty are still few. On the direct effects, van de Walle and Cratty (2004) using Vietnam Living Standard Survey (VLSS) data in 1993 and 1998 found significant effects of non-farm employment in reducing poverty. While van de Walle and Cratty (2004) claim that they consider the endogeneity of non-farm sector in reducing poverty, they simply estimated the share of hours worked in non-farm sector in total (or the probability of participating in non-farm sector) and poverty separately and compared the signs and statistical significance of coefficient estimates of explanatory variables without taking account of simultaneity. Thus their results are only suggestive of different covariates of non-farm employment and poverty.

More recently, using both long-term survey data in Palanpur, a village in western Uttar Pradesh, and the NSS data, Himanshu et al. (2013) have shown that the diversification into RNFE not only increased household income but also reduced poverty. They have also provided the evidence from Palanpur which suggests that the income inequality has increased with this diversification process. However, no discussions or formal analyses have been carried out by Himanshu et al. (2013) of the endogneity associated with household access to RNFE.

RNFE would be potentially important for breaking the poverty traps caused by, for instance, lack of education or nutrition. For example, people who are educated at secondary school or higher levels are likely to have a higher probability of finding a job in rural non-farm sector (e.g. in trading, manufacturing office works) and their children tend to be more educated, which creates a 'virtuous' circle (e.g. Knight et al., 2009, 10). However, those

who are not educated tend to be trapped in a 'vicious' circle. Likewise, undernourished people tend to be trapped in poverty as low nutritional levels imply low efficiency and high probability of being unemployed as predicted by the efficiency-wage hypothesis (e.g. Bliss and Stern, 1978, Dasgupta and Ray, 1986, 87). The poverty-nutrition hypotheses have been recently examined by Jha et al. (2009) and Imai et al. (2012) in the context of rural India. Reardon et al. (2000) also emphasise the barriers faced by poor households that prevent them from investing in non-farm assets, suggesting the existence of the poverty trap. That is, it is not an automatic process for poor agricultural households to enter the non-farm sector. Unlike agricultural jobs, rural non-farm employment tends to be less physically intensive and requires lower calories, as the activity intensity determines the nutritional status in rural India (Imai et al., 2012). Since RNFE tends to better promote food security to the poor than farm employment (Owsu et al., 2011), the former has the potential to break the poverty trap.

While building upon van de Walle and Cratty (2004) and Himanshu et al. (2013), our study takes account of the endogeneity issues based on national data in Vietnam and India. In our estimations, we have also estimated wage equations for male and female workers to consider the effect of male or female wage rates on non-farm labour market participation. The novelty of our study relative to the existing empirical literature includes (i) addressing the endogeneity issue formally using national data in India and Vietnam; (ii) considering the effects of male and female wage rates on the non-farm labour market participation; and (iii) estimating the effects of non-farm labour market participation on vulnerability of households after taking into account its endogeneity.

3. Data

Vietnamese Data

We will use Vietnam Household Living Standards Surveys (VHLSS) 2002, 2004, and 2006. The VHLSSs were initially implemented in 2002 to collect detailed household and commune level data. These are multi-topic household surveys with nationally representative household samples. They commonly cover a wide range of issues, including household composition and characteristics (e.g. education and health); detailed record on expenditure for both food and non-food items, health and education; employment and labour force participation (e.g. duration of employment and the precise categories of occupations); income by sources (e.g. salary/wage, payment in cash and in kind, farm and non-farm production); housing, ownership of other assets and durable goods; and participation of households in anti-poverty programs. Commune level surveys collect data on demography, economic conditions, agricultural production, and non-farm employment, local infrastructure, public services such as education and health facilities. Occupational code of employment provided by VHLSS would enable us to classify non-farm sector employment in several sub-components broadly defined (i.e., manual/unskilled; production; sales; professionals/clerk).

Indian Data

The NSS, set up by the Government of India in 1950, is a multi-subject integrated sample survey conducted all over India in the form of successive rounds relating to various aspects of social, economic, demographic, industrial and agricultural statistics. We use the data in the 'Household Consumer Expenditure' schedule, quinquennial surveys in the 50th round, 1993–94, and in the 61st round, 2004-05.[3] These form repeated cross-sectional data sets, each of which contains a large number of households across India. The consumption schedule contains a variety of information related to mean per capita expenditure (MPCE), disaggregated expenditure over many items together with basic socio economic

[3] We are not using 55th round in 1999-2000 as the consumption data in 55th round are not comparable with those in 50th or 61st round because of the change in recall periods. The consumption data are comparable between 50th round and 61st round.

characteristics of the household (e.g., sex, age, religion, caste, and land-holding). To derive wages at the level of NSS agro-climatic region, we supplement the consumption schedule by Employment and Unemployment schedule because the consumption survey and the employment survey collect data on different households and can be linked only at the aggregate level (e.g. NSS region level).[4] Non-farm sector employment can be classified into sub-categories by using National Classification of Occupations (NCO).

4. Methodologies

(1) Treatment Effects Model

To estimate the effect of non-farm sector employment on poverty and vulnerability, we employ a version of treatment effects model. The main idea of treatment effects model is to estimate poverty defined by household consumption per capita for two different regimes (de Janvry et al., 2005) - households participating only in the farm labour market and those participating in both farm and non-farm labour markets. It is a version of the Heckman sample selection model (Heckman, 1979), which estimates the effect of an endogenous binary treatment. This would enable us to take account of the sample selection bias associated with access to non-farm sector. In the first stage, access to non-farm sector is estimated by the probit model.[5] In the second, we estimate log of household consumption or vulnerability measure after controlling for the inverse Mills ratio which reflects the degree of sample selection bias.

The merit of treatment effects model is that sample selection bias is explicitly estimated by using the results of probit model. However, the weak aspects include: (i) strong

[4] Definitions of the variables of VHLSS and NSS data are given in Appendix Table.
[5] More specifically, we run the probit model at the household level for whether any household members have access to non-farm sector and then estimate the consumption or vulnerability equation in the second stage.

assumptions are imposed on the distributions of the error terms in the first and second stages; (ii) the coefficient estimates may be sensitive to choice of the explanatory variables and instruments; and (iii) valid instruments are rarely found in non-experimental data and if the instruments are invalid, the results will depend on the distributional assumptions.

The selection mechanism by the probit model for accessing rural non-farm economy (RNFE) can be more explicitly specified as (e.g., Greene, 2003):

$$D^* = \gamma' X + u_i \qquad (1)$$

and $\boldsymbol{D^* = 1 \quad if \ D^* = \gamma' X > 0}$

$D^* = 0$ *otherwise*

where $\Pr\{D = 1 | X\} = \Phi(\gamma' X)$

$\Pr\{D = 0 | X\} = 1 - \Phi(\gamma' X)$

D^* is a latent variable. In our case, D takes the value 1 if an i^{th} household has at least one household member who has access to non-farm employment and 0 otherwise. X is a vector of individual, household and regional characteristics and other determinants at commune or community levels. Φ denotes the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

Since available variables are different for Vietnam and India, we assume different specifications (or the choice of explanatory variables) for individual access to RNFE for X .

Vietnam:

$$D^* = D(\hat{W}_i^m, \hat{W}_i^f, M_i, E_i, H_i, L_i, R_i) \qquad (2)$$

$\hat{W}_i^m$: a household average of predicted wages of male members. Daily wage rate is estimated by individual characteristics, such as, age, its square, dummy variables of educational categories, whether he is working for the household's own farm (or non-farm) sector as a wage worker, whether the household belongs to ethnic majorities, size of land and its square, and regional and locational dummy variables.

$\hat{W}_i^f$: a household average of predicted wages of female members. $\hat{W}_i^m$ and $\hat{W}_i^f$ serve as instruments for the household's non-farm participation equation.[6]

If non-farm jobs emerge as a result of the division of labour and the non-farm wages exceed the reservation wage implied by the agricultural sector, people would work as nonfarm workers. If this is the case, there should be a positive link between the average wages and non-farm labour market participation. Alternatively, we can assume that the labour productivity proxied by wage rate is an important determinant of participation in non-farm sector employment. That is, only high productivity worker with higher agricultural wages rate can participate in RNFE as an analogy of theory of workfare where only high productivity workers can participate in workfare scheme or higher waged workers can afford exercising the 'real option' of switching from the agriculture labour marker to workfare or the non-farm labour market given the switching costs (Scandizzo et al., 2009).

M_i : whether the household head is male.

E_i : a set of dummy variables of educational attainment of the household head (whether he or she has no education; whether completed primary education; whether completed lower secondary education; whether completed upper secondary education; whether completed technical education; whether completed higher education).

H_i : household composition/ characteristics (household size; the share of female members; dependency burden (the share of household members below 15 years or above 65 years; whether a household belongs to ethnic majority) of the i^{th} household).

L_i : size of land (in hectare) owned by the household and its square for the i^{th} household.

[6] We estimate the wage equations for male and female workers separately given the segmentation of labour markets by gender in developing countries. If we use the household averages of individual variables (e.g. education or age) as well as household-level variables in estimating the household probability of accessing the non-farm sector employment in one equation, some of the individual variables (e.g. education) will be dropped automatically due to multicollinearity. Hence, to utilise the data structure of our survey data, we estimate the wage equations first using the individual data and then estimating the rural non-farm employment equation by using predicted wages for Vietnam.

R_i: a set of regional dummy variables (whether a household is located in red river delta region; northeast region; northwest region; north central coast region; south central coast region; central highlands region; north east south region; Mekong river delta region; central coast region; low mountains; and high mountains).

India:

Because of data limitations, a different set of explanatory variables is chosen as determinants of accessing rural non-farm employment.

$$D^* = D(\overline{W}_i, E_i, H_i, L_i, B_i, R_i) \qquad (3)$$

$\overline{W}_i$: wage rate estimated using employment data and aggregated for NSS region.[7][8] Explanatory variables in the wage rate equations include age and its square, a number of dummy variables on literacy and educational attainments, land, Scheduled Tribe (ST), Scheduled Caste (SC), non-agricultural or agricultural self- employment, religion. State fixed effects are considered by inserting state dummy variables.

E_i: a set of variables on the highest level of educational attainment of household members (e.g. whether completed primary school, secondary school, or higher education).

H_i: a set of variables indicating household composition, such as whether a household is headed by a female member, number of adult male or female members, dependency burden: the share of household members under 15 years old or over 60 years old.

L_i: owned land as a measure of household wealth.

[7] Unlike VHLSS data for Vietnam, matching of individual wage data and household data in NSS for India is only possible at the level of NSS agro-climatic region, because, as we have already noted, different sets of households or individuals are surveyed for the Employment and Unemployment Schedule which contains the individual wage data, and for the Expenditure Schedule covering household consumption or other household variables.

[8] The results for wage equations for Vietnam and India will be provided on request.

B_i: social backwardness of the household in terms of (i) whether a household belongs to Scheduled Castes (SCs) and (ii) whether it belongs to Scheduled Tribes (STs).

R_i: a vector of state dummy variables.

The linear outcome regression model in the second stage is specified below to examine the determinants of poverty - as proxied by household consumption (log of MPCE for the Indian data and log of per capita real household consumption for the Vietnamese data) or vulnerability derived by Chaudhuri's (2003) method which captures the probability of a household falling into poverty in the next period. It is noted here that non-farm labour market participation is estimated in the first stage of the treatment effects model, while poverty is estimated (proxied by log per capita household consumption or household vulnerability) in the second stage. We use log household consumption and vulnerability as a measure of poverty because treatment effects model requires that the dependent variable in the second stage is continuous and the standard binary measure of poverty (0 or 1) cannot be used. Moreover, as suggested by previous literature, households in India and Vietnam tend to be vulnerable to shocks (e.g. Imai et al, 2011; Gaiha and Imai, 2009). We denote household poverty - either log per capita household consumption or vulnerability – as Y .

$$Y = Z\gamma + \theta D + \varepsilon_i \qquad (4)$$
$$(u, \varepsilon) \sim \text{bivariate normal}[0, 0, 1, \sigma_\varepsilon, \rho].$$

where θ is the average net effect (ANE) of access to rural non-farm sector employment. In case log per capita household consumption is estimated, the positive estimate of θ implies that accessing RNFE increases consumption and thus decreases poverty unless income distribution changes. In the case of vulnerability, the negative estimate of θ implies that access to rural non-farm sector employment decreases vulnerability.

Here Z is a vector of determinants of Y . For Vietnam this is estimated by:

$$Z = Z(M_i, E_i, H_i, L_i, R_i) \qquad (5)$$

and for India

$$Z = Z(E_i, H_i, L_i, B_i, R_i) \tag{6}$$

That is, we include all the variables used for the non-farm sector participation equation ((2) or (3)) except the instruments, predicted wages.

Using a formula for the joint density of bivariate normally distributed variables, the expected poverty for those with access to rural non-farm sector employment is written as:

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y|D=1] &= \beta' Z + \theta + E[\varepsilon_i | D=1] \\ &= \beta' Z + \theta + \rho\sigma_\varepsilon \frac{\phi(\gamma' X)}{\Phi(\gamma' X)} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where ϕ is the standard normal density function. The ratio of ϕ and Φ is called the inverse Mills ratio.

Expected poverty (or undernutrition or vulnerability) for non-participants is:

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y|D=0] &= \beta' Z + E[\varepsilon_i | D=0] \\ &= \beta' Z - \rho\sigma_\varepsilon \frac{\phi(\gamma' X)}{1-\Phi(\gamma' X)} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The expected effect of poverty reduction associated with RNFE is computed as (Greene, 2003, 787-789):

$$E[Y|D=1] - E[Y|D=0] = \theta + \rho\sigma_\varepsilon \frac{\phi(\gamma' X)}{\Phi(\gamma' X)[1-\Phi(\gamma' X)]} \tag{9}$$

If ρ is positive (negative), the coefficient estimate of θ using OLS is biased upward (downward) and the sample selection term will correct this. Since σ_ε is positive, the sign and significance of the estimate of $\rho\sigma_\varepsilon$ (usually denoted as β_λ) will show whether there exists any selection bias. To estimate the parameters of this model, the likelihood function given by Maddala (1983, p.122) is used where the bivariate normal function is reduced to the univariate function and the correlation coefficient ρ. The predicted values of (7) and (8) are

derived and compared by the standard t test to examine whether the average treatment effect or poverty reducing effect is significant.

The results of treatment effects model will have to be interpreted with caution because the results are sensitive to the specification of the model or the selection of explanatory variables and/or the instrument. Also important are the distributional assumptions of the model. Despite these limitations, the model is one of the few available methods to control for sample selection bias and capable of yielding insights into whether access to rural non-farm sector employment leads to poverty reduction.

(2) Vulnerability Measure

It would be ideal to use panel data to derive household's vulnerability measures, but, in its absence, we can derive a measure of 'Vulnerability as Expected Poverty' (VEP), an *ex ante* measure, based on Chaudhuri (2003) and Chaudhuri, Jalan and Suryahadi (2002) who applied it to a large cross-section of households in Indonesia[9] and defined vulnerability as the probability that a household will fall into poverty in the future after controlling for the observable household characteristics. Accordingly, it takes the value from 0 to 1, and the higher the value of vulnerability measure, the higher is the probability of a household falling into poverty in the next period. Imai et al. (2011) derived and analysed Chaudhuri's vulnerability measure using the VHLSS data for Vietnam, and Imai (2011) did so using the Indian NSS data. We will use these cross-sectional vulnerability measures subject to the caveat of estimating vulnerability from a single cross-section that cannot capture the effect of aggregate shocks affecting all the households in the sample area. The details of derivation of Chaudhuri's vulnerability measure is found in Hoddinott and Quisumbing (2003b). Imai et al. (2011) and Imai (2011) provide a full set of results of vulnerability for Vietnam and India.

[9] See a summary by Hoddinott and Quisumbing (2003a, b) of methodological issues in measuring vulnerability.

4. Econometric Results

This section summarises the results of treatment effects model which is applied to estimate the effects of accessing rural non-farm sector employment. Vulnerability estimates based on VHLSS and NSS data are reported in Imai et al. (2011) and Imai (2011) and we highlight only the results of treatment effects model.

Table 1 gives the results of treatment effects model applied to VHLSS data in 2002, 2004 and 2006. For each year, two different proxies for poverty have been tried as a dependent variable - log of per capita consumption and vulnerability. The first panel reports the results of the first stage probit model for whether a household member participates in the non-farm sector labour market and the second panel gives the results for OLS whereby log per capita consumption or vulnerability is estimated.

The first panel of Table 1 suggests that predicted wage rates as well as household characteristics (e.g. educational attainment, household composition) affect the probability of a household member participating in the non-farm sector. In 2002 and 2006, both predicted male wage rate and female wage rate positively and significantly increased the probability of the household having a member participating in the non-farm sector employment, while in 2004 only male wage rate was positive and significant. A household owing more land tends to have a smaller possibility of participating in the non-farm labour market with an indication of non-linearity, suggested by a positive and significant coefficient estimate of the size of land squared (with its coefficient estimate in absolute term larger than the level of size of land). This indicates that, other things being equal, the households with some amount of land tend to concentrate on only farming, while the landless or those with a large area of land tend to participate in non-farm employment, either because their earnings from farming are small or uncertain, or they can invest in some skills due to the large income from farming. Other

variables show more or less expected results (e.g. higher educational attainment tends to increase the probability of participating in non-farm employment; belonging to ethnic majority increases the probability; a younger household head is more likely to participate in non-farm employment; location affects the probability). $\rho\sigma_\varepsilon$ or β_λ in equation (7) is statistically significant (except in case of consumption in 2004 and in 2006), implying that there exists sample selection bias that should be corrected for in deriving the average treatment effects. Use of treatment effects model is justified in most cases.

The second panel of Table 1 shows the results of determinants of per capita household consumption and household vulnerability for 2002, 2004 and 2006. For example, size of household significantly decreases consumption in all the years and significantly decreases vulnerability in 2002, 2004 and 2006. An older household head tends to have higher per capita consumption and lower vulnerability with non-linear effects. Higher dependency burden is associated with lower per capita consumption and higher vulnerability. Education and location are important determinants of both consumption and vulnerability. $\hat{\theta}$, an estimate of θ in equations (7) and (9) shows the Average Net Effects (ANE) and it is positive and significant except in the case of consumption for 2004. However, ANE should not be treated as a treatment effect if the sample selection term, β_λ, is statistically significant. At the bottom of the table, we report the Average Treatment Effect (ATE), the difference of the expected outcome for participants in non-farm employment and for non-participants after controlling for sample selection (as in equation (9), the sum of ANE and the sample selection term). In order to evaluate the effect of access to non-farm employment on poverty after taking account of sample selection, we need to base our discussion on ATE, rather than ANE (Imai, 2011).

In 2002, per capita consumption was significantly higher by 19.2% for participants in the non-farm labour market than for non-participants after taking account of sample selection,

which is consistent with the poverty reducing role of rural non-farm employment. In the same year, vulnerability as a probability of falling into poverty is reduced by 14.9% as a result of participating in non-farm employment. In 2004, per capita consumption is significantly higher by 12.9% for non-farm labour market participants than for non-participants after controlling for sample selection, while the vulnerability is lower for non-farm labour market participants by 7.3%. In 2006, per capita consumption is higher by 13.1% and vulnerability is lower by 5.9% if the household has access to non-farm employment. In sum, we confirm that rural non-farm employment substantially reduced consumption poverty and vulnerability throughout the period 2002 to 2006. The results may suggest that RNFE opens up a new set of consumption bundles which others could not avail of.

(Table 1 to be inserted)

To see how non-farm sector employment in different categories affects poverty and vulnerability, we have repeated the same model by changing only the definition of binary-classification of non-farm employment. Only the final results of ATE are summarised in Table 2. Sub-categories are broadly defined by occupational code of individual members participating in the non-farm employment - "Unskilled manual employment" (mechanical and physically demanding jobs e.g. unskilled construction works), "Production" (jobs classified in manufacturing sector or associated with production, e.g. employment in plant and machine operators/ assemblers or craftsman), "Sales" (jobs associated with sales and trade) and "Professionals/ clerks" (managers, professionals, technicians, clerks). It should be noted that these categories are broadly defined by the occupational categories within which ranks or skill requirements are diverse. Hence, the results should be interpreted with caution. Also, different occupational coding systems are used for Vietnam and India and the results are not necessarily comparable.

(Table 2 to be inserted)

Given the above caveats, ATE on consumption and vulnerability is different across different categories of non-farm employment. For example, "Unskilled and Manual" non-farm employment increased consumption by 5.1% in 2002 and by 11.0% in 2004, but in the meantime *increased* vulnerability (by 5.2% in 2004 and 5.8% in 2006). This implies that non-farm manual employment may increase household consumption only at the cost of greater vulnerability in Vietnam. Non-farm sector in "Production" increased consumption significantly over the years with some variation (by 15.7% in 2002, 3.2% in 2004 and 13.8% in 2006) and decreased vulnerability by 15.6% in 2002 and by 2.1% in 2004. The poverty and vulnerability reducing effects of non-farm employment on "Sales" and "Professionals/ Clerks" are more clearly observed. On average, access to employment in "Sales" increased per capita consumption by 21.0% to 29.6% and reduced vulnerability by 6.0% to 26.7%. The effect of non-farm employment in "Professionals/ Clerks" on per capita consumption was also substantial over time (ranging from 15.4% to 22.0%), while vulnerability was substantially reduced at the same time. That is, with some variation, poverty and vulnerability reducing effects of skilled non-farm employment are much stronger than those of unskilled or manual employment after controlling for sample selection biases associated with participation in such non-farm employment.

Table 3 gives the results of treatment effects model for the Indian NSS data. As before, the first panel presents the results of participation equation (probit model). Female headedness negatively affected participation in NSS61 (in 2004-2005).[10] Dependency burden is negative and significant, that is, the household with higher dependency burden is less likely to participate in the rural non-farm sector employment. A younger household head is more likely to participate in non-farm employment but with non-linear effects. A

[10] Because female headedness is measured with error in NSS50/year, it was not used in the regression.

household with more educated members tends to participate in non-farm employment. If the household has more land, the probability of participating in non-farm employment is larger, which is suggested by a *positive* and significant coefficient for the dummy variable on whether a household owns land greater than 2.5 hectares (the first, second and the last columns). This is because in India where farmers may face a greater degree of uncertainty, owning a larger land is necessary for acquiring some skills to be engaged in non-farm employment. But this is only possible if the farms own a certain amount of land (i.e. greater than 2.5 hectares) as we also observe a *negative* and significant coefficient estimate for a dummy on owning a small area of land (between 0.1and 2.5 hectares) (the third and fourth columns, 2004-5). Belonging to the SCs and STs is also associated with lower probability of participating in non-farm employment. For NSS50, i.e., in 1993-1994, higher predicted wages significantly lead to higher probability of participating in non-farm employment. The coefficient estimate for regional price is positive, but not statistically significant for NSS61. The coefficient estimate of $\rho\sigma_{\varepsilon}$ or β_{λ} is significant except the cases for "vulnerability" in 1993-1994 and "log MPCE" in 2004-5.

(Table 3 to be inserted)

The second panel of Table 3 reports the regression results of the second-stage equation for log MPCE or vulnerability. We report the regression results only selectively. For instance, in contrast to Vietnam, somewhat surprising is the finding that dependency burden significantly increased log MPCE, but decreased vulnerability. In 1993-1994, a household with an older head was more vulnerable with a strong non-linear effect, while age of the head had no significant effect on per capita consumption. On the contrary, a household with an older head consumed more with a strong non-linear effect in 2004-2005. In general, a household with a more educated household consumed more and was less vulnerable. As expected, the larger the size of the land a household owned, it consumed more and was less

vulnerable. Belonging to the SCs or STs was associated with a lower level of consumption as well as a higher level of vulnerability.

We have summarised the results of ATE at the bottom of Table 3. It is confirmed that access to non-farm employment increased per capita consumption on average by 10.2% in 1993-4 and 10.4% in 2004-5. That is, the consumption increasing effect (or the effect of reducing consumption poverty) continued to be substantial. Vulnerability was significantly reduced by participation in non-farm employment - by 3.8% in 1993-4 and by 7.1% in 2004-2005 (in terms of the probability of falling into poverty in the next period). It can be concluded that in India participation in RNFE is likely to reduce household vulnerability significantly.

Table 4 reports a summary of the results for India where non-farm employment is disaggregated by occupational categories. "Professionals/ Clerks" has the largest poverty and vulnerability reducing effects in 1993-1994 and 2004-2005, followed by "Production" and "Sales" which have similar magnitudes of poverty and vulnerability reducing effects. "Unskilled/ Manual" employment involves the smallest poverty and vulnerability reduction effects among the four categories, but the role of these effects should not be neglected given that the poor do not have easy access to skilled employment in non-farm sector. Access to unskilled/ manual employment in non-farm sector increased per capita consumption by 6.0% (8.4%) in 1993-1994 (2004-2005) on average, while it reduced the probability of falling into poverty by 4.0% (7.6%) in 1993-1994 (2004-2005).

(Table 4 to be inserted)

5. Concluding Observations

The present study has contributed to the existing empirical literature, which has already established that rural non-farm income is an important resource for rural agricultural

households, in the following three ways. First, this is the first study to show that rural non-farm sector employment has significantly reduced poverty and vulnerability in Vietnam and India while taking account of the endogeneity problem. Second, and related to the first point, we have identified a larger poverty reducing effect of skilled employment in rural non-farm sector. Finally, by focusing on both Vietnam and India, we have developed a comparative perspective in terms of the role of rural non-farm employment.

More specifically, the present study has examined whether participation in the rural non-farm sector employment or involvement in activity in rural non-farm economy (RNFE) has any poverty-reducing or vulnerability-reducing effect in Vietnam and India drawing upon nation-wide cross-sectional household data sets. To take account of sample selection bias associated with RNFE, we applied treatment-effects model, a variant of Heckman sample selection model. We find that participation in non-farm sector employment significantly increased per capita consumption or expenditure – as a proxy for poverty reduction - in 2002, 2004, and 2006 in rural Vietnam and in 1993-1994 and 2004-2005 in rural India. The results are consistent with poverty and vulnerability reducing roles of accessing RNFE. This is important as a significant number of households were found to be not only poor but also vulnerable to shocks in the future (e.g. weather shocks, illness of household members, macro-economic slowdown) in Vietnam as well as India (Gaiha and Imai, 2009; Imai et al., 2011). Diversification of household activities into non-farm sector would reduce such risks.

Disaggregation of non-farm sector employment by occupational categories shows that access to more skilled employment is likely to have larger poverty and vulnerability reducing effects than unskilled or manual employment. Non-farm employment in "Sales" and "Professionals/ Clerks" categories has stronger effects in reducing poverty and vulnerability in both Vietnam and India. "Unskilled/ Manual" employment significantly reduces poverty and vulnerability in India over the years and access of the rural poor to unskilled or manual

employment is likely to be important given that the poor do not have easy access to skilled employment in non-farm sector. On the contrary, the poverty reducing effect of unskilled/ manual non-farm employment is observed in 2002 and 2004, but not in 2006 in Vietnam but with greater household vulnerability in 2004 and 2006. Non-farm employment associated with "Production" significantly reduced poverty and vulnerability over time in both India and Vietnam, except in 2006 when vulnerability rose in Vietnam. That is, we observe more consistent poverty and vulnerability effects of relatively unskilled/ physical demanding jobs in non-farm sector for India than for Vietnam. This finding has considerable policy significance as the rural poor do not have easy access to skilled non-farm employment. The issue is whether there is enough incentive for the non-farm or business sector to create preferred job types in the rural areas. Given the potential role of non-farm sector in reducing vulnerability, central or local governments, or international donors or NGOs might want to support this process from both demand and supply sides. For instance, it will be important for governments to relocate some business activities from urban to rural areas, support the business for processing and retailing agricultural food products in rural areas, and/or develop the infrastructure necessary for promoting non-farm economy. In the meantime, it will be necessary for governments or donors to help poor farmers to take up skills necessary for rural non-farm employment, e.g. through microfinance programmes or newly created training centre.

Our results are consistent with recent views that non-farm sector plays a key role in helping poor households escape poverty. Policy interventions designed to help agricultural households diversify into non-farm sector activities (e.g. skill training; microfinance) would potentially reduce not only poverty but also vulnerability.

Our results have indicated that there are more similarities than differences in the impact of rural non-farm employment between Vietnam - an economy in transition - and

India - an emerging economy. Some clues may, however, emerge from a deeper understanding of differences in constraints to expansion of land, variation in population pressure, and productivity, access to credit, decentralised structures of governance, and weak rural infrastructure, which is left for future research. That Vietnam has adapted rapidly to a market-oriented policy regime may in fact be key to why similarities in the impact of rural non-farm employment are so much more striking in these two countries.

If this observation is combined with our main result that rural non-farm employment reduces poverty and vulnerability, it can be inferred that more market-oriented policy regime in Vietnam has enabled the country to reduce poverty more rapidly than India where the shift to market-oriented policy regime is slower and the average aggregate benefit from access to rural non-farm employment is smaller. This is another interesting topic for future research.

References

Becker, G. S., & Murphy, K. M. (1992). The division of labor, coordination costs, and knowledge. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 107, 1137-1160.

Bliss C., & Stern, N. (1978). Productivity, wages and nutrition: Part I: The theory. *Journal of Development Economics,* 5(4), 331-362.

Chaudhuri, S. (2003). Assessing vulnerability to poverty: concepts, empirical methods and illustrative examples. mimeo, New York: Columbia University.

Chaudhuri, S., Jalan, J., & Suryahadi, A. (2002). Assessing Household Vulnerability to Poverty: A Methodology and Estimates for Indonesia. Columbia University Department of Economics Discussion Paper No. 0102-52, New York: Columbia University.

Dasgupta, P., & Ray, D. (1986). Inequality as a determinant of malnutrition and unemployment: Theory. *Economic Journal,* 96, 1011–1034.

Dasgupta, P., & Ray, D. (1987). Inequality as a determinant of malnutrition and unemployment: Policy. *Economic Journal,* 97, 177–188.

de Janvry, A., Sadoulet, E., & Nong, Z. (2005). The role of non-farm incomes in reducing rural poverty and inequality in China. CUDARE Working Paper Series 1001, University of California at Berkeley.

Dollar, D. & Kraay, A. (2002). Growth is good for the poor. *Journal of Economic Growth,* 7, 195-225.

Gaiha, R., & Imai, K. (2009). Measuring Vulnerability and Poverty in Rural India. in W. Naudé, A. Santos-Paulino and M. McGillivray (Eds.), *Vulnerability in Developing Countries*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Gaiha, R., Kaicker, N., Imai, K., & Thapa, G. (2012). Demand for Nutrients in India: An Analysis Based on the 50th, 61st and 66th Rounds of the NSS. IFAD, Rome, mimeo.

Gaiha, R., Jha, R., & Kulkarni, V. S. (2014). *Diets, Malnutrition and Disease in India*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Galor, O., & Moav, O. (2004). From physical to human capital accumulation: Inequality and the process of development. *Review of Economic Studies*, 71, 1001-1026.

Greene, W. H. (2003). *Econometric Analysis* 5th edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Haggblade, S., Hazell, P., & Reardon, T. (2010). The Rural Nonfarm Economy: Prospects for Growth and Poverty Reduction. *World Development*, 38(10), 1429–1441.

Heckman, J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica* 47, 153-161.

Himanshu, Lanjouw, P., Murgai, R., & Stern, N. (2013). Nonfarm diversification, poverty, economic mobility, and income inequality: a case study in village India. *Agricultural Economics* 44, 461-473.

Himanshu, & Sen, K. (2014). Revisiting the Great Indian Poverty Debate: Measurement, Patterns, and Determinants. BWPI Working Paper Series 203, Manchester, the University of Manchester.

Hoddinott, J., & Quisumbing, A. (2003a). Data Sources for Microeconometric Risk and Vulnerability Assessments. Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No.0323, Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Hoddinott, J., & Quisumbing, A. (2003b). Methods for Microeconometric Risk and Vulnerability Assessments. Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No.0324, Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Imai, K. (2011). Poverty, undernutrition and vulnerability in rural India: Role of rural public works and food for work programmes. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 25(6), 669–691.

Imai, K., Gaiha, R., & Kang, W. (2011). Poverty Dynamics and Vulnerability in Vietnam. *Applied Economics*, 43(25), 3603-3618.

Imai, K., Annim, S.K., Kulkarni, V.S., & Gaiha, R. (2012). Nutrition, Activity Intensity and Wage Linkages: Evidence from India. RIEB DP2012-10, Kobe: RIEB, Kobe University.

Imai, K., Annim, S.K., Kulkarni, V.S., & Gaiha, R. (2014). Women's Empowerment and Prevalence of Stunted and Underweight Children in Rural India. *World Development*, 62(10), 88-105

Jha, R., Gaiha, R., & Sharma, A. (2009). Calorie and Micronutrient Deprivation and Poverty Nutrition Traps in Rural India. *World Development*, 37(5), 982–991.

Himanshu, Lanjouw, P., Murgai, R., Stern, N. (2013). Nonfarm diversification, poverty, economic mobility, and income inequality: a case study in village India. *Agricultural Economics*, 44, 461-473.

Kim, S. (1989). Labor specialization and the extent of the market. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 692-705.

Knight, J., Li, S., & Deng, Q. (2009). Education and the Poverty Trap in Rural China: Setting the Trap. *Oxford Development Studies*, 37 (4), 311-332.

Knight, J., Li, S., & Deng, Q. (2010). Education and the Poverty Trap in Rural China: Closing the Trap. *Oxford Development Studies*, 38 (1), 1-24.

Lanjouw, J., & Lanjouw, P. (2001). The rural non-farm: sector: issues and evidence from developing countries. *Agricultural Economics*, 26, 1-23.

Maddala, G. S. (1983). *Limited-dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maoz, Y. D. & Moav, O. (1999). Intergenerational mobility and the process of development. *Economic Journal*, 109, 677-697.

Owusu, V., Abdulai, A., & Abdul-Rahman, S. (2011). Non-farm work and food security among farm households in Northern Ghana. *Food Policy*, 36, 108–118.

Reardon T., Stamoulis, K., Balisacan, A., Cruz ME, Berdegue, J., & Banks, B. (1998). Rural non-farm income in developing countries, in FAO (1998). *The State of Food and Agriculture*, Rome: FAO, 283-356.

Reardon, T., Stamoulis, K., Lanjouw, P., & Balisacan, A. (2000). Effects of Non-Farm Employment on Rural Income Inequality in Developing Countries: An Investment Perspective. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51(2), 266-288.

Scandizzo, P, Gaiha, R., & Imai, K. (2009). Option Values, Switches and Wages - An Analysis of the Employment Guarantee Scheme in India. *Review of Development Economics*, 13(2), 248-263.

Smith, A. (1776) *An inequality into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. Three volumes, 5th edition*, London: A. Strahan and T. Cabell.

Thapa, G., Gaiha, R., Kaur, S., Kaicker, N., & Vashishtha, P. (2013). Agriculture-pathways to prosperity in Asia and the Pacific. Discussion papers Series 17, Rome, the Asia and the Pacific Division, IFAD.

van de Walle, D., & Cratty, D. (2004). Is the emerging non-farm market economy the route out of poverty in Vietnam? *The Economics of Transition*, 12(2), 237-274.

World Bank (2014). *World Development Indicators*, Washington DC, World Bank.

Table 1

The Results of Treatment Effects Model on the Effects of Individual Participation in Rural Non-Farm Employment on Poverty and Vulnerability for Vietnam

	2002				2004				2006			
1st Stage: Dependent Variable	**Participation in Non-farm sector employment**				**Participation in Non-farm sector employment**				**Participation in Non-farm sector employment**			
	Coef.	Z value *1	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value
Explanatory Variables *2												
Predicted Daily Male Wage Rate	0.205	(20.57)*	0.139	(15.78)**	0.017	(4.56)**	0.012	(4.78)**	0.007	(4.22)**	0.003	(3.49)**
Predicted Daily Female Wage Rate	0.180	(13.74)*	0.076	(6.53)**	-0.006	(-1.56)	-0.004	(-1.57)	0.010	(3.94)**	0.006	(3.56)**
Whether a head is male	-0.170	(-6.12)*	-0.128	(-4.05)**	-0.064	(-0.82)	-0.077	(-1.05)	0.190	(2.30)*	0.112	(1.45)
Whether completed primary school	0.051	(1.47)	0.004	(0.11)	-0.323	(-1.08)	-0.652	(-2.42)*	0.139	(0.44)	0.090	(0.29)
Whether completed lower secondary school	0.260	(7.32)**	0.181	(4.98)**	-0.083	(-0.28)	-0.361	(-1.34)	0.290	(0.92)	0.284	(0.92)
Whether completed upper secondary school	0.259	(6.51)**	0.296	(7.25)**	0.115	(0.38)	-0.140	(-0.51)	0.424	(1.34)	0.425	(1.36)
Whether completed technical school	0.347	(7.04)**	0.478	(9.30)**	0.276	(0.91)	0.032	(0.12)	0.619	(1.94)†	0.595	(1.91)†
Whether completed higher school education	-0.009	(-0.15)	0.277	(4.35)**	0.330	(1.04)	0.035	(0.12)	0.740	(2.20)*	0.673	(2.08)*
Size of household	0.033	(5.41)**	0.029	(4.56)**	0.031	(2.17)*	0.014	(1.08)	0.049	(3.30)**	0.048	(3.52)**
Share of female members	0.023	(0.47)	-0.066	(-1.32)	-0.068	(-0.54)	-0.075	(-0.65)	-0.099	(-0.79)	-0.114	(-0.99)
Dependency Burden (share of household members under 15 or above 60)	0.171	(3.73)**	-0.079	(-1.66)†	0.020	(0.22)	-0.052	(-0.61)	0.171	(1.54)	-0.200	(-1.92)†
Size of land (hectare)	-24.483	(-22.71)**	-16.296	(-14.29)**	-20.501	(-7.63)**	-13.885	(-6.18)**	-10.523	(-4.29)**	-7.270	(-3.34)**
Size of land squared	30.071	(16.90)**	42.264	(9.77)**	56.908	(5.56)**	42.433	(4.90)**	21.561	(2.59)*	17.278	(2.50)*
Age of a household head	-0.120	(-23.71)**	-0.111	(-20.72)**	-0.132	(-10.51)**	-0.098	(-8.44)**	-0.123	(-8.98)**	-0.097	(-7.59)**
Age squared	0.001	(25.47)**	0.001	(23.28)**	0.001	(10.88)**	0.001	(9.26)**	0.001	(9.04)**	0.001	(7.97)**
Whether a household head is married	-0.122	(-3.81)**	-0.100	(-2.86)**	-0.181	(-2.01)*	-0.032	(-0.38)	-0.272	(-3.00)*	-0.178	(-2.09)*
Whether belonging to ethnic majorities	0.389	(10.53)**	0.383	(9.34)**	0.317	(3.55)**	0.807	(9.62)**	0.187	(2.24)*	0.554	(7.38)**
Constant	0.049	(0.35)	0.355	(2.39)*	2.161	(4.68)**	1.082	(2.55)	1.136	(2.25)	0.387	(0.81)
$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}$	-0.217	(-21.12)**	-0.207	(-57.62)**	0.041	(0.47)	-0.157	(-45.61)**	-0.056	(-0.80)	-0.151	(-49.12)**
$\hat{\rho}$	-0.473	(-23.89)**	-0.795	(-95.06)**	0.103	(0.47)	-0.865	(-106.47)**	-0.142	(-0.81)	-0.879	(-122.40)**
2nd Stage: Dependent Variable	**log per capita consumption**		**Vulnerability**		**log per capita consumption**		**Vulnerability**		**log per capita consumption**		**Vulnerability**	
	Coef.	Z value *1	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value
Whether a head is male	-0.035	(-3.75)**	0.064	(9.95)**	-0.044	(-1.85)†	0.022	(1.99)**	-0.005	(-0.22)	-0.001	(-0.11)
Whether completed primary school	0.120	(10.93)**	-0.085	(-12.99)**	0.112	(1.26)	-0.076	(-1.90)†	0.175	(1.94)†	-0.144	(-3.70)**
Whether completed lower secondary school	0.222	(19.48)**	-0.225	(-33.20)**	0.260	(2.97)**	-0.192	(-4.77)**	0.270	(2.97)**	-0.257	(-6.61)**
Whether completed upper secondary school	0.397	(30.68)**	-0.338	(-43.49)**	0.439	(4.97)**	-0.272	(-6.71)**	0.442	(4.75)**	-0.309	(-7.87)**

Whether completed technical school	0.501	(31.54)**	-0.430	(-43.33)**	0.580	(6.47)**	-0.327	(-8.03)**	0.561	(5.85)**	-0.350	(-8.89)**
Whether completed higher school education	0.802	(46.73)**	-0.383	(-33.38)**	0.803	(8.55)**	-0.308	(-7.28)**	0.753	(7.27)**	-0.343	(-8.39)**
Size of household	-0.091	(-48.98)**	-0.003	(-2.63)*	-0.086	(-20.23)**	0.000	(-0.12)	-0.093	(-19.71)**	-0.007	(-4.00)**
Share of female members	-0.050	(-3.21)**	0.048	(4.78)**	-0.075	(-2.02)*	0.039	(2.29)*	-0.008	(-0.22)	0.002	(0.11)
Dependency Burden (share of household members under 15 or above 60)	-0.276	(-19.39)**	0.401	(44.52)**	-0.121	(-4.49)**	0.071	(5.69)**	-0.257	(-7.72)**	0.202	(14.29)**
Size of land (hectare)	6.474	(21.36)**	-0.767	(-3.64)**	5.500	(5.17)**	-0.236	(-0.75)	7.029	(9.43)**	-0.306	(-1.09)
Size of land squared	-8.582	(-12.87)**	1.611	(1.71)†	-15.160	(-4.27)**	1.675	(1.35)	-15.385	(-6.97)**	1.585	(1.77)†
Age of a household head	0.026	(16.02)**	0.017	(17.53)**	0.018	(2.59)**	-0.003	(-1.66)*	0.014	(2.12)*	0.011	(6.18)**
Age squared	0.000	(-15.18)**	0.000	(-20.14)**	0.000	(-2.26)*	0.000	(0.19)	0.000	(-1.93)†	0.000	(-6.55)**
Whether a household head is married	0.123	(11.79)**	-0.011	(-1.57)	0.099	(3.52)**	-0.008	(-0.64)	0.109	(3.78)**	0.010	(0.85)
Whether belonging to ethnic majorities	0.188	(15.96)**	-0.463	(-64.07)**	0.273	(9.68)**	-0.424	(-37.32)**	0.276	(11.49)**	-0.305	(-30.36)**
$\hat{\theta}$	0.574	(33.94)**	0.208	(32.31)**	0.060	(0.42)	0.196	(31.62)**	0.226	(1.93)†	0.197	(35.30)**
Constant	7.019	(153.30)	0.231	(8.29)	7.415	(32.41)	0.748	(12.43)	6.982	(37.16)	0.304	(4.90)
No. of Observations	25136		20205		4032		4030		4091		4091	
Wald $Chi^2(27)$	20778**		1010**		2698**		7227**		3050**		6039**	
Variable	log per capita consumption		Vulnerability		log per capita consumption		Vulnerability		log per capita consumption		Vulnerability	
Treat With RNFE	8.015		0.115		8.040		0.088		7.650			
Control Without RNFE	7.823		0.265		7.912		0.162		7.519			
Average Treatment Effect (ATE) $(=\theta+\rho\sigma_{\varepsilon}\frac{\phi(\gamma' X_i)}{\Phi(\gamma' X_i)[1-\Phi(\gamma' X_i)]})$												
t statistics in brackets	**+19.2%**	**(55.34)****	**-14.9%**	**(-63.84)****	**+12.9%**	**(18.40)****	**-7.3%**	**(16.42)****	**+13.1%**	**(17.73)****	**-5.9%**	**(-16.46)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly? (based on ATE)	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	

Notes: *1. z or t statistics in brackets; + p<.10, * p<.05, ** p<.01. *2. Regional and locational dummy variables are included in both stages, but are not shown to save the space. Dummy variables are "whether in river delta region; North East region; North West region; North Central Coast region; South Central Coast region; Central Highlands region; North East South region; Central Coast region; Inland Delta; Hills; Low Mountains.

Source: Authors Calculation based on VHLSS 2002, 2004 and 2006.

Table 2

The Results of Averaged Treatment Effect (ATE) of Rural Non-Farm Employment by Occupational Categories in Vietnam

	2002				2004				2006			
Dependent Variable	log per capita consumption		Vulnerability		log per capita consumption		Vulnerability		log per capita consumption		vulnerability	
Explanatory Variables *2	**ATE**	t value *1	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value
Aggregate Effect	**+19.2%**	**(55.34)****	**-14.9%**	**(-63.84)****	**+12.9%**	**(18.40)****	**-7.3%**	**(16.42)****	**+13.1%**	**(17.73)****	**-5.9%**	**(-16.46)****
*Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?*3.*	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Unskilled/ Manual	**+5.1%**	**(12.78)****	+0.5%	(1.30)	**+11.0%**	**(12.84)****	+5.2%	(7.35)**	+1.3%	(1.46)	+5.8%	(10.07)**
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		NO		**YES**		NO		NO		NO	
Production	**+15.7%**	**(41.31)****	**-15.6%**	**(-45.70)****	**+3.2%**	**(3.91)****	**-2.1%**	**(-3.20)****	**+13.8%**	**(16.23)****	+1.2%	**(8.15)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		NO	
Sales	**+29.6%**	**(78.37)****	**-26.7%**	**(-100.00)****	**+21.0%**	**(24.80)****	**-8.7%**	**(-13.60)****	**+22.2%**	**(25.48)****	**-6.0%**	**(-11.62)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Professionals/ Clerks	**+20.0%**	**(5.64)****	**-24.9%**	**(-84.47)****	**+15.4%**	**(17.02)****	**-5.5%**	**(-7.88)****	**+22.0%**	**(23.72)****	**-7.3%**	**(-13.71)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	

Notes: *1. t statistics in brackets; + p<.10, * p<.05, ** p<.01. *2. The same specification we used for the aggregate case (Table 1) is used for sub-categories of non-farm sector employment, determined by the occupational code (available in questionnaires for VHLSS data). *3. The case with an answer "YES" is shown in bold.

Source: Authors Calculation based on VHLSS 2002, 2004 and 2006.

Table 3

The Results of Treatment Effects Model on the Effects of Participation in Rural Non-Farm Employment for Vietnam on Poverty and Vulnerability for India

		1993-94 (NSS 50)				2004-2005 (NSS 61)			
1st Stage:	**Dependent Variable**	**Participation in Non-farm sector employment**				**Participation in Non-farm sector employment**			
		Coef.	Z value*1	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value	Coef.	Z value
Explanatory Variables*2									
Whether a household is headed by a female member		-	-	-	-	-0.039	(-1.18)	-0.064	(-2.02)*
Number of adult female members		0.030	(2.03)*	0.034	(2.31)*	0.002	(0.12)	-0.034	(-2.12)*
Number of adult male members		0.066	(4.92)**	0.059	(4.38)**	0.046	(2.88)**	0.012	(0.77)
Dependency Burden (share of household members under 15 or above 60)		-0.150	(-3.33)**	-0.186	(-4.05)**	-0.099	(-2.23)**	0.143	(3.39)**
Age of household head		-1.237	(-2.93)**	-1.386	(-3.28)**	-2.658	(-5.74)**	-2.308	(-5.24)**
Age squared		1.073	(2.29)*	1.262	(2.70)**	2.237	(4.58)**	2.072	(4.48)**
The max. education of adult (Primary)		0.301	(8.94)**	0.305	(9.02)**	0.195	(7.73)**	0.232	(9.48)**
The max. education of adult (Middle)		0.481	(12.10)**	0.481	(11.95)**	0.389	(14.89)**	0.429	(17.01)**
The max. education of adult (>=Matriculates)		0.527	(9.12)**	0.528	(9.01)**	0.541	(13.02)**	0.561	(14.27)**
Land (0.1<=2.5 ha) (default: the landless)		-0.033	(-0.66)	-0.040	(-0.80)	-0.091	(-4.31)**	-0.053	(-2.60)**
Land (>2.5 ha) (default: the landless)		0.164	(1.99)*	0.242	(2.90)**	0.147	(1.31)	0.171	(1.68)†
Whether a household belongs to SC (Scheduled Caste)		-0.021	(-0.68)	-0.028	(-0.89)	-0.119	(-3.82)**	-0.153	(-5.02)**
Whether a household belongs to ST (Scheduled Tribe)		-0.170	(-7.29)**	-0.176	(-7.46)**	-0.166	(-7.51)**	-0.195	(-9.14)**
Predicted male wages (at NSS region)		0.012	(14.71)**	0.008	(9.40)**	-	-	-	-
Aggregate Price (at NSS region)		-	-	-	-	0.026	(1.19)	0.013	(1.17)
Constant"		-0.470	(-2.63)	-0.235	(-1.32)	0.848	(2.70)	0.730	(3.87)
$\hat{\beta}_{\lambda}$		-0.196	(-14.38)**	0.012	(1.27)	-0.061	(-1.42)	-0.212	(-49.99)**
$\hat{\rho}$		-0.452	(-15.93)**	0.049	(1.27)	-0.163	(-1.44)	-0.800	(-85.56)**
2nd Stage:	**Dependent Variable**	**log per capita MPCE**		**Vulnerability**		**log per capita MPCE**		**Vulnerability**	
Whether a household is headed by a female member		-	-	-	-	-0.036	(-3.90)**	0.051	(7.69)**
Number of adult female members		-0.402	(-92.40)**	0.153	(64.48)**	-0.149	(-32.14)**	0.101	(30.57)**
Number of adult male members		-0.339	(-86.29)**	0.152	(70.72)**	-0.093	(-20.08)**	0.094	(29.32)**
Dependency Burden (share of household members under 15 or above 60)		2.343	(176.86)**	-1.543	(-213.27)**	0.662	(52.52)**	-0.527	(-59.97)**
Age of household head		0.051	(0.41)	0.989	(14.38)**	0.596	(4.09)**	0.084	(0.90)

Age squared	-0.134	(-0.96)	-0.997	(-13.13)**	-0.291	(-1.97)*	-0.331	(-3.40)**
The max. education of adult (Primary)	0.052	(4.78)**	-0.055	(-9.18)**	0.048	(5.71)**	-0.143	(-28.39)**
The max. education of adult (Middle)	0.096	(7.05)**	-0.116	(-15.43)**	0.121	(10.02)**	-0.269	(-50.48)**
The max. education of adult (>=Matriculates)	0.182	(9.35)**	-0.228	(-21.24)**	0.259	(14.48)**	-0.342	(-40.25)**
Land (0.1<=2.5 ha) (default: the landless)	0.048	(3.38)**	-0.078	(-10.11)**	0.026	(4.10)**	-0.047	(-11.21)**
Land (>2.5 ha) (default: the landless)	0.040	(1.47)	-0.093	(-6.18)**	0.093	(2.98)**	-0.188	(-8.51)**
Whether a household belongs to SC (Scheduled Caste)	-0.140	(-15.01)**	0.090	(17.79)**	-0.147	(-16.15)**	0.222	(36.19)**
Whether a household belongs to ST (Scheduled Tribe)	-0.070	(-10.17)**	0.057	(15.20)**	-0.067	(-9.07)**	0.121	(27.63)**
$\hat{\theta}$	0.456	(18.65)**	-0.059	(-3.61)**	0.205	(2.90)**	0.284	(37.95)**
Constant	7.927	(143.21)	1.180	(38.56)	9.330	(123.29)	-0.024	(-0.87)
No. of Observations	21883		21883					
Wald $Chi^2(37)$ [Wald $Chi^2(95)$ for NSS61]	52256**		62554**					
Variable	**Log MPCE**		**Vulnerability**		**Log MPCE**		**Vulnerability**	
Treat With RNFE	**8.693**		**0.6036**		**9.5887**		**0.1705**	
Control Without RNFE	**8.591**		**0.6415**		**9.4848**		**0.2412**	
ATE ($= \theta + \rho\sigma_\varepsilon \frac{\phi(\gamma' X_i)}{\Phi(\gamma' X_i)[1-\Phi(\gamma' X_i)]}$); t value in brackets.	**+10.2%**	**(15.99)****	**-3.79%**	**(-9.94)****	**+10.4%**	**(38.47)****	**-7.08%**	**(-24.50)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly? (based on ATE)	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	

Notes: *1. z or t statistics in brackets; + p<.10, * p<.05, ** p<.01. *2. State dummies and included, but are not shown to save the space.

Source: Authors Calculation based on NSS50 and NSS61.

Table 4

The Results of Averaged Treatment Effect (ATE) of Rural Non-Farm Employment by Occupational Categories in India

	1993-94 (NSS 50)				2004-2005 (NSS 61)			
Dependent Variable	log per capita consumption		vulnerability		log per capita consumption		Vulnerability	
Explanatory Variables *2	**ATE**	t value *1	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value	**ATE**	t value
Aggregate Effect	**+10.2%**	**(15.99)****	**-3.8%**	**(-9.94)****	**+10.4%**	**(38.47)****	**-7.1%**	**(-24.50)****
*Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?*3*	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Unskilled/ Manual	**+6.0%**	**(9.06)****	**-4.0%**	**(-10.08)****	**+8.4%**	**(30.06)****	**-7.6%**	**(-24.05)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Production	**+14.3%**	**(20.54)****	**-2.8%**	**(-6.69)****	**+15.3%**	**(47.38)****	**-9.5%**	**(-26.49)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Sales	**+14.7%**	**(20.37)****	**-2.6%**	**(-6.04)****	**+13.3%**	**(42.55)****	**-9.7%**	**(28.95)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	
Professionals/ Clerk	**+24.1%**	**(33.98)****	**-4.6%**	**(-10.74)****	**+24.1%**	**(72.89)****	**-15.2%**	**(45.99)****
Does RNFE Reduce Poverty (or Vulnerability) Significantly?	**YES**		**YES**		**YES**		**YES**	

Notes: *1. t statistics in brackets; + p<.10, * p<.05, ** p<.01. *2. The same specification we used for the aggregate case (Table 1) is used for sub-categories of non-farm sector employment, determined by the occupational code (available in questionnaires for VHLSS data).
*3. The case with an answer "YES" is shown in bold.
Source: Authors Calculation based on NSS50 and NSS61.

Appendix Table Definitions of the Variables of VHLSS and NSS data

Variable	Definition
VHLSS Data	
Rlconpc	log real per capita consumption expenditure in 2002 value
Headage	Age of household head
Headage2	(Age of household head)2
Married	Whether a household head has a spouse
Femaleshare	Share of female members
Femaleshare2	(Share of female members)2
Hhsize	Size of Household
Depburden	Ratio of dependency burden
Majorities	Whether a household belongs to ethnic majority
Noschooling_Head	Whether a household had no education
Primary_Head	Whether a household finished with primary school education
Lowersecon_Head	Whether a household finished with lower secondary school education
Uppersecon_Head	Whether a household finished with upper secondary school education
Technical_Head	Whether a household finished with technical school education
Higher_Head	Whether a household finished with higher school education
RedRiverDelta	Whether a household is located in red river delta region
NorthEast	Whether a household is located in northeast region
NorthWest	Whether a household is located in northwest region
NorthCentralCoast	Whether a household is located in north central coast region
SouthCentralCoast	Whether a household is located in south central coast region
CentralHighlands	Whether a household is located in central highlands region
NorthEastSouth	Whether a household is located in north east south region
MekongRiverDelta	Whether a household is located in mekong river delta region
CentralCoast	Whether a household is located in central coast region
Land	Size of Land (million hactare)
Land2	(Size of Land)2
NSS Data (India)	
Whether a household is headed by a female member	Whether a household is headed by a female member, (=1 if yes, =0 if no).
Number of adult female members	Number of adult female members (15 years old or above) in a household
Number of adult male members	Number of adult male members (15 years old or above) in a household
Dependency Burden	The share of children under 15 years old or adults over 60 years old in the total number of household members.
Age of household head	Age of household head (years)
Age squared	Square of age of household head
The max. education of adult (Primary)	The maximum level of educational attainment of adult member in the household is the completion of primary school.
The max. education of adult (Middle)	The maximum level of educational attainment of adult member in the household is the completion of middle school.
The max. education of adult (>=Matriculates)	The maximum level of educational attainment of adult member in the household is matriculates or higher.
Land (0.1<=2.5 ha) (default: the landless)	The area of owned land of the household is from 0,1 hectare to 2.5 hectare.
Land (>2.5 ha) (default: the landless)	The area of owned land of the household is larger than 2.5 hectare.
Land pc	The area of owned land per capita
Whether self-employed in non-agriculture	Whether the occupation type of the household head is self-employed in non-agriculture (=1 if yes, =0 if no).- default of the four choices is 'others'.
Whether agricultural labour	Whether the occupation type of the household head is agricultural labour (=1 if yes, =0 if no).
Whether non-agricultural labour	Whether the occupation type of the household head is labour in non-agriculture (=1 if yes, =0 if no).
Whether self-employed in agriculture	Whether the occupation type of the household head is self-employed in agriculture (=1 if yes, =0 if no).

Whether a household belongs to SCs (Scheduled Castes)	Whether a household belongs to SC (Scheduled Caste) (=1 if yes, =0 if no).
Whether a household belongs to STs (Scheduled Tribes)	Whether a household belongs to ST (Scheduled Tribe) (=1 if yes, =0 if no).
RPW	Whether a household has access to Rural Public Works.
FFW	Whether a household has access to Food for Work Programme.
Predicted agricultural wage rate for males	Agricultural Wage Rate for male workers averaged at NSS region.
Poor	Whether the household per capita expenditure is under the national poverty line for rural areas.
poor (calorie based)	Whether the household is undernourished in terms of calorie intakes.
poor (protein based)	Whether the household is undernourished in terms of protein intakes.
Vulnerability Measure (based on 100% income poverty line)	Whether the household is vulnerable (based on 100% of the national poverty line).
Vulnerability Measure (based on 80% income poverty line)	Whether the household is vulnerable (based on 80% of the national poverty line).
Vulnerability Measure (based on 120% income poverty line)	Whether the household is vulnerable (based on 120% of the national poverty line).