



Social Stratification in the Southeast Region of Viet Nam

Cuong The Bui

Universiti Brunei Darussalam

Working Paper No. 16

Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam

Gadong 2015

Editorial Board, Working Paper Series

Dr. Paul J. Carnegie, Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

Professor Lian Kwen Fee, Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

Author

Cuong The Bui is Senior Researcher and Professor of Sociology at the Southern Institute of Social Sciences, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam and Visiting Professor at the Institute of Asian Studies, UBD. Between 1999 and 2005 he was Vice-Director of the Institute of Sociology located in Ha Noi. From 2005 until 2012 he was Director of the Southern Institute of Social Sciences and Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Social Sciences. Professor Cuong has published widely in his field and he is currently leading several large research projects on social stratification, welfare, civil society and community research in Viet Nam.

Contact: cuong.buithe@ubd.edu.com and cuongbuithe@yahoo.com

The Views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute of Asian Studies or the Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

© Copyright is held by the author(s) of each working paper; no part of this publication may be republished, reprinted or reproduced in any form without permission of the paper's author(s).

Social Stratification in the Southeast Region of Viet Nam

Cuong The Bui

Abstract:

In 2010, the Southern Institute of Social Sciences of the Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences conducted two surveys in the Southeast region of Viet Nam. The first survey was conducted in Ho Chi Minh City. It consists of 1,080 households living in 30 wards or communes. The second one was carried out in other provinces of the Southeast region, consisting of 1,080 households living in 30 wards, towns or communes. This paper outlines the social stratification structures by occupational groups, social strata and quintiles of income based on the data set analysis of the surveys. Three properties attached to the social groups, namely the economy, knowledge and power resources, are measured by three variables: household's income, years of schooling, and being a member of the ruling Party. The analysis highlights that the distributions of these resources are consistently structured by the configuration of social stratification.

Keywords: *Social stratification, Southeast region of Viet Nam, Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam*

List of IAS Working Papers

1. King, Victor T., Culture and Identity: Some Borneo Comparisons. Working Paper No 1 Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2012
2. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke, Local Knowledge and the Digital Divide: Focus on Southeast Asia. Working Paper No 2. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2012
3. King, Victor T., Borneo and Beyond: Reflections on Borneo Studies, Anthropology and the Social Sciences. Working Paper No 3. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
4. King, Victor T., UNESCO in Southeast Asia: World Heritage Sites in Comparative Perspective. Working Paper No 4. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
5. Purwaningrum, Farah, Knowledge Transfer Within an Industrial Cluster in the Jakarta Metropolitan Area. Working Paper No 5. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
6. Evers, Hans-Dieter, Ndah, Anthony Banyouko & Yahya, Liyana, Epistemic Landscape Atlas of Brunei Darussalam. Working Paper No 6. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
7. Carnegie, Paul J., Is the Indonesian Transition a Model for the Arab Spring? Working Paper No 7. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
8. Lian, Kwen Fee, Citizenship Regimes and the Politics of Difference in Southeast Asia. Working Paper No 8. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013
9. Purwaningrum, Farah, Ariff Lim, Syamimi, Evers, Hans-Dieter & Ndah, Anthony Banyouko, The Governance of Knowledge: Perspectives from Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia. Working Paper No 9. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014
10. Facal, Gabriel, Hyper-centralization of Political Power and Fragmentation of Local Authority Networks in Banten (Indonesia). Working Paper No10. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014
11. Hussainmiya, B.A. and Mail, Asbol Haji, “No Federation Please-We Are Bruneians”: Scuttling the Northern Borneo Closer Association Proposals. Working Paper No11. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014
12. Abdul Hakim, Mufidah. Pengangun as Ritual Specialist in Brunei Darussalam. Working Paper No12. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014
13. Bensaoud, Mariam. Between R2P and the ASEAN Way: The case of Myanmar’s Cyclone Nargis. Working Paper No13. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015
14. Abdul Razak, Nurul Umillah Binti, Anuar, Adira Rehafizzan Binti, Pg. Mohd Sahar, Dk. Siti Nurul Islam Binti & Matsuni, Nur Hidayah Binti. Domestic Maids in Brunei: A Case Study. Working Paper No14. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015
15. Ibrahim, Zawawi. From Island to Nation-state Formations and Developmentalism: Penan Story-telling as Narratives of ‘territorialising space’ and Reclaiming Stewardship. Working Paper No15. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015
16. Bui, Cuong The. *Social Stratification in the Southeast Region of Viet Nam*. Working Paper No 16. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015

Social Stratification in the Southeast Region of Viet Nam

Cuong The Bui

INTRODUCTION

In sociological terms, social stratification is a key feature of a society and remains an important topic of investigation in the discipline. It has many comprehensive consequences affecting a society and its population. To grasp the social stratification configuration of a given society at a given time is not only academically valuable but it has key implications for policy making.

Shortly after the unification of Viet Nam in 1975, the revolutionary leaders enforced the orthodox communist policies implemented in the North of Viet Nam after 1954 onto the South of the country. These policies included the nationalization and collectivization of basic means of production, the abolishment of private sectors, and the administrative management of all economic and labor resources. Therefore, brought about a major transformation in social stratification. These policies drove the country into an increasingly comprehensive crisis during the post-war period 1976 – 1985, forcing politicians to launch the reforms called *Doi Moi* (Renovation) in 1986. This soon led to recovery in the economy and launched decades of high economic growth and rapid poverty reduction. Due to the new strategies, once again the configuration of social stratification transformed dramatically since the late 1980s onward. These societal disruptions as well as the increasing gap between social groups have gained gripped the attention of politicians, scholars and the public in Viet Nam for more than two decades.

This work outlines the structure of social stratification in the Southeast region of Viet Nam based on two surveys conducted in 2010 by the Southern Institute of Social Sciences. Firstly, it presents the shape of the social stratification of this area by occupational groups. Next, it analyzes three social groups' characteristics related to economy, knowledge and power resources.

SOUTHEAST REGION OF VIET NAM

Viet Nam is divided into eight socio-economic regions, from the North to the South of the country respectively: Northwest, Northeast, Red River Delta, North Central Coast, South Central Coast, Central Highlands, Southeast, and Mekong Delta (See **Appendix Figure 1**: Viet Nam map). Table 1 demonstrates some main indicators of the Southeast region and Ho Chi Minh City. This region (including Ho Chi Minh City) occupies 18.25 percent of the total population. Southeast is the most economically developed region in Viet Nam. In 2012, the monthly income per capita of the area is 1.55 times higher than that of the whole nation. This rate for Ho Chi Minh City is 1.83.

DATA SOURCES

According to the official division from the Government, Viet Nam is separated into eight socio-economic regions. Our investigation focuses on the Southeast region, which included six provinces, namely: Binh Phuoc, Tay Ninh, Binh Duong, Dong Nai, Ho Chi Minh City, and Ba Ria – Vung Tau. However, we believe that Ho Chi Minh City is a large entity with many distinct characteristics; hence, two separate studies were conducted: one for Ho Chi Minh City and one for the other five provinces. Because of this, for this article, the term "Minor Region of the Southeast" is used in reference to the area consisting of five provinces of the Southeast region, excluding Ho Chi Minh City.

The survey in Ho Chi Minh City was carried out as: *the Social structure, lifestyles and well-being of residents in Ho Chi Minh City today* project, funded by the Department of Sciences and Technology of Ho Chi Minh City. The survey for the Minor Region of the Southeast was completed through a research program called: *Some main issues of sustainable development in the South region of Vietnam during 2011 – 2020*, with funding from the Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences. Both were led by Cuong The Bui.

The fieldwork for the Ho Chi Minh City survey was conducted in March and April of 2010. The fieldwork for the Minor Region of the Southeast study was done in April and May of 2010.

Both were sampled independently but followed the same sampling process, which has two phases.

Phase 1: selecting fieldwork locations (the selection unit is the lowest administrative unit, i.e. communes in rural areas, or wards and towns in urban areas). Phase 1 has two steps. In step 1, two lists of every ward, town and commune of Ho Chi Minh City and of the Minor Region of the Southeast were made. The lists were then sorted by urbanization levels. As a result, there is one list for the Minor Region of the Southeast containing 553 wards, towns and communes, and one list for Ho Chi Minh City with 322 wards and communes in total. For step 2, 30 wards/towns/communes were randomly selected from each list. Subsequently, one list of 30 units in the Minor Region of the Southeast and one list of 30 units in Ho Chi Minh City were set.

Phase 2: deciding units (households) to interview. Phase 2 consists of two steps and was implemented in fieldwork. In step 1, three residential clusters are chosen from each ward/town/commune from the lists. Those clusters comprise one well-off, one modest and one poor cluster in terms of living standards. In step 2, based on the lists of households, 12 households are picked randomly from each residential cluster. For the purposes of the study, the heads of households or spouses of households' heads are considered representatives of households to be interviewed.

Consequently, each survey sample in Ho Chi Minh City and in the Minor Region of the Southeast consists of 1,080 households living in 30 wards/towns/communes.

The questionnaires includes 42 comprehensive questions related to the following five sections: background information of household, living conditions of households, land and agricultural activities, physical and social infrastructure of communities, and cultural life and value orientations.

MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY SAMPLES

Table 2 describes seven main characteristics of the samples.

The urban – rural ratios between two areas are in a marked contrast. The proportions of respondents living in urban areas are 80 percent for Ho Chi Minh City and only 23.4 percent for the Minor Region of the Southeast.

The gender percentages of households' representatives are relatively equal in the Minor Region of the Southeast (51.2 percent of male respondents compared to 48.8 percent of females). In contrast, this ratio in Ho Chi Minh City shows an imbalance of 38.6 percent males and 61.4 percent females. This largely due to differences in patterns of livelihood between metropolitan and countryside areas. In the city, when interviewers arrived, mostly women were at home to answer while the majority of men went to work away from home. Meanwhile, in rural areas, many men worked at home or were present when interviewers came. The age structures of these areas are fairly similar. Nevertheless, the structures of education attainment are very different. This underscores the fact that conditions to pursue education are decidedly more favorable in urban areas than in the countryside. As a big city, Ho Chi Minh City creates more demands and opportunities for highly educated people to come live and work there. On the other hand, Ho Chi Minh City also has higher rates of singles and divorced/separated people than the Minor Region of the Southeast does.

The percentages of ethnic minority respondents for two regions are comparable (12.8 percent for Ho Chi Minh City and 13.0 for the Minor Region of Southeast). However, it should be noted that the percentage of Chinese between these areas contrast strongly: 2.2 percent in the Minor Region of the Southeast and 10.9 percent in Ho Chi Minh City (nearly five times higher).

Religion structures are also noteworthy. The percentage of respondents claiming to be adherents of Buddhism in Ho Chi Minh City is higher than in the Minor Southeast Region: 25.6 percent compared to 18.1 percent respectively. On the other hand, the respondents identifying themselves as Christians occupy 13.6 percent in Ho Chi Minh City and 25.1 percent in the Minor Region. A major reason for this is that after 1954, a large majority of northern Christians moved to the South and settled in a number of provinces that are now parts of the Minor Southeast Region. It should be remarked that the percentage of respondents considering themselves to worship ancestors is 47.3 percent in the Minor Region and 57.8 percent in Ho Chi Minh City. In fact, ancestor-

worship is a very popular and long-standing belief practice in Viet Nam; as such, it is safe to assume that among the respondents claiming to be followers of Buddhism, Christianity, as well as other religions, many also practice ancestor-worship.

FRAMEWORK OF SOCIAL CLASSIFICATION

This paper uses three classifications for analysis as follows: occupational groups, social strata, and quintiles. The occupational groups will be used as a basic criterion to build the social stratification structure for the two fieldwork sites. The occupational frames are established based on the Vietnam Standard Occupational Classification in 2009. **Table 3** demonstrates the ten occupational group classification frames used to illustrate the social stratification structure by occupations. The occupational groups are listed in Column 2 with their definitions described in Column 3. These ten occupational groups are as follows:

1. Leaders and managers in sectors of Party/State (Party, Government, mass organizations affiliated with Party/State, public agencies affiliated with Party/State)
2. Owners and managers of private companies
3. Middle and higher professionals
4. Non-agricultural private business owners
5. Upper peasants (upper farmers)
6. Industrial workers and handicraftsmen
7. Staff in trade and service units
8. Middle peasants (middle farmers)
9. Lower peasants
10. Non-skilled labors

The occupational groups are combined with three social strata, namely: the upper, the middle and the lower stratum (See Column 4 in Table 3). The upper stratum consists of the first five occupational groups. The middle stratum includes group 6, 7 and 8. The lower stratum contains the last two groups.

CONFIGURATION OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

This section presents the social stratification figures for the two regions. **Table 4** shows the percentage distribution of households into ten occupational groups and then into three social strata in the Minor Southeast Region and Ho Chi Minh City. Not all households in these two regions are taken into account here. Only representatives of households who were employed at the time of the interviews are included in the analysis. In other words, those who were in school, unemployed, or retired and stay-at-home spouses are excluded from the analysis.¹ As a result, 874 representatives of surveyed households in the Minor Southeast Region and 661 representatives of surveyed households in Ho Chi Minh City are taken into account in the analysis.

There are significant contrasts between the social stratification figures in the Minor Southeast Region and Ho Chi Minh City. The rates of group 1 (leaders and managers in Party/State sector) in the two regions are similar (2.5 percent in the Minor Southeast Region and 2.7 percent in Ho Chi Minh City). However, occupational groups 2, 3, 4 and 7 in Ho Chi Minh City have much higher proportions than the respective groups in the Minor Southeast Region. Group 10 (non-skilled labors) in Ho Chi Minh City consists of only 10.3 percent while it accounts for 18.1 percent in the Minor Southeast Region. Obviously, the percentage of peasantry in Ho Chi Minh City is much lower than in the Minor Southeast Region (4.1 percent compared to 49.0 percent in total).

As a result, the figures of social strata in these regions are considerably different. The percentage distributions of the upper, middle and lower strata in the Minor Southeast Region are 19.7 percent, 44.6 percent and 35.7 percent respectively. These numbers in Ho Chi Minh City are 32.2 percent, 53.4 percent and 14.4 percent respectively. Therefore, the social stratification figures of both regions are shaped like rhombi. However, note that the upper portion of the rhombus-shaped figure for Ho Chi Minh City is bigger than its lower portion (32.2 percent compared to 14.4 percent), while the upper portion of the rhombus-shaped figure for the Minor Southeast Region is smaller than its lower portion (19.7 percent compared to 35.7 percent). In addition, the

¹ An analysis of the occupational group structure of every household member also yields the same results (it is not shown in this paper).

middle section of the figure of Ho Chi Minh City is also bigger than the middle segment of the figure of the Minor Southeast Region (53.4 percent compared to 44.6 percent). These regional social stratification figures are, therefore, dissimilar to the national social stratification figures. Do Thien Kinh's research shows that the national social stratification figure is shaped as a pyramid (Do Thien Kinh 2012, pp. 55-61).

Table 5 illustrates the different patterns mentioned above by urban – rural areas.

THREE RELEVANT RESOURCES BY SOCIAL CATEGORIES

The surveys aim to identify the main characteristics of the social groups in terms of economic, political, social and cultural dimensions. These characteristics can also be considered as relevant resources, which are attached to and used by the social groups. The difference between the social groups in terms of resources is the stand-out indicator reflecting the social inequality between them. In this paper, three variables are used to measure three relevant resources of the social groups. They are “annual income per capita” to measure the economic resource, “number of years of schooling” to evaluate the knowledge resource, and “being a member of the Party” to determine the power resource.²

Differences in Economic Resource through Annual Income per Capita

Table 6 illustrates the annual income per capita by ten occupational groups, three social strata, and five quintiles of income. The average annual income per capita in Ho Chi Minh City is more than 1.5 times higher than that in the Minor Southeast Region. The differences within either region are remarkable.

In the Minor Southeast Region, occupational groups 8, 9 and 10 (middle peasants, lower peasants, and non-skilled labors respectively) have approximately the same annual incomes per capita, which is only about 70 percent of the average annual income. The income of group 6 (industrial workers and handicraftsmen) is 1.5 times higher than the lowest groups (group 9 and 10). Group 1, 3 and 7 (leaders and managers in Party/State sector, middle and higher professionals, and staff in trade and

² In the last Constitutions of Viet Nam, the Constitution 1992 and the Constitution 2013, the Communist Party of Viet Nam is defined as “the leading force of the State and society”.

service units respectively) enjoy the annual income per capita that is twice as high as the lowest groups. This rate for group 4 (non-agricultural private owners) and group 5 (upper farmers) are 2.4 and 3.0 respectively.

The gaps in Ho Chi Minh City are even wider. Group 9 and 10 are ranked lowest; their incomes are only about 50 percent of the average level. The annual incomes per capita of group 6 and 7 are approximately 1.5 times higher than those of the two lowest groups. The rate for group 1 is 2.3 while the rate for group 2, 3 and 4 are considerably higher.

In terms of social strata, the middle stratum in the Minor Southeast Region has an annual income per capita 1.3 times higher than the lower stratum does. This rate for the upper stratum is 2.5. The differences in Ho Chi Minh City are more significant. The rates are 1.5 and 2.9 respectively.

Section C in **Table 6** indicates the annual income per capita by income quintiles. The gap between these quintiles is significantly clearer. In the Minor Southeast Region, the annual income per capita of the poorest quintile is approximately 25 percent of the average level. The annual income per capita of the richest quintile is more than 10.1 times higher than the poorest quintile. This rate is 14.2 for Ho Chi Minh City.

Differences in Knowledge Resource through Years of Schooling

Table 7 describes the number of schooling years by ten occupational groups, three social strata and five quintiles of income. In comparison between two regions, the average number of schooling years in Ho Chi Minh City is 1.4 times higher than that in the Minor Southeast Region. Generally, the numbers of schooling years among the occupational groups, social strata, and income quintiles of Ho Chi Minh City are higher than those of the Minor Southeast Region.

In the Minor Southeast Region, the years of schooling of the highest group (Group 3 “middle and higher professionals”) is 2.5 times higher than of the lowest group (Group 10 “non-skilled labors”). This rate for Ho Chi Minh City is 2.4 (Group 3 to Group 9 “lower peasants”). In comparison between the upper and the lower strata, the rate is 1.6 for the Minor Southeast Region and 1.9 for Ho Chi Minh City. The number of schooling years of the richest income quintile is twice as high as the number of the

lowest income quintile in the Minor Southeast Region, while it is 1.7 times higher in Ho Chi Minh City.

Differences in Power Resource through Being a Member of the Party

Table 8 and **9** describe the percentage distributions of Party members by ten occupational groups, three social strata and five quintiles of income. It should be noted that the absolute number of the respondents who report they are members of the Party is limited. Therefore, the percentages in these tables are only for reference. Further research in this topic is needed.

Table 8 and **9** also show there are consistent patterns in the percentage distributions of Party members by occupational groups, social strata and quintiles of income.

In the Minor Southeast Region, 54.6 percent of all Party members work in Group 1 (“leaders and managers in Party/State sector”) and Group 3 (“middle and higher professionals”). If the percentages of Party members in Group 4 and 5 (“non-agricultural private business owners” and “upper farmers” respectively) were added, this rate would reach almost 70 percent. The percentage of Party members in the two lowest groups (“lower peasants” and “non-skilled labors”) is 15.2 percent (**Table 8**). **Table 9** confirms this distribution pattern.

In Ho Chi Minh City, almost 70 percent of members of the Party concentrate in the first three groups (Group 1 “leaders and managers in sectors of Party/State”, Group 2 “owners and managers of private companies”, and Group 3 “middle and higher professionals”). It is interesting that the number of members of the Party in Group 2 accounts for 22.2 percent of all Party members in the sample. The number of members of the Party in this group reaches 36.4 percent of all respondents of the group. There is almost no Party member in the two lowest groups (“lower peasants” and “non-skilled labors”). These patterns in **Table 9** are consistent with those in **Table 8**.

In the Minor Southeast Region, the Party members in the lower stratum consist of 9.1 percent of all Party members. This rate is 21.2 percent for the middle stratum and almost 70 percent for the upper stratum. This pattern is even more recognizable in Ho Chi Minh City.

Section C of Table 8 and 9 shows the pattern of distribution by income quintiles. The percentage of Party members (compared to all Party members or to Party members in each category) mostly increases from poorer quintiles to richer quintiles for both regions.

CONCLUSION

The two surveys conducted in the Minor Southeast Region and in Ho Chi Minh City provide the figures for social stratification in these regions. The structure of social stratification is drawn around three different classifications, namely the occupational groups, the social strata and the quintiles of income. In general, the figures by occupational groups and social strata conform to a rhombus shape. This reflect quite distinctly the middle class. The difference between the figures in the two regions is notable.

The analysis of the distribution of three relevant resources (economic, knowledge and power resource) using three related variables among the social groups indicates that these resources are strongly hierarchical in structure in terms of the occupational groups, the social strata and the quintiles of income for both regions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As the principal investigator of two surveys and the author of this paper, I would like to express my deep appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Le Thanh Sang, Mrs. Tran Dan Tam and Mrs. Nguyen Thi Minh Chau for their great contributions to these two surveys. Sincere thanks go to dozens of interviewers and data processing workers, as well as hundreds of local collaborators and thousands of residents in the regions who enthusiastically created these vast data sets. I would like to convey special gratitude to the Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences and Ho Chi Minh City Department of Sciences and Technology for kindly funding this research idea. I would also like to show particular gratitude to the Universiti Brunei Darussalam, Institute of Asian Studies for hosting me as Visiting Professor from 2013 until November 2014. Thanks to that, I was able to complete this paper and I also received helpful feedback from many of my colleagues at the Institute of Asian Studies.

REFERENCES

Bui The Cuong. 2012. *Có cấu xã hội, lối sống và phúc lợi của cư dân Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh hiện nay [Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today]*. Project Report. Ho Chi Minh City: Ho Chi Minh City Department of Sciences and Technology.

Bui The Cuong & Le Thanh Sang. 2010. *Một số vấn đề về cơ cấu xã hội và phân tầng xã hội ở Tây Nam Bộ: Kết quả từ cuộc khảo sát dinh lương năm 2008 [Some Issues of Social Structure and Social Stratification in Southwest Region of Vietnam]*. In: Ho Chi Minh City Review of Social Sciences. No. 3(139)/2010. pp. 35-47.

Do Thien Kinh. 2012. *Hệ thống phân tầng xã hội ở Việt Nam hiện nay (Qua những cuộc Điều tra mức sống hộ gia đình Việt Nam 2002-2004-2006-2008) [Social Stratification in Vietnam Today (Based on Vietnam Living Standards Surveys 2002-2004-2006-2008)]*. Hanoi: Social Sciences Press.

General Statistics Office. 2009. *Vietnam Standard Classification of Occupations 2009*.

General Statistics Office. 2012. *Results of Vietnam Households Living Standards Survey 2012*.

<http://www.gso.gov.vn/default.aspx?tabid=512&idmid=5&ItemID=14843>

General Statistics Office. 2013. *Statistical Yearbook of Vietnam 2013*.
<http://www.gso.gov.vn/default.aspx?tabid=512&idmid=5&ItemID=16031>

Le Thanh Sang. 2011. *Một số vấn đề cơ bản về phát triển xã hội và quản lý phát triển xã hội nhằm phát triển bền vững vùng Nam Bộ [Some Main Issues of Social Development and Management of Social Development in South Region]*. Research Report. Ho Chi Minh City: Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Le Thanh Sang & Nguyen Thi Minh Chau. 2012. *Có cấu phân tầng xã hội ở Đông Nam Bộ trong tam nhìn so sánh với Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh và Tây Nam Bộ [Social Stratification in Southeast Region Compared to Ho Chi Minh City and Southwest Region]*. Paper at the Workshop “Social Sciences and Sustainable Development in Southeast Region of Viet Nam 2012” organized by the Southern Institute of Social Sciences and the People’s Committee of Dong Nai Province held in July 12-13, 2012 in Bien Hoa City.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Main indicators of Viet Nam, Southeast Region of Viet Nam and HCM City, 2013

No	Main indicators	Whole country	Southeast (including HCMC)	HCM City
1	Area (km ²)	330,972.4	23,590.8	2,095.6
2	Population (1,000 person)	89,708.9	15,459.6	7,818.2
3	Population density (person/km ²)	271	655	3,731
4	Population by urban – rural areas (1,000 person):			
	- Urban	28,874.9	9,411.3	6,450.0
	- Rural	60,834.0	6,048.3	1,368.1
5	Population structure (%):			
	- Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	- Urban	32.2	60.9	82.5
	- Rural	67.8	39.1	17.5
6	Population growth:			
	- Population growth rate (%)	1.05	1.92	2.01
	- Rate of natural population increase (‰)	9.9	11.2	10.2
7	Migration:			
	- In-migration (‰)	8.8	15.7	16.5
	- Net migration (‰)	-	8.3	6.2
8	Labor force at age of 15 and up (1,000 person)	53,245.6	8,687.7	4,122.3
9	Monthly income per capita (VND 1,000) (2012)	1,999.8	3,016.4	3,652.7
10	Monthly income per capita of the rich quintile compared to the poor quintile (times) (2012)	9.4	7.5	6.3

Source: General Statistics Office 2012 and 2013.

Table 2. Characteristics of samples, Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010, %

No	Characteristics	Minor Southeast	HCM City
1	Gender: - Male - Female	51.2 48.8	38.6 61.4
2	Age: - 34 and under - 35 – 44 - 45 – 59 - 60+	16.8 29.4 37.3 16.6	14.0 24.7 40.7 20.6
3	Education attainment: - Primary school and lower - Secondary school - High school - Higher education and above	38.9 35.9 17.3 7.9	24.1 30.2 27.6 18.1
4	Marital status: - Single - Married - Divorced, separated	4.9 83.6 11.5	12.3 73.3 14.4
5	Location: - Urban - Rural	23.4 76.6	80.0 20.0
6	Ethnicity: - Viet (Kinh) - Chinese - Other ethnic minorities	87.7 2.2 10.8	90.6 10.9 1.9
7	Religion: - Ancestor worship - Buddhism - Christianity - Others	47.3 18.1 25.1 9.5	57.8 25.6 13.6 3.0
	N (households)	1,080	1,080

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Table 3. Classification of occupational groups and social strata based on Vietnam Standard Classification of Occupations 2009

No.	Occupational groups	Description	Strata
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sectors (Party, Government, mass organizations affiliated with Party/State, public agencies affiliated with Party/State)	Heads and Vice-heads of units and above in the Party and State sector (including heads of units of the social and economic organizations affiliated with the Party and State)	Upper
2	Owners and managers in private companies	Heads and Vice-heads of units and above	
3	Middle and higher professionals	Middle and higher professionals	
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	Owners of production units mainly based on households in the industrial, trade and service sector	
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	Owners of productive lands sized 5,000 m ² per capita and up, who are also skilled peasants in agricultural sector	
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	Skilled industrial workers and skilled handicraftsmen	Middle
7	Staff in trade and service units	Staff working in trade and service units	
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	Owners of productive lands sized between 1,000 – 5,000 m ² per capita, who are also skilled peasants in agricultural sector	
9	Lower peasants	Skilled peasants with little or no productive lands (less than 1,000 m ² per capita)	Lower
10	Non-skilled labors	Hired peasants or non-skilled workers	

Source: General Statistics Office. 2009. *Vietnam Standard Classification of Occupations 2009*; Bui The Cuong & Le Thanh Sang 2010; Le Thanh Sang & Nguyen Thi Minh Chau 2012.

Table 4. Percentages of households by occupational groups and social strata in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010

No	Occupational groups and social strata	Minor Southeast	HCM City
A	Occupational groups		
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	2.5	2.7
2	Owners and managers in private companies	-	3.3
3	Middle and higher professionals	3.7	8.8
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	3.0	17.4
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	10.5	-
6	Industrial workers, handicraftsmen	12.4	18.6
7	Staff in trade and service units	11.3	34.8
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	20.9	-
9	Lower peasants	17.6	4.1
10	Non-skilled labors	18.1	10.3
B	Strata		
1	Upper (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	19.7	32.2
2	Middle (A6+A7+A8)	44.6	53.4
3	Lower (A9+A10)	35.7	14.4
	Total	100.0	100.0
	N (representatives of households)	874	661

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Vietnam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Table 5. Percentages of households by occupational groups in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010 in terms of urban and rural areas

No	Occupational groups	Urban		Rural	
		Minor Southeast	HCM City	Minor Southeast	HCM City
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	5,2	2,6	1,4	3,1
2	Owners and managers in private companies	0,0	4,0	0,0	1,3
3	Middle and higher professionals	7,6	11,0	2,1	1,9
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	6,4	20,0	1,6	9,4
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	0,8	0,0	14,4	0,0
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	18,3	16,6	10,0	25,0
7	Staff in trade and service units	16,3	36,5	9,3	29,4
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	8,0	0,0	26,2	0,0
9	Lower peasants	12,7	0,8	19,6	14,4
10	Non-skilled labors	24,7	8,6	15,4	15,6
	Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
	N (households)	251	501	623	160

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Table 6. Annual income per capita by occupational groups, social strata and quintiles of income in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010

No	Occupational groups, social strata and quintiles of income	Annual income per capita (VND 1,000)		Compared to the category having lowest income (which is equivalent to 1.0)	
		Minor Southeast	HCM City	Minor Southeast	HCM City
A	Occupational groups				
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	21,9	32,7	1.8	2,3
2	Owners and managers in private companies	-	77,3	-	5,3
3	Middle and higher professionals	23,0	38,8	1.9	2,7
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	29,7	40,1	2.4	2,8
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	36,1	-	3.0	-
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	18,1	21,9	1.5	1,5
7	Staff in trade and service units	22,3	22,8	1.8	1,6
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	14,6	-	1.2	-
9	Lower peasants	12,2	14,5	1.0	1,0
10	Non-skilled labors	12,3	14,9	1.0	1,0
	Average	18,3	28,0	1.5	1,9
	N (households)	874	661		
B	Social strata				
1	Upper (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	30,9	43,0	2.5	2.9
2	Middle (A6+A7+A8)	16,0	22,4	1.3	1.5
3	Lower (A9+A10)	12,3	14,8	1.0	1.0
	Average	18,3	28,0	1.5	1.9
	N (households)	874	661		
C	Income quintiles				
1	Rich	46,3	96,6	10.1	14.2
2	Well-off	19,2	26,7	4.2	3.9
3	Middle	13,0	17,8	2.8	2.6
4	Near poor	8,8	12,3	1.9	1.8
5	Poor	4,6	6,8	1.0	1.0
	Average	18,4	32,0	4.0	4.7
	N (households)	1,080	1,080		

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Note: US\$ 1.00 is equivalent to VND 21,000.00 (2010).

Table 7. Number of schooling years by occupational groups, social strata and income quintiles in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010

No	Occupational groups and social strata	Minor Southeast	HCM City
A	Occupational groups		
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	10.14	13.83
2	Owners and managers in private companies	-	14.95
3	Middle and higher professionals	14.00	15.05
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	10.08	9.14
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	6.39	-
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	8.02	8.33
7	Staff in trade and service units	7.62	9.05
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	5.68	-
9	Lower peasants	6.21	6.19
10	Non-skilled labors	5.55	6.32
	Average	6.88	9.39
	N (households)	872	659
B	Social strata		
1	Upper (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	8.84	11.76
2	Middle (A6+A7+A8)	6.65	8.80
3	Lower (A9+A10)	5.55	6.28
	Average	6.88	9.39
	N (households)	872	659
C	Income quintiles		
1	Rich	9.07	11.99
2	Well-off	7.58	10.49
3	Middle	7.54	8.77
4	Near poor	5.93	7.21
5	Poor	4.61	6.89
	Average	6.95	9.76
	N (households)	1,078	1,077

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Table 8. Percentages of members of the Party by occupational groups, social strata and income quintiles compared to the total number of members of the Party in the whole samples in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010

No	Occupational groups and social strata	Minor Southeast	HCM City
A	Occupational groups		
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	27.3	19.4
2	Owners and managers in private companies	-	22.2
3	Middle and higher professionals	27.3	27.8
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	6.1	2.8
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	9.1	-
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	3.0	8.3
7	Staff in trade and service units	9.1	19.4
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	3.0	-
9	Lower peasants	6.1	0.0
10	Non-skilled labors	9.1	0.0
	Total	100.0	100.0
	n (members of Party)	33	36
	N (representatives of households)	874	661
B	Strata		
1	Upper (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	69.7	72.2
2	Middle (A6+A7+A8)	21.2	27.8
3	Lower (A9+A10)	9.1	0.0
	Total	100.0	100.0
	n (members of Party)	33	36
	N (representatives of households)	874	661
C	Income quintiles		
1	Rich	39.1	54.2
2	Well-off	32.6	13.6
3	Middle	17.4	22.0
4	Near poor	6.5	6.8
5	Poor	4.4	3.4
	Total	100.0	100.0
	n (members of Party)	46	59
	N (representatives of households)	1,069	1,080

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Note: The absolute number of Party members in the samples is small. Therefore, the percentages in this table are for reference only.

Table 9. Percentages of members of the Party by occupational groups, social strata and income quintiles in Minor Southeast Region and HCM City 2010

No	Occupational groups and social strata	Minor Southeast	HCM City	Total
A	Occupational groups			
1	Leaders and managers in Party/State sector	40.9	38.9	100.0
2	Owners and managers in private companies	-	36.4	100.0
3	Middle and higher professionals	28.1	17.2	100.0
4	Non-agricultural private business owners	7.7	0.9	100.0
5	Upper peasants (farmers)	3.3	-	100.0
6	Industrial workers and handicraftsmen	0.9	2.4	100.0
7	Staff in trade and service units	3.0	3.0	100.0
8	Middle peasants (farmers)	0.5	-	100.0
9	Lower peasants	1.3	0.0	100.0
10	Non-skilled labors	1.9	0.0	100.0
	n (members of Party)	33	36	
	N (representatives of households)	874	661	
B	Strata			
1	Upper (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	13.4	12.2	100.0
2	Middle (A6+A7+A8)	1.3	2.8	100.0
3	Lower (A9+A10)	1.9	0.0	100.0
	n (members of Party)	33	36	
	N (representatives of households)	874	661	
C	Income quintiles			
1	Rich	8.3	14.8	100.0
2	Well-off	6.9	3.7	100.0
3	Middle	3.7	6.0	100.0
4	Near poor	1.4	1.9	100.0
5	Poor	0.9	0.9	100.0
	n (members of Party)	46	59	
	N (representatives of households)	1,069	1,080	

Source: Data set collected by the research program *Some Main Issues of Sustainable Development in the South Region of Viet Nam during 2011 – 2020* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Program Leader: Bui The Cuong), and by the research project *Social Structure, Lifestyles and Well-Being of Residents in Ho Chi Minh City Today* conducted in 2009 – 2010 (Principal investigator: Bui The Cuong). Southern Institute of Social Sciences.

Note: The absolute number of Party members in the samples is small. Therefore, the percentages in this table are for reference only.



Figure 1. Socio-economic regions in Viet Nam

Source: <http://www.nationsonline.org/oneworld/map/vietnam-administrative-map.htm>

Note: The map is shown for academic purposes. It is not intended to address territory issues between nations.