



By

VIET NAM INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND POLICY RESEARCH JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY

Hanoi, September 2017





## WORKSHOP AGENDA

## "Labor Productivity and Wage Growth in Viet Nam"

*Time:* 08:30 – 12:00, Wednesday, 13 September 2017 Venue: Song Hong Ballroom, Sheraton Hotel, 11 Xuan Dieu Road, Hanoi

Time	Agenda
08:30 - 09:00	Registration
09:00 - 09:05	Introduction
09:05 - 09:15	Opening Remarks Mr. Fujita Yasuo Chief Representative, JICA Viet Nam Office
09:15 – 10:15	<ul> <li>Labor Productivity and Wage Growth in Viet Nam</li> <li>Dr. Nguyen Duc Thanh, President of Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR)</li> <li>Dr. Futoshi Yamauchi, Senior Economist, World Bank</li> <li>Dr. Nguyen Tien Dung, Senior Team member</li> </ul>
10:15 - 10:30	Tea break
10:30 - 11:00	<ul> <li>Comments from the experts</li> <li>Prof. Kenichi Ohno, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS), Japan</li> <li>Dr. Ho Dinh Bao, National Economics University</li> <li>Dr. Luong Minh Huan, Vice Rector, Enterprise Development Institute under Viet Nam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI)</li> </ul>
11:00 - 11:50	Open discussion with all participants
11:50 - 12:00	Closing remarks Dr. Nguyen Duc Thanh, VEPR
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch at the hotel





By

VIET NAM INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND POLICY RESEARCH JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY

Hanoi, September 2017

## **ABOUT VEPR**

**VIET NAM INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND POLICY (VEPR)**, formerly known as Viet Nam Centre for Economic and Policy Research, was established on July 7, 2008 as a research centre under the University of Economics and Business of Viet Nam National University, Ha Noi (VNU). VEPR has legal status and is headquartered at the University of Economics and Business, Xuan Thuy, Cau Giay, Ha Noi.

VEPR considers its primary mission to be carrying out economic and policy research to assist in improving the decision-making quality of policy-making institutions, enterprises, and interest groups by providing insights into the social, political, and economic factors that drive the economic affairs of Viet Nam and the region. The main activities of VEPR include (i) providing quantitative and qualitative analysis of changing economic conditions in Viet Nam and assessing their impacts on various interest groups throughout the country, (ii) organizing policy dialogues among policy-makers, entrepreneurs, and other stakeholders to improve solutions to emerging issues, and (iii) conducting advanced training courses in economics, finance and policy analysis regularly and upon request.

## CONTRIBUTORS

**Nguyen Duc Thanh (Project Leader and Editor)** received his Ph.D. in Development Economics from the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (GRIPS), Tokyo, Japan. He was member of the Macroeconomic Advisory Group for the Prime Minister (2011-16). He is the President of Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR).

**Futoshi Yamauchi** received his B.A. in Law and M.A. in Economics from Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, and his Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Pennsylvania. He is Senior Economist at the Development Research Group in the World Bank. Prior to the Bank, he was a senior research fellow at the International Food Policy Research Institute, and has taught at the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies, Yokohama National University, and Kyoto University.

**Nguyen Tien Dung** received his M.A. and Ph.D. in International Development from Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan. He is currently a lecturer at University of Economics and Business of Viet Nam National University, Ha Noi a researcher at Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR).

**Murashima Eiichi** received his B.A. and M.A. in Economics from Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo. He is currently a representative of Viet Nam Office of Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).

**Pham Thi Tuyet Trinh** received her Bachelor of Economics with Honors from University of Economics and Law - Viet Nam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, and her Master of Public Policy from Korea Development Institute (KDI) School of Public Policy and Management, Sejong, Republic of Korea. She is currently a researcher at Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR).

**Nguyen Thanh Tung** received his B.A. in Economics from National Economics University, Hanoi, Viet Nam. He is currently a researcher at Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR).

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The report "Labor Productivity and Wage Growth in Viet Nam" is conducted by a team of experts and researchers from Viet Nam Institute for Economic and Policy Research (VEPR), University of Economics and Business, Viet Nam National University (Ha Noi, Viet Nam), the World Bank, National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies (Tokyo, Japan), and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The project is funded by JICA and is accomplished with the support from many individuals and organizations.

One of the most important contributions is attributed to the advisors and commentators, who have participated in various discussions, workshops, and seminars during different stages of the Report. We would like to thank Dr. Vu Minh Khuong (National University of Singapore), Dr. Ho Dinh Bao (National Economics University), Mr. Pham Minh Thai and Mr. Vu Hoang Dat (Viet Nam Academy of Social Sciences), as well as representatives of various organizations for their insightful comments and precious feedback for the Report.

We would also like to extend our appreciation to JICA Viet Nam for their generous support and cooperation for this Report, especially Mr. Kitamura Shu, Ms. Hoang Thi Tuat.

In addition, we would like to send our sincere thanks to government agencies and organizations at the central and local level, who have provided us great assistance during our field trip, as well as 17 firms participating in the in-depth interviews.

Last but not least, this Report would not be possible without the unwavering support, dedication and persistence of VEPR colleagues and staff.

Despite our efforts, we understand that there may be limitations and even errors in the Report. We sincerely hope to receive comments and contributions from the readers.

Ha Noi, 13 September 2017

On behalf of the Authors

Dr. Nguyen Duc Thanh

# CONTENTS

Authors	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
Executive Summary	1

## CHAPTER 1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on Labor Productivity in Viet Nam	7
Studies on the Effects of Minimum Wage	9
International Empirical Evidence	9
Studies on Minimum Wage in Viet Nam	12

## CHAPTER 2

## LABOR MARKET REGULATIONS AND MINIMUM WAGE POLICIES

Overview of Viet nam's Labor Market Regulations and Interventions	15
Labor Market Regulations	15
Labor Market Interventions	18
Minimum Wage System in Viet Nam	22
A Brief History of Minimum Wages in Viet Nam	22
Minimum Wage Setting Mechanisms in Viet Nam	24
Minimum Wage Growth and Structure	28
Minimum Wage in Neighboring Countries: A Comparative Analysis	32
Minimum Wage Setting Procedures	32
Minimum Wage Structure and Growth	38
Contributions to Social Security	40
Conclusion	42

## CHAPTER 3 MINIMUM WAGE COMPLIANCE IN VIET NAM

Introduction	45
Earnings Distribution and Compliance	47
Characteristics of Below-Minimum Wage Workers	61
Determinants of Minimum Wage Non-Compliance	66
Conclusion	70

## CHAPTER 4

## WAGE GROWTH AND LABOR PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH

73
77
83
91

## CHAPTER 5

## **EFFECTS OF MINIMUM WAGE: AGGREGATE-LEVEL ANALYSIS**

Introduction	94
Empirical Method	95
Data	96
Empirical Results and Discussion	97
Effect of Minimum Wage from Firms' Perspectives	104
Conclusion	105

## CHAPTER 6

## MINIMUM WAGE ON FIRM BEHAVIOR: FIRM-LEVEL ANALYSIS

108
109
111
112
118
119

## CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions	122
Policy implications	125
References	128
APPENDICES	135

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Over the past decade, Viet Nam has witnessed rapid minimum wage increases. While the labor productivity level remains low compared to other neighboring countries, the dramatic increase of minimum wage and wage has posed a concern over the competitiveness of firms in particular and the country in general. This study assesses the current labor market legislations with a focus on minimum wage policy in Viet Nam, the relationship between growth rates of minimum wage, average wage, and labor productivity; as well as the impacts of continuous adjustments in minimum wage on the economy.

# RECENT TRENDS OF MINIMUM WAGE, AVERAGE WAGE, AND LABOR PRODUCTIVITY IN VIET NAM

Viet Nam has witnessed rapid increases in minimum wage over the past years. Minimum wage grew at double-digit annual rates during the 2007-2015 period, far exceeding that of per-capita GDP and CPI.



Growth of minimum wage, CPI, and per-capita GDP in Viet Nam, 2008-2016 (2008=100)

*Notes: Before October 2011, only regional minimum wage levels applicable to domestic enterprises are presented.* 

#### Source: The Authors

During the same period, growth rates of minimum wage were also higher than that of labor productivity. Specifically, the ratio of minimum wage to labor productivity experienced rapid increase, from 25% in 2007 to 50% in 2015. This pattern cannot be observed in such other countries in the region as China, Indonesia, and Thailand. The gap between minimum wage growth and labor productivity growth in Viet Nam has widened faster than in other countries considered.



Ratio of minimum wage to labor productivity in Viet Nam and other countries, 2007-2015



Source: The Authors' Calculation using Data from WDI and CEIC Database

From 2007 to 2015, Viet Nam has experienced 1.5-fold increase in average wage (2fold increase for the 2004-2015 period). Average wage increased rapidly until 2010 but significantly slowed down during the 2010-2014 period, partly reflecting the slowdown in economic growth. The payments on social security, which consists of social insurance, health insurance and unemployment insurance have also increased over time.

#### Annual real wage in Viet Nam, 2004-2015

70 60 50 40 30 20 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 - Labor Income I Labor Income II

(Wage deflated by GDP deflator, 2010 as base year, Unit: Mil. VND)

Notes: Labor income I consists of wages, bonus and subsidies. Labor incomes II consists of all components of labor income I and payments on social insurance, health insurance and unemployment insurance

Source: The Authors' Calculation from Viet Nam Enterprise Surveys

In 2017, the minimum cost per worker, which is measured as total of minimum wage and contributions to social security (including social insurance, health insurance, and unemployment insurance), incurred by enterprises in Viet Nam reached to the level slightly less than Thailand and higher than Indonesia. This rather high level of contributions to social security in Viet Nam, in case little value is assigned to interventions financed by such contributions, tends to create a "tax wedge" between the labor cost to the employer and the take-home pay of employee.



Minimum Wage and Contributions to Social Security in Viet Nam and Other Countries in 2017 (USD)



Source: The Authors' Calculation using Data from WDI and CEIC Database

Regarding the relationship between average wage and labor productivity, during the 2004-2015 period, labor productivity growth in Viet Nam is significant (4.4%); however, the average wage growth rates (5.8%) outpaced the productivity growth rate. For the first subperiod of 2004-2009, wage grew less than labor productivity but opposite trend has been observed since 2009. In more recent years, for the whole economy, wage growth closely followed productivity growth.

The misalignment between labor productivity growth with minimum wage growth, and average wage growth, if continues, would gradually but seriously break the balance of the economy in many aspects, especially hindering the accumulation of human capital, reducing the motivation of investors, profits of enterprises, and the competitiveness of the economy.

### **IMPACTS OF MINIMUM WAGE GROWTH**

In general, an increase in minimum wage results in increase in average wages and reduction in employment and profits. On average, a 1% increase in minimum wage may result in 0.32% increase in average wage, 0.13% decrease in employment. Regarding profit rates, measured as profits over revenue, 100% increase in minimum wage will be likely to lead to 2.3 percentage point decrease in profit rates. The effects, however, vary considerably across economic sectors, reflecting the differences in the extent of labor market regulations and enterprises' technological and financial abilities to deal with rising labor costs.

In terms of average wages, although an increase in minimum wage has statistical and negative effects on enterprises of all economic sectors, the effects are relatively low in private sector compared to those in state and FDI sectors.

In terms of employment, significant effects are found in state sector (1% increase in minimum wage results in 0.25% decrease in employment) but modest, insignificant effects are found in private and FDI sectors. It should be noted that, in private sector, significant employment effects is found among firms with higher level of compliance with labor regulations (in this case, contribution to social insurance), whereas firms not paying insurance experienced insignificant impacts. This implies that those enterprises which strictly obey the regulations on wage and social security contributions tend to suffer more from minimum wage increase, laying off employment. On the other hand, those enterprises that less comply with the regulations are also less likely to comply with minimum wage policies, and hence not resulting in employment reduction.

In terms of profits, negative and significant impacts are found in private sector. Specifically, 100% increase in minimum wage tends to lower the profit rates by 3.25 percentage points. A rapid and continuous increase in minimum wage, therefore, might slow down the capital accumulation of private sector, thereby slowing down its growth.

In addition to the aggregate-level analysis, analysis at the firm level with a focus on private and FDI firms in manufacturing industries has shown consistent findings. Specifically, an increase in minimum wage reduces employment growth in all industries. The reduction of employment growth is larger among relatively large enterprises (number of workers). Moreover, when minimum wage increases, labor-intensive industries such as garment and textiles, wood products and furniture producers tend to introduce machines to replace labor, whereas such capital-intensive industries as electronics and machinery manufacturing reduce machine investments. This shows that firms are more likely to expand their production and investment in machinery (instead of labor) in the Vietnamese industries that have static comparative advantage; whereas for some other important industries, firms tend not to do so because of concerns over the possible rise of labor costs in the coming time, thus losing comparative advantage.

#### Impacts on Employment Growth and Machine Investments by Manufacturing Industries



Assumption: 30% change in minimum wage

Note: Capital intensity measured as book value of fixed assets divided by number of workers.

Source: The Authors' Estimation from Viet Nam Enterprise Surveys

#### MINIMUM WAGE AND EARNING DISTRIBUTION IN VIET NAM

There are a large number of individuals (around half of the total sample) who do not have labor contracts, hence are not covered by minimum wage regulations.

Examining all wage workers (not government officials or workers at state nonproductive organizations) aged 15 and above, who have worked and been paid in the last 30 days prior to the time of each survey (Vietnam Household Living Standards Survey and Labor Force Survey), research has shown that a large number of workers classified as working in "Household and individual sector" and "Household of individual production and trade sector" earn less than minimum wage level in 2014.

Proportion of workers earning more than minimum wage appears to be high at least among workers under labor contract in the private, state and FDI sectors (formal sector). This proportion is even higher among firms in private, state, FDI sectors in manufacturing industries. In addition, the proportion to be paid less than minimum wage level tends to increase over time, most probably due to hike in minimum wage in 2012 and afterwards.

	2010 (VHLSS)	2012 (VHLSS)	2014 (VHLSS)	2014 (LFS)
By type of ownership				
Household and individual	21	28	33	25
Household of individual production and trade	9	15	18	15
Collective and cooperative	15	38	35	30
Private-owned	3	5	7	4
Without contract	7	12	18	11
With contract	2	3	3	3
State-owned enterprise				4
Foreign-owned	3	3	2	1
Without contract	12	9	13	11
With contract	2	3	2	1

Proportion of wage workers earning less than minimum wage level, 2010-2014 (%)

Notes: All wage workers aged 15 and above, who have worked and been paid in the last 30 days prior to the time of each survey are the samples. Government officials, workers in state non-productive organizations and those who are paid with state budget are excluded. In Viet Nam Household Living Standard Surveys (VHLSS), workers in state-run sector are excluded from the sample since the survey does not distinguish between stateowned non-productive organization and state-owned enterprise.

Source: The Authors' Estimation from Viet Nam Household Living Standards Survey 2010-2012-2014, and Labor Force Survey 2014

Further analysis on the probability of an individual to earn less than minimum wage level indicates that in general, younger (or older), relatively less educated, out of contract and/or social insurance workers are likely to be paid below the minimum wage. Moreover, the current minimum wage system does not adequately cover disadvantaged and vulnerable groups of the society. Therefore, using minimum wage as a social protection policy (assuring the minimum living standards for workers and reducing poverty) may not work effectively.

## MINIMUM WAGE POLICY TARGET AND ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM

Minimum wage satisfies the lowest level to be paid to worker who performs the simplest task under normal condition, ensuring the minimum needs of the workers and their families (Article 91, Labor Code 2012). The minimum wage is applied to employees working in enterprises, cooperatives, farms, households, individuals and institutions and organizations that use workers under labor contract in accordance with the provisions of the Labor Code. Also stated in Article 91, minimum wage is determined on the monthly, daily, or hourly basis. In practice, however,

monthly minimum wage has been almost exclusively focused. The nonexistence of daily and hourly minimum wage levels makes it difficult to ensure the compliance of minimum wage, especially for part-time and underemployed workers.

Regarding the minimum wage adjustment, government make decisions on adjusting minimum wage level based on the basic needs of workers and their families, socio-economic conditions, wage on labor market, and the recommendation made by the National Wages Council. The current Council consists of three parties: the Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs, the Representatives of Employees and the Representatives of Employers at central level, with no participation of independent academia or scholar in the Council.



### Minimum Wage Adjustment Procedure in Viet Nam

Source: The Authors' Compilation from Decree No. 49/2013/NĐ-CP

In reality, minimum wage adjustment rate is calculated by technical members of the Council based on different factors, including CPI, GDP growth rate, "basic needs" of workers, and other factors (e.g. labor productivity, firms' ability to pay, unemployment, number of companies which have dissolved, etc.) as well as an "extra increase". It is, however, questionable to determine the basic needs of workers as well as identify the essential criteria for minimum wage adjustment. For a worker who does the most basic work in normal working conditions, the basic needs consist of demand for food and foodstuff, demand for non-food, and demand for supporting child.

The current method of calculating basic needs based on a basket of 45 commodities remain controversial because many so-called temptation goods such as alcohol, coffee are

included. In reality, a qualitative approach, which is mainly to compensate for inflation, is often used by technical board members to adjust the minimum wage level every year.

## POLICY IMPLICATIONS

First and foremost, minimum wage adjustments should be in line with labor productivity growth. Minimum wage has been increasing at such a high level over the past decade. The increase of minimum wage will be likely to have greater negative effect on employment, and more importantly, to erode the Vietnamese firms' competitiveness if minimum wage increase continues in such a manner decided being apart from increase in productivity.

Second, minimum wage does not appear to be effective if it is constructed as a social protection policy. As the current minimum wage system does not adequately cover those without labor contracts, and those are more vulnerable and disadvantaged, it is worth considering complementary policies to function as social security for those who are not covered by minimum wage policy.

Third, as the minimum wages is currently regulated on the monthly basis, it is suggested to shift to hourly minimum wage system. This is to ensure that those people working on hourly or daily basis can fully enjoy their benefits, while allowing employers more flexible in employing workers.

Fourth, minimum wage should be adjusted on a rule-based approach and therefore more transparently and predictably. Criteria for setting and adjusting minimum wage should be clearly specified (including the basket of commodities on which basic needs is calculated); and the adjustments should be properly scheduled in accordance with economic growth, inflation, and business situations. The rule-based approach will help increase the predictability and transparency, helping avoid discretionary adjustment of minimum wage, which makes investors and workers concerned.

Fifth, independent academia should also participate in the National Wage Council. Independent members should have strong knowledge of macroeconomics, labor economics and are able to examine the impact of minimum wages on employment, earnings and income before/after the adjustment. The inclusion of academia in the wage council can be observed in many other countries in the region, for example, Japan, Indonesia, and Malaysia.

Sixth, estimation of minimum wage impacts should be conducted more frequently with more availability of updated data. It is important to monitor the impact of minimum wage increase on the economy to prevent minimum wage increase resulting in undesirable consequences such as shift of workers from formal to informal sector. The availability of the updated data (labor force surveys and enterprise surveys) are important for setting minimum

wage and monitoring the effect of minimum wage. The government can also develop more tool to effectively monitor the productivity in different industries and sectors.

In a nutshell, we believe that it is now the time for Viet Nam to have a body that monitors and ensures boosting the productivity of the whole economy. Minimum wage is a tool to support less advantageous workers, but the fundamental problem indeed lies in labor productivity in general. Without a steady improvement in productivity, the effort of increasing minimum wage will be more likely to gradually diminish the competitiveness of the economy, causing greater unemployment. Therefore, it is essential for the Government to give top priority in promoting productivity in the medium and long term. It might be necessary to set up a special agency dedicating to this mission, from changing the mindset to studying, developing and implementing productivity-boosting model of Japan, Singapore, Israel, etc. This should be done in both the public and private sectors. For the public sector, speeding up the productivity improvement is also in tandem with the reform of government administration in particular and the building of facilitating government in general.

















Good Policy, Sound Economy

### Average Wage and Productivity Growth International Comparison

• Productivity growth in Vietnam is significant (4.4%).

Wage and Productivity Growth in Viet Nam and Asian Countries 2004-2015 (Average annual real wage growth deflated by the CPI, %)

- However, the average wage growth rates (5.8%) outpaced the productivity growth rate.
- Calculation using Vietnam Enterprise Surveys show that during the 2004-2009 period, wage grew less than labor productivity but wage growth exceeded productivity growth since 2009.

Country	Productivity Growth Rates	Average Wage Growth Rates
China	9.1	8.8
Indonesia	3.6	2.6
Malaysia	2.1	2.5
Philippines	2.6	0.4
Singapore	1.8	1.2
Thailand	2.7	3.5
Viet Nam	4.4	5.8

Notes: Monthly earning is in 2014 for Thailand and 2015 for other countries. Source: The Authors' Calculation from International Labor Organization (ILO) Database

9

Copyright © VEPR 2017





JICA VEPR Results on Average W	Good Policy, So Yage, Employment, ar	und Economy
• Estimation Results:	Impacts of Minimum Wage (GMM Estimations)	
Generally, minimum wage increases result in:		All Enterprises
1% increase in minimum wage ⇔ 0.32% increase in Average Wages.	Impacts on Average Wages	0.32***
<ul> <li>Reduction in employment         1% increase in minimum wage     </li> </ul>	Impacts on Employment	-0.13*** (0.04)
<ul> <li>⇒ 0.13% decrease in Employment.</li> <li>Reduction in profit rates</li> </ul>	Impacts on Profits	-2.30*** (0.74)
100% increase in minimum wage	Number of observations	31905
⇒ 2.3 percentage-point decrease in Profit rates (Profits/Revenue).	Notes: (i) Statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels indicated by ***, **, and *, respectively; (ii) Robust standard errors in parentheses; (ii) Year fixed effects and time trends are included in all estimations, but not reported	
	Source: The Authors' Estimation fro	om Enterprise Surveys
Copyright © VEPR 2017		12



1. A 100 100		Goo	d Policy, Sour	nd Economy
	Different Results on Complied firms are more	Private Firms e negatively affec	ted	
<ul> <li>Estimation Re</li> <li>In private sector:</li> <li>Average wage:         <ul> <li>For Impact on fir</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	esults: ms that pay social insurance (higher	Impacts of Mir Enterprises wi Compliance v (GMN	nimum Wag th Different vith Labor R VI Estimatio	e on Private Degrees of Regulations ns)
level of compliar increase in minir Average Wage. T State (0.41%) an	nce with labor regulations), 1% num wage ⇔ 0.4% increase in 'he impact is as large as firms in d FDI sector (0.44%).		Firms that pay social insurance	Firms that do not pay social insurance
<ul> <li>✓ Smaller impact of insurance (0.18%)</li> </ul>	n firms that do not pay social 6).	Average Wages	0.40***	0.18***
<ul> <li>Employments:</li> <li>✓ <u>Negative, signific</u> insurance in priv</li> </ul>	cant impacts on firms paying social at sector.	Employment	(0.07) -0.18** (0.07)	(0.06) 0.11 (0.08)
1% increas	se in minimum wage	Observations	13921	15116
<ul> <li>⇒ 0.18% d</li> <li>✓ <u>Insignificant imp</u></li> <li>⇒ <u>Employments of e</u> tend to shrink</li> </ul>	ecrease in employment. acts on firms NOT paying insurance. enterprises with high compliance	Notes: (i) Statistical signi ina (ii) R (ii) Year fixed effe	ificance at the 1 licated by ***, * Pobust standard cts and time tre estimat	%, 5%, and 10% level (*, and *, respectively errors in parentheses ends are included in a ions, but not reporte
tend to smith.		Source: The Author	ors' Estimation f	or Enterprise Survey
Copyright © VEPR 2017				14



						Go	od Polic	ty, Soun	d Econo	omy
CA	VEPR Dat	a Description	า (1)	of Fi	rm-L	evel	Ana	lysis		
0	Focus: This section an growth and (ii) mach	alyzes impact of ine investments (	minim mecha	um wa nizati	age in on) at	crease firm l	on (i) evel.	empl	oymei	nt
0	Data: multiple-year da from Enterprise Surve	ata of domestic p eys 2008-2015.	rivate	and Fl	DI firm	ıs in m	ianufa	icturin	g indu	istrie
0	Firms are different by	firm size and cap	ital (la	bor) i	ntensi	ty.				
0	Simulations by indust	ry	Siz	e Disti	ibutio	n, 2008	8-2015	(%)		
		Firm size	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
•	The enterprise surveys	Less than 5	8.5	8.7	10.2	12.9	15.7	16.6	17.5	18.1
	cover all size of the firms.	5 to 9	22.7	24.2	21.7	19.8	19.1	18.1	17.7	16.6
	A large proportion of the	10 to 24	24.6	24.0	22.8	23.1	22.2	21.8	21.3	20.8
	medium firms.	25 to 49	13.0	12.8	13.1	13.1	12.9	12.1	12.6	12.3
•	Firms with less than 50	50 to 99	10.2	9.8	10.1	10.1	9.5	9.8	9.4	9.9
	workers account for 60%	100 to 300	11.8	11.6	12.3	11.7	11.2	11.7	11.2	11.6
	of the sample.	300 to 999	6.3	6.3	6.9	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.9	7.2
		1000 and above	2.8	2.6	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.6
Сор	yright © VEPR 2017					Source: T	he Autho	ors' Calcu	lation	16



A) VEPR Results of	on Employment by Firm	Size		
<ul> <li>Empirical Results</li> </ul>	Impacts on Emplo	oyment Gr	owth	
			2011-12	
The reduction of		(1)	(2)	(3)
employment growth (%) is	Minimum wage growth (A)	-0.008	0.028	0.436*
larger among relatively large firms in terms of number of	Log of initial number of workers (B)	(0.117)	(0.118) -0.094*** (0.007)	-0.038
workers.	Interaction (A*B)		(0.007)	- <b>0.142</b> *
<ul> <li>Given firm of 100 workers</li> <li>1% increase in minimum wage</li> <li>⇒ 0.2% decrease in</li> </ul>	Constant	-0.039 (0.058)	0.174*** (0.058)	0.013 (0.094
employment growth.	Province dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Given firms of 50 workers	Ownership type dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
1% increase in minimum wage	Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
⇒ 0.1% decrease in	Observations	16,321	16,321	16,321
employment growth.	R-squared	0.013	0.049	0.049
	Notes: (i) Statistical si	gnificance at indicated by	the 1%, 5%, an ***, **, and *,	d 10% leve respective
	Source: The Au	uthors' Estima	tion from Ente	rprise Surv

	hine Investment hy	Good Policy	y, Sound Ec	onomy ntensi
Empirical Results	interneted and a second s			interio
	Impacts on Machino I	nvostmo	at (log val	uoc)
Labor intensive companies invest		ivestillei		uesj
more than capital intensive		(1)	(2)	(3)
companies in case of MW increase.		1.70	(2)	(3)
<ul> <li>Given a garment firm with capital</li> </ul>	Minimum wage growth (A)	1.70	1.41	(5.89)
intensity of 50 (e.g. book value of fixed	Log of Initial Capital/Labor (C)	(3.05)	0.48***	2.38***
assets is 6,300 mil. VND, number of			(0.10)	(0.47)
workers is 125)	Interaction (A*C)			-4.80**
1% increase in minimum wage				(1.17)
⇒ 2.4% increase in investment.	Province dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Given an electronics firm with	Ownership type dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
capital intensity of 125 (e.g. book	Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
value of fixed assets is 22,000 mil. VND,				
number of workers is 175)	Observations	14,238	14,238	14,238
1% increase in minimum wage	Uncensored Observations	2432	2432	2432
r 2% decrease in investment	Notes: (i) Statistical sig	inificance at	the 1%, 5%, a *** ** and	nd 10% leve * respective
	Source: The Aut	hors' Estima	tion from Ent	ernrise Sun
	Source. The Au	LIGIS LSUIIId	CONTROLLERING	crprise Sull
Copyright © VEPR 2017				19





1		Good Policy,	Sound Ecor	iomy
	Minimum Wage	Coverage		
<ul> <li>This Chapter example of minimum wag</li> </ul>	mined the actual coverage e and earning distribution.	Distribution of Owner in the Total Sample,	ship Types 2014 (%)	i
<ul> <li>Data: Vietnam Ho</li> </ul>	usehold Living Standards		2014 (VHLSS)	2014 (LFS)
Survey (VHLSS) ar	nd Labor Force Survey (LFS)	Total Household and individual	100 24	100
<u>There are a large</u>	number of individuals,	Without contract	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
around a half of to	otal sample, who do not cts. Those are not covered	Household of individual production	29	19
by minimum wage	e regulations.	With contract	1	18
• Note:		Collective and cooperative Without contract	1 1	1 0
All wage workers aged :	15 and above, who have worked and	With contract Private-owned	1 33	0 30
been paid in the last 30 are the samples	days prior to the time of each survey	Without contract	<mark>8</mark> 24	5
<ul> <li>Government officials, w</li> </ul>	vorkers in state non-productive	State-owned	24	9
<ul> <li>In Viet Nam Household</li> </ul>	Living Standard Surveys (VHLSS),	With contract	12	9
workers in state-run see since the survey does n	ctor are excluded from the sample ot distinguish between state-owned	Without contract	13 1 12	14
non-productive organiz	ation and state-owned enterprise.	Source: The Auth	12 ors' calculatio	n <b>22</b>

Good Policy, Sound Economy

23

#### **Proportion of Workers Earning less than Minimum Wage**

 Large number of workers classified as "Household and Individual" and "Household of individual production and

- trade" earn less than minimum wage level (33% and 18% respectably in 2014).
- Proportion of workers earning more than minimum wage is high among workers under labor contract in the private, state and FDI sectors (formal sector).
- This proportion is even higher among firms in private, state, FDI sectors in manufacturing industries.
- The proportion to be paid less than minimum wage level tends to increase over time, most probably due to hike in minimum wage in 2012 and afterwards.

	2010 (VHLSS)	2012 (VHLSS)	2014 (VHLSS)	2014 (LFS)
By type of ownership				
Household and individual	21	28	33	25
Household of individual production and trade	9	15	18	15
Collective and cooperative	15	38	35	30
Private-owned	3	5	7	4
Without contract	7	12	18	11
With contract	2	3	3	3
State-owned enterprise				4
Foreign-owned	3	3	2	1
Without contract	12	9	13	11
With contract	2	3	2	1

Copyright © VEPR 2017









egional minimum wage	adjustment criteria:	
Labor Code 2012	In fact	Problems
According to Article 91, minimum wage is adjusted based on:	Members of technical board (Wage Council) propose minimum wage levels based on:	
<ul> <li>Basic needs of workers and their families</li> <li>Socio-economic conditions</li> <li>Wage on labor market</li> <li>Recommendation made by National Wage Council</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Basic needs of workers and their families</li> <li>CPI, GDP growth rate</li> <li>Others (labor productivity, firms' ability to pay, unemployment, number of companies dissolving, etc.)</li> <li>Extra increase</li> </ul>	How to measure basic needs? - Food and foodstuff (Basket of 45 commodities including temptation goods - Non-food - Supporting child Which are the essential criteria?





























			Good Policy, Sound Economy
	Prob	ability of Earning less tha	n Minimum Wage
D Logit Model:			
		Reference Points in Lo	git Specification
<ul> <li>Dependent var</li> </ul>	riable	Variable	Omitted case
takes the value	e of one	Gender	Male
if wage is below	w the	Age	30-34 years old
minimum wage	e and	Household member or household head	Household member
zero otherwise	2.	Marital status	Single
The sample con	nsists of	General education level	No qualification
all laborers wh	o work	Vocational training level	No qualification
for wage or sal	lary	Employment contract	Having employment contract
-		Social insurance	Having social insurance
		Type of ownership	Private enterprise
		Type of industry	Agriculture, forestry, and fishery
		Province/City	Ha Noi
		Time of survey	January

						Good Pol	licy, Sour	nd Econo	my
	Pro	obabi	lity of	f Earn	ing less than	Minir	num	Wage	9
	VHLSS Year 2010 (1)	VHLSS Year 2012 (2)	VHLSS Year 2014 (3)	LFS Year 2014 (4)		VHLSS Year 2010 (1)	VHLSS Year 2012 (2)	VHLSS Year 2014 (3)	LFS Year 2014 (4)
Female Household head Rural area Employment contract Social insurance	0.069*** -0.008 -0.012 -0.047*** -0.095***	0.105*** -0.002 0.009 -0.076*** -0.092***	0.097*** -0.028** -0.005 -0.095*** -0.146***	0.084*** -0.003 0.007*** -0.023*** -0.098***	Vocational training Elementary vocational Middle vocational Professional vocational College vocational	-0.052*** -0.030 -0.015	-0.040* -0.021 -0.046 -0.104***	-0.063** -0.065* -0.006 -0.050	-0.085*** -0.077*** -0.077*** -0.081***
Marital status Married Widowed Divorced or Separated Age group	-0.013 -0.032 -0.007	-0.010 -0.010 0.010	-0.053*** 0.012 -0.036	-0.019*** -0.021*** -0.014**	Type of ownership Household or individual Individual production Collective/cooperative State-owned	0.056*** 0.027*** 0.018	0.085*** 0.053*** 0.305***	0.072*** 0.045*** 0.224***	0.093*** 0.053*** 0.187***
15-19 years 20-24 years 25-29 years	0.029* 0.012 0.009	0.077*** 0.013 -0.012	0.049** 0.025 -0.019	0.074*** 0.032*** 0.007**	Foreign-invested	0.029 Xos	-0.023	-0.029 Voc	-0.017***
35-39 years 40-44 years 45-49 years	0.027* 0.038** 0.046***	-0.008 -0.008 0.012	0.000 0.002 0.062***	0.006* 0.006* 0.028***	Control for industry type Control for survey time Observations	Yes No 4 356	Yes No 5 739	Yes No 5.810	Yes Yes 101 771
50-54 years 55-59 years 60 years and above	0.054** 0.100*** 0.120***	0.057*** 0.091*** 0.117***	0.075*** 0.095*** 0.195***	0.035*** 0.058*** 0.110***	Notes: Margir Statistical significance	al effects r at the 1%,	eported. R 5%, and 1	obust stan 0% levels i	dard errors indicated b
Primary school Lower-secondary school	-0.028** -0.029**	-0.042*** -0.041***	-0.031** -0.072***	-0.041*** -0.065***	Source	e: The Auth	iors' Calcul	**, and *, r ations	espectively
Upper-secondary school 3-year college 4-year college and above	-0.013 - -0.056**	-0.038** -0.079** -0.124***	-0.059*** -0.073** -0.147***	-0.071** -0.089*** -0.137***	using VH	LSS 2010-2	012-2014,	LFS 2014	
Copyright © VEPR 2017	2.000								44



VEPR	Contri in Viet	bution to s mam and o	Social Secu other count	rity tries	
		Social insurance	Sickness and Maternity	Unemployment	Total
China	Insured person	8%	2%	Up to 0.5%	Up to 10.5%
	Employer	Up to 20%	Up to 7%	1-1.5%	Up to 28.5%
	Total	Up to 28%	Up to 9%	Up to 2%	Up to 39%
Indonesia	Insured person	3%	1%	n/a	4%
	Employer	5.7%	4%	n/a	9.7%
	Total	8.7%	5%	n/a	13.7%
Japan	Insured person	8.9%	5%	0.4%	14.3%
-	Employer	8.9%	5%	0.7%	14.6%
	Total	17.8%	10%	1.1%	28.9%
Philippines	Insured person	3.63%	1.25%	n/a	4.88%
	Employer	7.37%	1.25%	n/a	8.62%
	Total	11%	2.5%	n/a	13.5%
Thailand	Insured person	3%	1.5%	0.5%	5%
	Employer	3%	1.5%	0.5%	5%
	Government	1%	1.5%	0.25%	2.75%
	Total	7%	4.5%	1.25%	12.75%
Viet Nam	Insured person	8%	1.5%	1%	10.5%
	Employer	18%	3%	1%	22%
	Total	26%	4.5%	2%	32.5%

