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Trade Liberalisation

• generally stimulates growth
• and through it poverty alleviation
• BUT
• it creates losers
• some of whom may be or become poor
What do we know about these latter - static - effects?

• Conceptual framework
• Some empirical results from the literature
• A case-study of Vietnam

• Growth is probably more important, but
  – Difficult to measure – especially with CGE models
  – Most critiques focus on static effects
Conceptual Framework

Figure 4.2: Trade Policy and Poverty – Causal Connections
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Households and Markets

- Do border price shocks get transmitted to poor households?
- Are markets created or destroyed?
- How well do households respond?
- Do the spillovers benefit the poor?
- Does trade liberalisation increase vulnerability?
Wages and Employment

• Does liberalisation raise wages or employment?
• Is transitional unemployment concentrated on the poor?
Government Revenue and Spending

• Does liberalisation actually cut government revenue?
• Do falling tariff revenues hurt the poor?
Households and Markets

- first order approximation of the welfare effect

\[ \Delta W = \sum_i (q_i - c_i) \Delta p_i \]

Barrett and Dorosh (1996)
Sahn and Sarris (1991)
Thomas et al (1999)
The Transmission of Border-Price Shocks

\[ P^m_1 = P_w r (1 + t_m) + \gamma_m \]

- \( P_w \) is the world price
- \( r \) is the exchange rate
- \( t_m \) is the proportional tariff or tax and
- \( \gamma_m \) is the transaction costs on importables

\[ P^x_1 = P_w r (1 - t_x) - \gamma_x \]
Are markets created or destroyed

• Romer (1994)
  - New technologies
  - Variety of productive activities and commodities
• Consumers also benefit from increased availability
• Discontinuous change
• de Janvry, Falchamps and Sadoulet (1991)
  - Non-tradabilities
How do households respond I

• Affects magnitude not sign
• Production
  - Farm level data show major constraints
  - Absence of key productive assets
  - Capital inputs
  - Less educated
  - Poorer quality land
  - Complementary policies
How do households respond II

- Consumption and Labour Supply
- Friedman and Levinsohn (2002)
- Subsistence activities, wage employment, self employment and consumption jointly determined
- But separability cannot be rejected
Do the spillovers benefit the poor?

- Growth linkages
- Locally produced non-tradeables are important
  - Services
  - Bulky starch items
  - Perishable foods
  - Locally processed foods
Does trade liberalisation increase vulnerability?

- Portfolio choice
  - From subsistence to cash crops
  - Risk aversion
  - Fully informed decisions?
- Variability of existing income sources or prices
  - Can go up or down with openness
  - Poor less well insured
- Poverty traps
Wages and Employment

- Stolper-Samuelson Theorem
- Reserve Army Model
- Segmented labour markets
- Common feature
- Apparently small wage and employment effects
Is transitional unemployment concentrated on the poor?

- Parallel with OECD countries not valid
- Little evidence for developing countries
- Transitional unemployment may be quite long lasting
- Adjustment costs greater
  - The more protected the sector
  - The greater the shock
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Key External Sector Reforms

- Relaxation of controls on trade and introduction of Harmonised System of tariffs
- Regional and multilateral trading agreements
- Unification of multiple exchange rates into one market-based exchange rate
- Relaxation of licensing procedure
- Phasing out of controls on retention and remittance of foreign exchange
- Initiation of an ‘open door policy’ to promote foreign investment
## Trade indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trade as % of GDP</th>
<th>Average Tariff Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td><strong>52.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><strong>70.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GSO statistics, CIEM (2001)
# Real Price Changes 1993-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods / Services</th>
<th>Change (%)*</th>
<th>Goods / Services</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackerel</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea shrimps</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>Petrol</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Soya beans</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring rice</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircut</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton fabrics</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Woollens</td>
<td>-38.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculations based on GSO statistics.
Note: * Change between 1993 and 1998.
## Dynamic Trade Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Increase (US$m)</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Increase (US$m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garments</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>Electrical machinery and parts</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>General machinery</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical machinery and parts</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>Iron and steel</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Special machinery</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculations based on World Bank Mirror Statistics  
Note: Increase between 1993 and 1998.
Labour demand per $1 of trade
Direct labour coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EX93</th>
<th>IM93</th>
<th>NET93</th>
<th>EX98</th>
<th>IM98</th>
<th>NET98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>0.1415</td>
<td>0.0859</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.1270</td>
<td>0.1009</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Skilled</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
<td>0.0330</td>
<td>-0.0045</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>-0.0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly-Skilled</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.1715</td>
<td>0.1216</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>0.1560</td>
<td>0.1349</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: calculations based on adjusted data
Multinomial Logit Model

The model analyses probability of being in one of 4 possible outcomes:
1. being poor in both periods
2. being non-poor in 1992-93 and becoming poor in 1997-9
4. being non-poor in both periods; is expressed as:

$$\text{Prob}(Y_i = j) = \frac{e^{\beta_j x_i}}{\sum_{k=1}^{4} e^{\beta_k x_i}}, \ j = 1,2,3,4$$

Relative Risk Ratios: Ratio of the probability of each outcome relative to the probability of the base category ($Y = 1$):

$$\frac{\text{Pr} ob(Y = 2)}{\text{Pr} ob(Y = 1)} = e^{\beta^{(2)} x}$$
Poverty Dynamics: Non-Trade

The following variables were significant in explaining movements out of poverty:

**Increase probability**
- White-collar occupation of household head
- Education of household head
- Spouse educated to technical level
- Household head being older
- Access to food shops, electricity, road, clinic
- Residing in urban area
- Residing in Central Highlands, South East, Mekong or Red River Deltas
- Longer period between the two surveys
- Interviewed in the last quarter of survey

**Decrease probability**
- Unemployment of household head
- Having young children
- Belonging to a non-Kinh non-Chinese ethnic group
- Access to a post office
## Multinomial Logit Model (RRRs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prob. of escaping from poverty</th>
<th>Prob. of falling into poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of rice production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Mekong River Delta</td>
<td>***1.75</td>
<td>*0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Red River Delta</td>
<td>**0.60</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of coffee production</strong></td>
<td>***2.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of fertiliser for rice</strong></td>
<td>***1.46</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of fertiliser for non-rice</strong></td>
<td>*1.70</td>
<td>*0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio of household members working in export to no. of adults (1)</strong></td>
<td>***1.25</td>
<td>*1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in ratio</strong></td>
<td>**1.17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** significant at 1% level; ** significant at 5% level; * significant at 10% level.

(1) The export sector includes seafood, food processing, garment, and shoes (+rubber and plastic products).
## The Benefits of Modelling Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pseudo-$R^2$</th>
<th>%correct predictions</th>
<th>predicted no. in poverty in 1998 (of 4302) $(\sigma)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>without trade variables</strong></td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td>1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with trade variables</strong></td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$(\sigma)$ Predictions of number in poverty from ‘preferred equation’ and from that equation with trade variables’ co-efficients set at half their estimated values.
Household Consumption I

• Regress rice share on:
  – Demographics, geography, ethnicity, infrastructure and seasonality

\[ w_{ht} = \alpha_t + \beta_t \ln x_{ht} + \sum_{m=1}^{\gamma} \gamma_{mt} Z_{mht} + u_{ht} \]
Household Consumption IV

Rice share

\[ r'' \]
\[ r_h'' \]

Idiosyncratic element

D''

PL income
## Rice shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Official Basket</th>
<th>Mean from VLSS</th>
<th>Predicted by equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences to Poverty Dynamic

• With predicted shares: 21 households
• With predicted shares plus residuals
  – 39 households (<1%)

• Regression results – no change
Conclusions

- The reform process in Vietnam has resulted in significant changes in the economy.
- Exports and imports have boomed during the 1990s and the prices of some tradables have increased strongly.
- Trade reforms may have stimulated the demand for labour and increased net labour income a little.
- Sectors of major export and import growth have had identifiable consequences for household poverty dynamics.
- Consumption differences hardly matter