

Article

Non-Farm Activities and Impacts beyond the Economy of Rural Households in Vietnam: A Review and Link to Policies

Rachmat Mulia ^{1,*}, Elisabeth Simelton ¹, Tan Quang Nguyen ¹ and Magnus Jirstrom ²

¹ World Agroforestry (ICRAF), Hanoi 10000, Vietnam; E.Simelton@cgiar.org (E.S.); N.QuangTan@cgiar.org (T.Q.N.)

² Department of Human Geography, Lund University, 22100 Lund, Sweden; magnus.jirstrom@keg.lu.se

* Correspondence: r.mulia@cgiar.org; Tel.: +84-24-3783-4644

Abstract: Rural households in Asian developing countries such as Vietnam have been participating in non-farm activities for decades, yet impacts beyond the economy of these households are little understood. Using evidence from available literature and two case studies from rural Vietnam, this paper exposes a range of socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities. An increased social tension driven by a widening economic gap between poor and better-off households or ethnic majority and minority groups was the most frequently reported impact in the literature. The case studies reveal additional impacts, notably those associated with public security, preservation of local culture, and safety of farm households with migrants during and following climate-related disasters. An increasing number of young migrants who exited family farms to access non-farm jobs partially led to the latter two impacts. The rural development and poverty reduction policies of Vietnam enacted in the past two decades (2000–2020) that promoted livelihood diversification had limited measures addressing socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities. An amendment of these two categories of policies for the implementation beyond 2020 or a strengthened synergy in implementation with other categories of policy such as social policies is necessary to ensure sustainable rural development in Vietnam.

Keywords: livelihood diversification; local culture; migration; public safety; remittance; rural development programs; social capitals; social policies



Citation: Mulia, R.; Simelton, E.; Nguyen, T.Q.; Jirstrom, M. Non-Farm Activities and Impacts beyond the Economy of Rural Households in Vietnam: A Review and Link to Policies. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 10182. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810182>

Academic Editors: Apostolos G. Papadopoulos, Stavros Zografakis and Loukia-Maria Fratsea

Received: 29 June 2021

Accepted: 9 September 2021

Published: 12 September 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Over the past few decades, rural transformation driven by policy reforms has stimulated economic growth in developing Asian countries such as Vietnam [1,2]. Rural transformation can be defined as “a process of comprehensive societal change whereby rural societies diversify their economies and reduce their reliance on agriculture” [3]. This transformation has widened opportunities for the diversification of rural sources of living and helped in eradicating rural poverty through increased employment opportunities and additional income from non-farm activities, including remittance [4–8].

Rural households diversify their livelihood as a risk-averse strategy for stabilising income or as an opportunity-led strategy to improve their living conditions, often referred to as push and pull factors, respectively [9,10]. Livelihood diversification is “an active social process of an individual or household to maintain or continuously adapt to diverse income opportunities to secure livelihood and improve living standards” [11]. The push factors in rural areas of Asian developing countries could relate to household’s economy, such as low and unstable income from farm activities [12–15], severe impacts of climate uncertainty or climate-related hazards on crop productivity or loss [16,17], or land pressures for example limited lands driven by increasing population [12,13,18]. The pull factors could relate to, e.g., the growth of labour-intensive industries and urban service sector [13,15].

In the context of rural livelihood, diversification is characterised by the increasing participation of rural households in non-farm activities. Non-farm activities are all income-

generating activities other than the production of raw agricultural commodities and include manufacture, commerce, construction and government services, among others [9,19,20]. On the other hand, farm activities include the production of unprocessed crops, livestock, forestry, or aquacultural products from farms or natural resources. The type and scale of rural non-farm activities depends on a complex interplay of individual capital such as education, household dynamics such as family size, or community scale such as proximity to urban areas [21–26]. Livelihood diversification offers rural households flexibility in allocating resources among income generating activities and can lead to a higher resilience to economic and environmental shock [10,27].

1.1. Non-Farm and the Economy of Rural Households in Vietnam

Rural transformation among developing Asian countries has advanced at different paces [28]. In Southeast Asia, the transformation in Vietnam, which began in the late 1980s, has been regarded as successful with impressive economic growth [2,29–32]. The share of farm households engaged in non-farm activities almost doubled from 1997 to 2004, specifically from 11% to 20.4% at the national level [32]. The share of agriculture in rural households' income declined from 43% in 2002 to 32% in 2012, overtaken by non-farm sources [33]. The income or consumption per capita of farm households who conduct non-farm activities has generally been 5–25% higher than those that do not, depending on the type and scale of their non-farm activities [23,29,34–36]. Some households used a fraction of their additional income for farming investments, such as buying equipment or crop diversification [37,38], that in turn increased income from farm activities. Nowadays, non-farm activities, supported by government policies aiming at a development of the rural economy, have become important sources of income across rural areas of Vietnam [39,40].

1.2. Impact beyond Economy—Research Need for Sustainable Rural Development

The increasing participation in non-farm activities has brought both economic and social changes in rural areas of Vietnam [41,42]. In general, the former relates to change in wealth or material well-being [43]. Share of non-farm to family's income or increase in consumption per capita has been commonly used as an indicator of such changes in the literature. Conversely, social changes are those associated with immaterial or intangible values [44] such as change in relationship among family members or community groups [45,46]. Several studies, in Vietnam and in other developing countries, have also explored the phenomenon of “feminisation” of agriculture driven by the migration of rural male labourers accessing non-farm opportunities (e.g., [13,47–50]). This migration has generally added labour burdens on women and affected their chances to engage in income generating activities. Both the economic and social changes are complex and, lest they led to undesirable impacts, need to be properly addressed by relevant policies in the country. Evidence on the environmental impacts of non-farm activities in rural areas of Vietnam have also been reported in the literature (e.g., [24,37,51]). For example, the expansion of rural small-medium enterprises such as rice processors, coffee shops, beauty salons, and motorbike service stations in the Mekong River Delta region of Vietnam have generated large volumes of wastewater discharged into canals and small rivers without proper treatment [24]. Understanding the impact beyond the economy of rural households is crucial to ensure the sustainable development of rural economies in Vietnam [40,52,53] and in supporting Vietnam's ambition of becoming a modern and industrialised nation by 2035 [54]. However, evidence beyond the economic aspects of non-farm activities in Vietnam, especially socio-cultural aspects, are scarce [29].

1.3. Policies That Promote Rural Livelihood Diversification in Vietnam

There are two main categories of policies that promote rural livelihood diversification for poverty reduction in Vietnam. The policies have been implemented for decades in the country.

- New rural development policies: following the Government Action Plan on Agriculture, Farmers and Rural Affairs (also known as Tam Nông in Vietnamese) that was released in 2008, Vietnam has implemented two New Rural Development (NRD) programs since 2010 through Decision No. 800/2010/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2010–2020 and the Decision No. 1600/2016/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2016–2020 issued in 2016 to replace the previous Decision. Among targets of diversifying and improving rural income for the economic restructuring, the two programs aimed at safeguarding natural resources and environment. NRD policies were those issued under the two programs.
- Poverty reduction policies: poverty reduction has been the core of Vietnam's development orientation since the national policy and economic reform (or Đổi Mới in Vietnamese) was implemented in the late 1980s. After the relatively successful achievement of the millennium goals in poverty reduction, Vietnam has continued with comprehensive and sustainable efforts for poverty reduction. The policies of this category are those enacted under four national target programs on poverty reduction. Since 2000, four such programs have been implemented through Decision No. 143/2001/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2001–2005, Decision No. 20/2007/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2006–2010, Decision No. 1489/2012/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2012–2015, and Decision 1722/2016/QĐ-TTg for the period of 2016–2020. The programs focused on the development of rural infrastructure, creation of jobs, livelihood improvement, capacity development, and access to legal support for ethnic minority and poor communities living in poor and underdeveloped villages and communes.

Vietnam also has a category of policies called social policies that provide support mainly for socially disadvantaged groups, such as ethnic minorities, poor households or communities, and women, to better integrate into rural economic development. Resolution No. 15/2012/NQ-TW by Vietnam's Communist Party emphasised that social policies in Vietnam should cover two main categories, namely merit policies and social security policies. Furthermore, the latter should encompass four aspects: (i) employment, income generation, and poverty reduction, (ii) social insurance, (iii) social assistance for people in difficult circumstances (including emergency assistance for victims of natural disasters), and (iv) access to social services, particularly for poor and disadvantaged people and ethnic minorities. Since 2000, various social policies have been promulgated in Vietnam which provide more specific measures for implementation and key policies include:

1. Decision No. 32/2010/QĐ-TTg on a scheme to develop social work professions for the period of 2010–2020.
2. Decision No. 629/2012/QĐ-TTg on Vietnam's Family Development Strategy to 2020, with vision to 2030.
3. Decision No. 524/2015/QĐ-TTg on a scheme to strengthen and develop grassroots-level social assistance centres for the period of 2016–2020.
4. Decision No. 647/2013/QĐ-TTg on a community-based scheme for caring for orphaned children, neglected children, HIV-AIDS infected children, children susceptible to toxic environments, children with serious disabilities, and children affected by natural and other disasters.
5. Decision No. 565/2017/QĐ-TTg on development of a social assistance system for the period of 2016–2020.
6. Decree No. 136/2013/ND-CP on social assistance policies for socially sponsored people.
7. Decision No. 1781/2012/QĐ-TTg on Vietnam's elderly communities for the period of 2012–2020.

In this paper, we focus on the impacts of non-farm activities beyond the economy of rural households in Vietnam. We present a synthesis of available literature and two case studies to highlight evidence of such impacts. The first case study is from a remote commune in the South Central Coast of Vietnam, wherein, driven mainly by low and unstable income from farm activities, farm households diversified their source of living [55]. The study exposes a range of socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities that the households and local authorities experienced or observed, either at household or community

level. The second is from a commune in North Central Coast of Vietnam that is prone to climate-related disasters. The local people regarded climate challenges, low and unstable income, and difficult access to distant farm plots as the main drawbacks of farm activities, exhorting them to participate in non-farm activities mainly through domestic or international migration [56]. The study exposes an extra risk that relates to the safety of farm households with migrants during and following extreme weather events such as storm or flood because of the absence of readily and available hands to prepare and recover from the events. We also investigated and present a summary of measures in the three categories of policies described above that can anticipate or mitigate undesirable impacts of non-farm activities. We used the policies enacted in the past two decades (2000–2020) to represent current policies because most of the policies for the period beyond 2020 are still under development by the Vietnamese government. The periods of implementation of the reviewed policies were mostly until 2020, with some policies having a vision leading up to 2030. The results of the investigation are expected to draw increased attention from relevant decision makers in Vietnam who are reviewing a series of rural development and poverty reduction policies for the period up to 2030.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. An Overview of the Methodology

We first determined aspects of non-farm activities that would be addressed by our study (step 1). Among three general aspects beyond economy, namely social, cultural and environmental [57], we focused on the first two because there is a significant gap in the current literature on impacts that relate to socio-cultural aspects. We eventually specified five socio-cultural aspects. Evidence of impacts that relate to the five aspects were compiled from the review of available literature to date (step 2). We conducted a literature review using Google Scholar with non-farm, nonfarm (without dash), livelihood diversification, or Vietnam as main keywords (both English and Vietnamese). We provide two case studies that expose impacts that were absent from the literature (step 3). In the first study, we conducted focus group discussions (FGDs) with two groups of farm households and one group of local authorities to generate qualitative data on any impact of non-farm activities that they considered undesirable. The semi-structured discussions during the FGDs allowed us to guide farmers identifying the impacts. In the second case study, we used the results of a structured household survey and unstructured interviews with local project collaborators and authorities to investigate the extra risk that rural households with migrants had to face during and following extreme weather events. Through the survey, we identified rural households that were affected by extreme weather events and factors that determined the length of their recovery time. The latter reflects period without farm income namely, the main source of their income. The key interviews unveiled challenges and risks that the households with migrants had to face during and following the extreme weather events and the availability of the government's support to help the households in mitigating the risks. The two case studies were conducted in 2019 and provide recent evidence from two rural areas of Vietnam where the households experienced concrete impacts from non-farm activities. Using the list of impacts reported in the literature and case studies, we investigated if the three categories of policies in Vietnam have measures that address undesirable impacts.

2.2. Step 1: Specifying Socio-Cultural Aspects

Based on the socio-cultural aspects that are considered critical to ensure sustainable rural development in Vietnam [58–60], yet are poorly investigated in the current literature, we investigated the impacts of non-farm activities that relate to five key aspects:

- (i) Social bonding, or ties among family members within households that participate in non-farm activities.
- (ii) Social bridging, or ties among individuals or households that participate in non-farm activities and other individuals or households in the community. This includes ties

- between household groups such as between poor and better-off households or an ethnic majority and minorities.
- (iii) Social linking, or ties between households that participate in non-farm activities and people or organisations in power either in public or private domains such as local authorities.
 - (iv) Individual or public safety, namely the protection of individuals, households, or community, from crimes, disasters, or other threats. We, however, excluded threats from polluted environments to public health driven by non-farm activities from this category.
 - (v) Preservation of local culture, including spiritual or religious values and local traditions or customs in various expressions such as traditional singing, dressing, or handicrafts.

The five aspects reflect trust, safety, and common values which influence social and economic sustainability within a community [61–65]. Social bonding, linking, and bridging have been considered as the three main categories of social capital [45,61]. They can be used to frame and analyse social issues beyond economic or environmental implications [60] and reflect trust within and between community groups that help to ensure cooperation and collective action within communities [61,62]. Individual or public safety was considered a social aspect in [46], ensuring people continue to participate in rural development. Local culture reflects common understanding, traditions, and values that determine debates and collective actions within a community [64]. Its preservation is crucial but has been much neglected in the discussion on sustainable development [64,65]. Hereafter, we refer to impacts of non-farm activities directly associated with the five key aspects as socio-cultural impacts.

Furthermore, our study focused on the impacts of non-farm activities undertaken by rural households but not by other types of stakeholders, such as large private or public companies that in some cases have created a population of landless households through the expansion of industrial parks or tourism centres in rural areas [47,66,67]. This type of expansion can eventually provide opportunities for rural households to access non-farm jobs and the socio-cultural impacts of their participation in those jobs were considered.

2.3. Step 2: Literature Review

We first verified the contents of all publications obtained using the keywords and classified them into those reporting impacts of non-farm activities and those focusing on other issues. We eventually differentiated the former into those reporting economic impacts and those reporting impacts beyond the economy of rural households. Finally, using the publications that belong to the latter category, we compiled the reported impacts of non-farm activities undertaken by rural households on their own family or affected groups within the community that relate to the five socio-cultural aspects described above. Information from journal articles (namely peer-reviewed publications), book chapters, theses, project reports, or working papers were considered. Information from other types of publication such as news articles, blogs, or presentations were excluded.

2.4. Step 3a: Case Study on Local Perspectives on the Undesirable Impacts of Non-Farm Activities

We conducted the study in Ta Bhing commune, Nam Giang district, Quang Nam province (15°35'0" N 107°55'0" E) of Vietnam. The commune is located about 125 km from Tam Ky, the capital of the province. In the past decade, rural households in the commune have been further involved in non-farm activities through participation in community-based tourism, promotion of local handicrafts, and engaging in temporary or permanent salary-based work offered by a new cement industry in operation since 2014 and located about 30 km from the commune. The farm households in the commune were generally lacking knowledge on suitable crop cultivation technique and plot management options and had limited market access of agricultural products that led to low and unstable income from farm activities [55]. The average land holding size per household was about 1.5 ha [55]. For a better livelihood, these households diversified their source of living with non-farm

activities. The majority of the local households are native to the commune (about 88%) and belong to Co Tu, one of the recognised ethnic minority groups in the country, classified as poor (about 64%) with income below the national poverty line of about USD 1.2 per person per day (in 2016), and who do not hold land certificates (about 52%) [55]. about 35% of farm households in the commune have at least one family member participating in non-farm activities [55].

Prior to the FGDs, the definition and scope of non-farm activities as compared to farm activities were clarified to participants. Each group consisted of five people. All participating farmers belong to the Co Tu ethnic group. The authorities were represented by staffs from the department of Song Thanh Nature Reserve who had a sufficient knowledge on the livelihood of local people living in the buffer zone communes of the reserve, such as the Ta Bhing commune. Each group was guided by a researcher from the World Agroforestry (ICRAF) and asked about their experience or observation of any impact of non-farm activities that they considered undesirable. All responses from the participants were recorded on A0 papers. The researchers provided some examples of undesirable impacts of non-farm activities to help participants understand the context of discussion and would immediately ask for a clarification or elaboration for any unclear or ambiguous response. The researchers also consulted the groups on potential solutions to anticipate or mitigate undesirable impacts of non-farm activities that the groups identified. All participants were conversant in the Vietnamese language as an official language in Vietnam.

2.5. Step 3b: Case Study on Extra Risks Faced by Rural Households with Migrants

We conducted this study in Ky Son commune, Ky Anh district, Ha Tinh province (18°20' N 105°54' E) of Vietnam. Ha Tinh is one of the most disaster-prone provinces in Vietnam and is exposed to dry, hot springs with occasional tornados, summers and autumns with drought, tropical storms and floods, and cold, damp winters. Local people usually have scattered agricultural plots, typically one in the lowlands with rice paddy, one in upland plains, and another in sloping uplands [56]. The plots in the lowlands are relatively small, about 500–1000 m² per plot, while in the uplands, they can be more than one hectare. The climate challenges, however, substantially restrict crop growth and productivity, and non-farm income has been increasingly considered as a temporary or permanent solution towards better livelihoods. Although the province has an industrial park, rural households have accessed non-farm opportunities mainly through organised recruitment for domestic or international migratory jobs. Based on statistical data from 2016, Ha Tinh is among Vietnam's main sources of domestic and international working migrants [38]. Those who left the farms were mostly young people expecting to compensate their exit from the family farms with remittance [56]. However, these people were often the ones with the "strongest arms" or the "healthiest" in the family. Those who stayed behind in the rural areas partially allocated the remittance for savings, and the rest for daily expenses, house reparation, or crop investment, mainly to develop perennial crop plantations considered to be less labour-intensive and more resilient to extreme weather events as compared to annual crop systems [56].

This case draws on two sources of information. First, we highlighted the evidence found by [56] that in Ha Tinh province, the post-disaster recovery time of rural households with migrants was much longer than those without. In their study, the recovery time reflects a period during which, driven by the loss of actual farms or stands and investment, rural households experience an absence of income from the farms or stands, which was their main income. Their study used the data from the household survey that involved 106 rural households in Ky Anh commune. The households were randomly selected using the list of households in the commune obtained from the commune's leader [56]. All the households belong to Kinh, the ethnic majority in Vietnam. The interview was conducted in the household's residence with one adult respondent who was available at that time. The survey recorded information on the household's demographic condition such as family size and land capital such as number of managed agricultural plots and land size. In

addition, the households were asked the length of recovery time that they experienced after extreme weather events that took place in the previous five years (2014–2019). All their responses were immediately recorded on Open Data Kit (ODK). All respondents were conversant with the Vietnamese language. A multivariate regression analysis was used to investigate the effect of family size, different extreme weather events, and the absence of migrated family members on the length of recovery time. The analysis was conducted using R software. A more detailed description on the survey and the statistical analysis were provided by [56].

The second source was unpublished information from the key interviews. The interviews were mostly conducted informally during project's activities in the commune. The project collaborators and local authorities had a sufficient knowledge on the condition of each household in the Ky Anh commune. The local authorities included the representative from the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, the Farmer's Union, and village leaders.

3. Results

3.1. Socio-Cultural Impacts Reported in the Literature

We reviewed 74 publications published between 2002 and 2021, of which 50 publications reported on the impacts of non-farm activities. The rest focused, for example, on determinants of households' participation in non-farm activities. Most (namely 36) of the 50 publications focused on the impacts of non-farm activities on rural household income (e.g., [34,36,68–73]). Impacts that relate to the five key socio-cultural aspects of this study were found in thirteen publications (Table 1).

Increasing social tension within communities driven by a widening economic gap between poor and better-off households was the most reported impact by ten of the thirteen publications (Table 1). In many cases, economically poor households (hereafter referred to as poor households) are associated with ethnic minorities. They often have more limiting assets and access than the better-off households or the ethnic majority to start and expand non-farm activities. For example, data from the Vietnam Access to Resources Household Survey conducted over 2006–2014 [74] showed that poor households across provinces in Vietnam had limited access to both formal and informal credit that restricted them in taking up non-farm activities. Compared to better-off households, loan applications by poor households were more often rejected, particularly due to the lack of reliable collateral assets, such as land use titles. Furthermore, once accepted, the loan size accessible by the poor households was usually less, as low as half, of the loan size accessed by better-off households [74]. The widening economic gap between ethnic minority and majority groups also occurs between regions in Vietnam because most ethnic minority groups live in mountainous and remote areas of the country. They had greater challenges in merely accessing non-farm opportunities due to less access to public services and infrastructure, including information [74–76]. Improved access to education, information, and credit, and infrastructure development, have been considered as key solutions to narrow the economic gap [74–76].

Non-farm activities affected the social bonding of rural households in several ways. Firstly, change in length of working hours or distance to work, including in the case of migration, could substantially reduce communication and cohesiveness within families [47] or generate intense longing and anxiety in those who were left behind or who migrated [38]. Secondly, in the case of migration, a strong expectation from family members that the migrants must be financially successful imposes pressure on migrants and affects the ties between migrants and their family, although in some cases, this became a strong motivational force [38]. This expectation has been partly driven by the need to pay back loans used to cover the cost of accessing non-farm jobs. Thirdly, sharing substantial income from non-farm activities, including remittance, within families can increase the "bargaining power" of those who participated in non-farm activities towards family members. This benefit, however, mainly applies to men. As expounded in [38], in general, rural

households in Vietnam still observe a patriarchal system in which men are expected to cover the financial needs of their family and make important household decisions. Men's bargaining power within families depends on the income that they generate and material wealth such as homes and land that they afford from that income. Therefore, sending a substantial remittance to families could increase men's power within families or even in their community. Rural women, on the other hand, are generally bound by social norms under the patriarchal system. Although they can generate substantial income or remittance from non-farm activities and use it to cover most of their family's needs, becoming the breadwinner has the potential to affect the harmony within a family. Female breadwinners usually tried to maintain the harmony within families in several ways, including ensuring that their breadwinner status is only temporary to reassure their husbands.

In addition to increasing social tension among community groups, non-farm activities may affect social bridging at least in two other ways, both related to migration. Especially in the case of female migrants, long absences from the village can result in false accusations or negative rumours from the community or neighbours [38]. One such accusation is being involved in prostitution. On the other hand, for male migrants, as long as they send substantial remittances to their family, their "prestige" in the community can increase [38].

For other socio-cultural impacts, we found one related to individual or public safety, one on social linking, and none on preserving local culture. For social linking, other studies reported the advantages and disadvantages of having this social capital for households who will engage or have engaged in non-farm activities rather than the impact of non-farm activities on this capital. For example, thanks to the help of people or organisations in power, households can better access existing non-farm opportunities or available resources to start the activities [77–79], but they might have to afford some costs to maintain the relationship, and this could reduce the net income from their non-farm activities [79].

From the perspective of those who undertook the activities, seven of the ten impacts found in the literature can be considered as undesirable, excluding the increase in bargaining power and prestige potentially experienced by men who can provide substantial income from non-farm activities to their family, and the new relationship with people or organisations in power that rural households built within the environment of new non-farm activities.

Table 1. Socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities reported in the literature.

Impacts	Source
Social bonding	
Change in length of working hours or distance to working location may reduce time spent on communication with family members and could further lead to less cohesiveness, increased family conflict, or divorce	[47]
Especially in the case of migration, intense longing or anxiety in those who were left behind in rural areas or those who migrated	[38]
A strong expectation from family members that the migrants must be financially successful may affect the family ties	[38]
Due to the patriarchal system, sending remittance to family could increase the "bargaining power" of men within their family, including household decision-making power	[38]
In women's cases, being the breadwinner within a family may upset the harmony within their family and create the need to reassure their husbands	[38]
Social bridging	
Mainly for the case of female migrants, a false accusation or negative rumour might emerge in the community because of their long absence from the village, affecting their relationship with, e.g., neighbours	[38]
Sending substantial remittance to family could increase the "prestige" of men within their community	[38]
Widening economic gaps between poor and better-off households or between ethnic minority and majority groups could generate or intensify social tension within rural communities	[33,36,74–76,80–84]

Table 1. Cont.

Impacts	Source
Social linking	
Participation in non-farm activities could lead to a growing need to interact and build relationship with people or organisations in power	[45]
Individual or public safety	
Especially for women, risk of poor treatment, sexual harassment, and domestic violence at migration sites	[47]

3.2. Case Study on the Undesirable Impacts of Non-Farm Activities

We compiled the responses from the two groups of farmers in Table 2. The groups identified six undesirable impacts of non-farm activities and some potential solutions to anticipate or mitigate the impacts. Four of the six impacts are associated with four of the five key socio-cultural aspects. The groups identified degraded ties within family and community because of change in length of working hour and distance to working place as impacts on social bonding and bridging, respectively. Regarding individual or public safety, they were concerned about the increasing number of “strangers” in the villages and the risk of forest fires because of tourism activities which involved some groups of households in the villages. The groups also had a strong concern for the preservation of local culture because of the increasing number of individuals, especially young migrants, who have neglected their village identities.

Table 2. Undesirable impacts of non-farm activities according to farmers.

Impacts *	Socio-Cultural Aspect	Solutions Proposed by the Group
Labour shortage for farm activities	-	Hire or exchange labour or develop forest plantations which are less labour-intensive and have longer rotations than agriculture to reduce the risk of plot exploitation by others
Lack of time for family and communal work affecting harmony within the family and community	Social bonding and bridging	Government facilitates rural households in participating in non-farm jobs located within or nearby the commune
For households without a certificate of land use right, participation in non-farm activities keeps them away from their land and there is a high risk of unilateral claim by others	-	Local government needs to issue a certificate of land use right for those households
Some tourism activities deplete natural resources, e.g., use a lot of firewood for barbeque events, pollute the environment, and increase the risk of forest fire	Individual or public safety **	Need to increase awareness from all stakeholders involved in the tourism activities on environmental protection, and treat waste to reduce water and land pollution
Tourism activities affected village security due to an increasing number of “strangers” in the village	Individual or public safety	NA ***
Young migrants had no time to learn and neglected their village’s cultural heritage such as traditional clothing, songs, and dancing, as well as indigenous skills and customs such as knitting and worshipping their ancestors	Preservation of local culture	Local government needs to issue a regulation that obliges young migrants to return to their hometown regularly, to remind and preserve their village customs and identity, and organise monthly cultural events in the village

* The order does not indicate ranking/degree of importance. ** Related mainly to risk of forest fire because public health was not included in the five socio-cultural aspects. *** No solution provided by the group.

“Some young migrants behaved ‘strangely’ when they came back here either for temporary or more permanently. They went away for long time to earn money and they eventually forgot how to wear traditional dress properly and had no interest in learning traditional songs like Hat Ly or Hai Doi Dap. They might influence other young people here to behave similarly and there is a risk that none will keep the local culture in the future.” (farmer, Co Tu ethnic group, Quang Nam province)

“Young people have been busy with non-farm activities and they have to travel far from the commune every day for those activities. Consequently, they have no time to learn indigenous culture like traditional knitting, dancing, singing, and worshipping. I think the government should facilitate the young people to create or access local non-farm opportunities. Therefore, they still have time to do communal works, spend sufficient time with family, and learn local culture as their identity.” (farmer, Co Tu ethnic group, Quang Nam province)

The group of local authorities also identified six undesirable impacts (Table 3), of which four are associated with three of the five socio-cultural aspects. Related to individual or public safety, in addition to impacts from tourism activities that were also identified by the groups of farmers, the authorities claimed that the widening economic gap between poor and better-off households may increase social crimes in the community. However, they could not identify a solution to anticipate or mitigate this impact. Like the farmer groups, the authorities were also concerned about degraded ties within families and a lack of interest from those participating in non-farm activities, especially young migrants, to adopt and preserve local customs and culture. All of the proposed solutions from the authorities relate to improvement in policy regulation or implementation.

“Tourism activities that also promote local products such as local handicrafts have brought about non-farm opportunities and more income for some groups of people in the commune. However, at the same time, there has been an increasing number of ‘strangers’ that visited the commune. We need to strengthen commune’s security measure, otherwise, social crimes will increase and will affect many people in the commune and their family.” (staff of department of Song Thanh Nature Reserve, Quang Nam province)

“It’s important to preserve local culture including the traditional handicraft villages. Nowadays, many young people are occupied in non-farm activities and they have no time and interest to learn the handicraft technique. Consequently, we have a labour shortage to maintain the handicraft production. We need to strengthen the promotion of local handicraft for example through tourism activities.” (staff of department of Song Thanh Nature Reserve, Quang Nam province)

The socio-economic condition of rural households in the Ta Bhing commune can partially explain the solutions identified by the groups of farmers or authorities. For example, the proposal of a policy that can provide financial support for non-farm investment likely relates to the fact that 64% of the households in the commune were classified as poor. The expectation that local government could issue a certificate of land use right for a larger group of farmers was likely associated with the fact that 52% of the households in the commune had no land certificate. Both groups of farmers and authorities expressed great concern on the preservation of local culture and village identities, likely because most of the households were native to the commune.

Table 3. Undesirable impacts of non-farm activities according to authorities.

Impacts *	Socio-Cultural Aspect	Solutions Proposed by the Group
Impact on family economy due to investment risk in non-farm activities	-	Relevant authorities need to issue a policy that can provide financial support and facilitate poor household participation in non-farm activities, and to provide them with training on non-farm investment
Lack of productive labourers in the village for farm activities due to longer working hours for non-farm activities and outmigration	-	Relevant authorities need to create opportunities or facilitate rural household participation in non-farm activities which are less labour-intensive or near to the commune. In this case, households can still find sufficient time to undertake farm work
Lack of time and attention for family that can lead to serious family conflict	Social bonding	Relevant authorities need to create opportunities or facilitate rural household participation in non-farm activities located within or near to the commune
Risk of losing local culture, customs and traditional handicraft villages due to a lack of attention and labour management	Preservation of local culture	Regularly organise traditional festivals, encourage and facilitate young people to maintain traditional handicraft villages
Increasing risk of social crimes because more “strangers” visited the villages driven by tourism activities and due to the widening economic gap between poor and better-off households	Individual or public safety	NA **
Non-farm activities such as sand and gold mining cause water and land pollution	-	Need for law-enforcement, strengthened inspection and sanctions for people who neglect environmental protection

* The order does not indicate ranking/degree of importance, ** No solution provided by the group.

3.3. Case Study on Extra Risks Faced by Households with Migrants

According to [56], about 98% of the 106 surveyed households in Ky Son commune had been affected by various extreme weather events such as flash floods, floods, drought, typhoons, or cold spells within a five-year period (2014–2019). The main impact on their farms was crop loss (experienced by 67% of surveyed households) or lower crop productivity (61%). In addition, intense storms and typhoons resulted in serious damage to their houses (87%).

The recovery time of households with migrants was longer by almost a year on average, compared with those without migrants (Table 4). The key interviews revealed that a year difference in recovery time between these two groups of households was possible because some households were missing their strongest arms or the healthiest family member due to migration during and following the extreme weather events. An absence of family members resulted in households lacking readily and available hands to anticipate, mitigate, and recover from disasters that can risk their life, especially women. Moreover, most households in the commune had scattered agricultural plots, with some plots being highly inaccessible due to relatively far distances from home—in some cases, over a 60-min walk or 30 min by motorbike. Distant plots were often more prone to extreme weather events because they received less preparation to anticipate the events compared with those located closer to home. Furthermore, clearing up plots from crop or other debris after disasters, especially storms and floods, was tedious work, among other tasks, resulting in physical and mental fatigue. The longest recovery time of a household with migrants in the commune was 60 months.

“To rescue our belongings from the flood, I was carrying food and furniture to the loft (in the house) and taking the animals to higher terrains. I was 30 weeks pregnant and alone because my husband was working far away from home. I lost the (unborn) baby.”
(woman, 45 years old, Ha Tinh province)

“A 40-year-old woman drowned when she was on the way to her mother’s house with food. Her husband was away working in another province at the time. It was sad.”
(woman, 37 years old, Ha Tinh province)

Table 4. Factors affecting length of recovery time in Ha Tinh province based on a multivariate regression analysis (source: [56]).

Independent Variable = Length of Post-Disaster Recovery Time (months)			
Dependent Variables	Unit	Coefficient	<i>p</i> -Value
Household size	Number of people	−0.97	0.116
Migrant family member	0 = no, 1 = yes	11.248	0.000
Received remittance	0 = no, 1 = yes	−1.34	0.501
Affected by drought	0 = no, 1 = yes	8.35	0.000
Affected by flood	0 = no, 1 = yes	7.56	0.000
Affected by flash flood	0 = no, 1 = yes	1.13	0.560
Affected by storm	0 = no, 1 = yes	1.30	0.504
Affected by cold spell	0 = no, 1 = yes	−1.13	0.671
Affected by hot spell	0 = no, 1 = yes	5.10	0.009

Household size generated no significant influence (*p*-value = 0.116) on the length of recovery time (Table 4), likely because the size of surveyed households was mostly uniform at four members; therefore, there were not enough data on different family sizes to return a significant value. The absence or presence of remittance was also not significant (*p*-value = 0.501). Among different extreme weather events, drought and hot spells substantially extended the length of recovery time (Table 4). The two events were likely associated with the El Niño drought in 2014–16. The impact of flooding was also significant (*p*-value = 0.000), although its effect might be confounded with those from storm and flash flood. The impact likely relates to a series of tropical storms that fell on Central Vietnam in 2017 and 2018.

As indicated in the survey data, the affected households in the commune had no disaster insurance and only 7% of them received technical assistance from agricultural extension agencies following the disasters. The key interviews revealed that financial or other support, such as food distribution, for the affected households could in fact be withdrawn from public funds such as village or communal funds. However, only few among the affected households received these funds, likely because of passive follow up both from households and local authorities. For example, only 20% of affected households received support from village funds. The key interviews also brought up the fact that non-governmental or civil society organisations typically intervened after severe disasters only, such as the extended El Niño-related drought in 2015–16. The Youth Union, one civil society organisation, sometimes provided other types of assistance such as helping to clear up farms and houses after storms or floods.

3.4. Policy Measures Addressing the Socio-Cultural Impacts

For the investigation of policy measures, we excluded three impacts of non-farm activities considered desirable, namely, the possible increase in bargaining power and prestige of men and broadened or strengthened relationships between rural households and people or organisations in power. The NRD policies have some measures that can potentially mitigate some impacts relating to social bridging and individual or public safety (Table A1), but not to social bonding and preservation of local culture. The measures basically consist of two types:

- Measures to strengthen social security programs that can potentially reduce social tension and crimes driven by widening economic gaps between poor and better-off households or between ethnic minority and majority groups. The social security programs intend to provide social, health, and unemployment insurance especially for poor and disadvantaged people. However, the policies provide no elaboration on concrete social security programs, associated targets, and indicators.
- Measures to issue village regulations on social order and security that can potentially anticipate or mitigate social crimes driven by tourism activities or widening economic gaps between community groups.

For the poverty reduction policies, the majority of measures in the policies were not relevant to the reported socio-cultural impacts except the measure to build cultural houses at village and commune levels. Such measures can, to some extent, help increase the attention from young migrants to preserving local cultures.

On the other hand, the reviewed social policies had more measures to address the reported socio-cultural impacts (Table A2). The measures basically consist of four types:

- Measures to strengthen social service provision centres and associates at grassroots levels can potentially reduce risks that relate to social bonding, such as family conflict or divorce, and social bridging, including increasing social tension and crime driven by widening economic gaps between community groups. The social service provision centres were expected to help address challenges faced by rural households especially the poor, marginalised, and disadvantaged people through initiatives such as vocational training or counselling to enable them to be more self-reliant and better integrated in society.
- Measures to provide prevention and response services for gender-based violence are relevant for anticipating or reducing the impact of poor treatment, sexual harassment, and domestic violence at migration sites, especially for female migrants.
- Measures to support rural households affected by disaster through providing food, financial or in-kind support which can potentially reduce the risks faced by households with migrants after extreme weather events.
- Measures to facilitate the transfer of skills and know-how by traditional artists to young generations can help preserve local cultures.

4. Discussion

4.1. *Feminisation of Agriculture in the Five Key Socio-Cultural Aspects*

In this study, we have not neglected the issue of the feminisation of agriculture, yet we considered its social rather than economic aspects. For example, in relation to social bonding, the long absences of men may impact cohesiveness within families, bringing about an intense feeling of longing or anxiety from both the women who stayed behind and the men who migrated. Moreover, pressure on male migrants driven by the expectation that they must be financially successful can also affect intra-household relationships. Regarding social bridging, a desirable impact may occur, namely an increase in the prestige and bargaining power of male migrants in the community because of a substantial non-farm income that they impart on their family. Informal key interviews during our study revealed another possible impact of male migration on social bridging; the relationship between women who stay behind and their or their husband's relatives or neighbours can be affected because of the women's increased dependency on them for labour or household decision-making. In terms of social linking, migration can allow men to build new connections with people or organisations in power. The feminisation issue has, however, been more recently debunked with a more nuanced understanding of both migrant and staying family members' perspectives and decision-making. For example, [38] found no strong evidence of such feminisation issues among households with male labour migrants in Ha Tinh province. The study supported the critique by [85,86] that the feminisation approach "tends to view women as one unified category, generalizes gendered trends, and overlooks diversity among women". In addition, the study emphasised that the absence of male

labour could increase women's control over agricultural management, particularly in contexts where gender norms are relatively relaxed.

4.2. The Insignificant Role of Remittance to Recovery Time

In the study case from Ha Tinh province, receiving remittance provided no significant contribution to shortening the post-disaster recovery time of households with migrants despite the limited availability of public and private support. This is surprising because in many cases across developing countries, including other areas in Vietnam, rural households receiving remittance have generally been more resilient to natural disasters than those without through better housing, saving, or access to emergency information before, during, and after disasters [87–90]. This trend has mainly been identified in disaster-prone areas under the absence of reliable social security systems [88]. This finding in the case study also seems to be contradictory with additional information obtained from the key interviews highlighting that households with remittance in Ky Son commune usually had better financial capacity post disaster to afford basic needs, such as food, education, medical services or house reparation, than those without. Furthermore, many remittance-receiving households in the commune invested in perennial crop systems such as forest plantations that were likely more resistant to extreme weather events than annual crop systems.

The definition of recovery time used in [56] might partially explain the unfamiliar finding from the Ha Tinh province. The study included time needed for clearing up agricultural farms or forest stands from crop and other debris and time span until the first harvest of reconstructed crop systems. In that case, the recovery times of households with and without remittance could be comparable because extreme weather events such as the extended El Niño drought in 2014–2016 and the tropical storms and resulting heavy floods that fell on Central Vietnam in 2017–2018 were capable of demolishing both perennial and annual crop systems. Under such circumstances, the affected households with perennial crop systems, with a limited fraction of remittance to reconstruct farm plots, might even need more time to clear up the damaged plots and collect the first harvest than those with annual crop systems. In the literature, the important role of remittance during and following natural disasters mainly relates to its use for affording basic needs such as food and it is evident that, in that specific context, remittance-receiving households are more resilient and can recover more quickly than those without remittance. Under such context, a similar case was also found in the Ky Anh commune.

4.3. The Need of Amendment and Strengthened Synergy among Policies

Some studies in the literature implied that the current rural development or poverty reduction policies in Vietnam have not sufficiently accounted for the critical role of socio-cultural factors such as social capital or local culture in rural development [58–60]. However, the studies provided no detailed explanation on how the policy investigation was conducted. In our study, the exposition of the category, amount, and measures of the reviewed policies clearly unveils the lack of measure in the two categories of policy that address socio-cultural impacts of non-fam activities. Therefore, an amendment of the rural development and poverty reduction policies for an implementation beyond 2020 is necessary to ensure sustainable rural development in Vietnam.

A strengthened synergy in implementation with the other categories of policies such as social policies might also be an option. However, this clearly needs a solid horizontal coordination among state agencies at national and sub-national levels to ensure an integration of the social policies' targets, measures, and budget in the implementation of rural development and poverty reduction policies. In fact, an effort to create a synergy among different categories of public policies has been initiated by the Vietnamese government. Since 2014, the government has commissioned a study to develop a methodological framework for integrating, e.g., social policies into socio-economic development programmes to achieve a more sustainable development. The rural development, poverty reduction, and social policies, like other development policies in Vietnam, are reformulated every five

years. The reformulation process provides an excellent opportunity to reinforce efforts in strengthening synergy among policies, both in formulation and implementation, with or without a need of adapting the government structure.

The study case from Ha Tinh province also indicates the need for improving the effectiveness of policy implementation at the grassroots level. For example, the social policies had relevant measures to mitigate post-disaster impacts on affected households through provision of food, cash, financial support for house reparation, or financial or in-kind support for recovery in general. However, in Ky Son commune, only a limited number of households could access and benefit from such support. This calls for a better mechanism for monitoring and evaluating policy implementation at the grassroots level. Studies also show that some financial or in-kind support for poor and disadvantaged groups have unexpectedly widened the gap between poor and better-off households, due to unequal access to support [91–94]. This calls for a careful assessment of policy intentions and results. More work is also needed to assess and generate reliable disaster loss and damage data, to plan for faster recovery and proactive measures.

4.4. Caveats in Data Availability and Analyses Used in the Case Studies

The case study in the South Central Coast region of Vietnam has exposed a range of socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities that were previously absent from the literature, such as the risk of increasing social crime driven by tourism activities and the widening economic gap between poor and better-off households, and the risk of losing local culture, customs, and traditional handicraft villages due to a lack of attention, especially from young migrants. In addition, the farmers and local authorities involved in the FGDs helped identify solutions that they considered feasible for anticipating or mitigating the impacts. However, the discussions only involved male farmers which restricted the investigation into gendered perspectives of undesirable impacts. Furthermore, segregating farmers into different groups based upon the types of non-farm activities that they assume can generate useful information for developing more specific measures to address the undesirable impacts. These two missing aspects should be considered in future studies.

In the other case study, the current data analysis by [56] and additional information from the key interviews clearly demonstrated the extra risk faced by rural households with migrants during and following extreme weather events. However, due to the limited resource of the project, only 106 households which constitute about 5% of the total population in the Ky Anh commune were involved in the household survey [56]. A further analysis to investigate the role of remittance on household post-disaster recovery time is also necessary. First, for each household, the recovery time should be identified for each land use type that the household was managing. The multivariate regression analysis must eventually incorporate land attributes such as land size, distance from home, and main crop species, and household capital such as the average age of family members who stayed behind and the gender composition among family members, should be included. This more refined analysis is necessary because the insignificant contribution of remittance to recovery time as shown by the current analysis is likely a confounding effect of these various factors. Second, a more thorough understanding on the role of remittance to recovery time can be obtained through investigating the effect of magnitude instead of presence of remittance, under the presence of other factors considered in the analysis.

5. Conclusions

The literature review in this study identified ten different socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities in rural areas of Vietnam. Among those impacts, increasing social tension driven by the widening economic gap between poor and better-off households or ethnic minority and majority groups was the most reported.

The two case studies add a range of additional impacts. In the Quang Nam province, South Central Coast region of Vietnam, local communities experienced an increasing risk of public insecurity and losing local culture because of tourism activities and increasing

number of young migrants, respectively. The tourism activities have brought about additional income for some groups of people in the commune and at the same time brought more “strangers” to the commune. To anticipate social crimes, the community members identified the need of strengthening the commune’s security while continuing to promote local tourism and local products. The lack of attention from young migrants has led to the risk of losing local culture, including handicraft villages. The local government was expected to facilitate young people to access or create local non-farm opportunities.

The case study from Ha Tinh, a disaster-prone province in the North Central Coast of Vietnam, exposes the impact of migration, especially by young people, on the safety of their family farms during and following extreme weather events. Their absence could lead to a life-threatening risk because their families who stayed behind in the rural areas lacked assistance to prepare and recover from disasters. The study also revealed that, following the disaster events, the households with migrants had a longer recovery time as compared to those without migrants because of the lack of readily and available hands and limited fraction of remittance that can be used to reconstruct farm plots.

The new rural development and poverty reduction policies that were enacted in the past two decades (2000–2020) had limited measures that address socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities. The former has some measures only for impacts associated with social bridging and individual or public safety, but not social bonding and preservation of local culture. The latter has one measure for impacts associated with the preservation of local culture. Therefore, an amendment of the two categories of policies for an implementation beyond 2020 is necessary. A strengthened synergy in implementation with other categories of policy such as social policies might be an option, but it needs a solid horizontal coordination among state agencies at all levels to ensure an integration of the social policies’ targets, measures, and budget in the implementation of rural development and poverty reduction policies.

The synthesis of socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities provided by this paper and the investigation of policy measures that address the impacts can increase awareness and reinforce efforts for a more sustainable rural development in Vietnam.

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation, R.M., E.S. and M.J.; methodology, R.M. and E.S.; software, R.M. and E.S.; validation, R.M., E.S. and T.Q.N.; formal analysis, R.M., E.S. and T.Q.N.; investigation, R.M., E.S. and T.Q.N.; resources, E.S. and M.J.; data curation, R.M., E.S., T.Q.N. and M.J.; writing—original draft preparation, R.M.; writing—review and editing, E.S., T.Q.N. and M.J.; visualisation, supervision, M.J.; project administration, E.S. and M.J.; funding acquisition, E.S. and M.J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation (SIDA) through the AgriFoSe2030 project under Theme 1 on “Social and economic dimensions of smallholder agriculture” led by the Lund University (Lund, Sweden), the CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA), on Policies, Institutions and Markets (PIM), and on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). The APC was funded by the AgriFoSe2030 project.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The survey data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: We sincerely thank the provincial authorities, especially Song Thanh Natural Reserve of Quang Nam province as a co-organiser of the focus group discussions. A sincere gratitude is also addressed to all participants who attended the discussions. We also thank Toan Thi Nguyen, Hoa Thi Vuong, Viet Quoc Hoang, Trang Thu Le, and Nia Thi Lo for their hard work collecting data through the household survey in Ha Tinh province, as well as local authorities who co-organised the survey and farmers who allocated their time to participate in the survey. We are grateful for Hanna North and anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedbacks to the content of the paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Measures in new rural development policies to address the socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities.

Relevant Measures and Targets in the Policies *			
No	Impacts	Policies for 2010–2020 (Decision No. 800/2010/QD-TTg)	Policies for 2016–2020 (Decision No. 1600/2016/QD-TTg)
Social bonding			
1	Risk of family conflict or divorce	- (no related measure)	-
2	Intense longing or anxiety in households who stay behind in rural areas and/or migrant family members	-	-
3	Pressure because of the strong expectation that migrants must be financially successful	-	-
4	Risk of disharmony within a family when women become the family's breadwinner	-	-
Social bridging			
5	Affected relationship between female migrants and others in the community or neighbours because of false accusations or negative rumours	-	-
6	Social tension within rural communities driven by a widening economic gap	Reduce poverty and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs (sub-measure 3). No target indicator provided.	Reduce poverty and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs at village and commune levels (sub-measure 2). No target indicator provided.
Individual or public safety			
7	Increasing social crimes in the villages driven by tourism activities	Strengthen social security and the order of rural society (measure 11) through issuing village regulations on social order and security and prevent social crimes (sub-measure 1) and strengthen local security forces (sub-measure 2). Target indicator: 85% of rural communes maintain good security and social order by 2015 and 95% by 2020.	Strengthen national and rural social security and order (measure 10) through fighting, preventing, and controlling crime and social vices, and maintaining the safety, security, and social order of rural society (sub-measure 1). Target indicator: 98% of the communes maintain good security and social order by 2020.
8	Increasing social crimes driven by widening economic gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement poverty reduction programs and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs (sub-measure 3). No target indicator provided. • Strengthen social security and the order of rural society (measure 11) through issuing village regulations on social order and security and prevent social crimes (sub-measure 1) and strengthen local security forces (sub-measure 2). Target indicator: 85% of rural communes maintain good security and social order by 2015 and 95% by 2020. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement poverty reduction programs and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs at village and commune levels (sub-measure 2). No target indicator provided. • Strengthen national and rural social security and order (measure 10) through fighting, preventing, and controlling crimes, and social vices, and maintain the safety, security, and social order of rural society (sub-measure 1). Target indicator: 98% of the communes maintain good security and social order by 2020.
9	Especially for women, the risk of poor treatment, sexual harassment, and domestic violence at migration sites	-	-

Table A1. Cont.

No	Impacts	Relevant Measures and Targets in the Policies *	
		Policies for 2010–2020 (Decision No. 800/2010/QD-TTg)	Policies for 2016–2020 (Decision No. 1600/2016/QD-TTg)
10	Extra risks during extreme weather events faced by households with migrants	Implement poverty reduction programs and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs (sub-measure 3). No target indicator provided.	Implement poverty reduction programs and strengthen social security (measure 4) through strengthening social security programs at village and commune levels (sub-measure 2). No target indicator provided.
	Preservation of local culture		
11	Less attention to preservation of local cultures and customs	-	-

* Each new rural development policy has several key measures, and each measure has several sub-measures. Target indicators were formulated for some sub-measures. In this table, we present relevant measures, sub-measures, and, if available, target indicators.

Table A2. Measures in social policies that address the socio-cultural impacts of non-farm activities.

No	Impacts	Relevant Measures in the Policies
	Social bonding	
1	Risk of family conflict or divorce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop grassroots-level networks of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg). Improve communication on family development and anti-domestic violence, focusing on men; increase awareness and build capacity for family members, including knowledge and skills on improving intra-family relationships; establish a network of family service provision systems (Decision No. 629/2012/QD-TTg). Develop a child protection system (Decision No. 647/QD-TTg).
2	Intense longing or anxiety in households who stay behind in rural areas and/or migrant family members	Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg).
3	Pressure because of a strong expectation that migrants must be financially successful	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg). Improve communication on family development and anti-domestic violence, focusing on men; increase awareness and build capacity for family members, including knowledge and skills on improving intra-family relationships; establish a network of family service provision systems (Decision No. 629/2012/QD-TTg).
4	Risk of disharmony within a family when women be-come the family's breadwinner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg). Improve communication on family development and anti-domestic violence, focusing on men; increase awareness and build capacity for family members, including knowledge and skills on improving intra-family relationships; establish a network of family service provision systems (Decision No. 629/2012/QD-TTg).
	Social bridging	
5	Affected relationships be-tween female migrants and others in the community or neighbours because of a false accusation or negative rumours	Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg).

Table A2. Cont.

No	Impacts	Relevant Measures in the Policies
6	Social tension within rural communities driven by a widening economic gap	Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg).
	Individual or public safety	
7	Increasing social crimes in the villages driven by tourism activities	-
8	Increasing social crimes driven by widening economic gaps	Strengthen and develop the network of grassroots-level social assistance centres (Decision No. 524/2015/QD-TTg).
9	Especially for women, risk of poor treatment, sexual harassment, and domestic violence at migration sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a grassroots-level network of social service provision centres and associates; develop a code of conduct and provide capacity development for (grassroots-level) social workers (Decision No. 32/2010/QD-TTg). Provide a prevention and response service addressing gender-based violence (Decision No. 565/2017/QD-TTg).
10	Extra risks during extreme weather events faced by households with migrants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a child protection system (Decision No. 647/QD-TTg). Strengthen and develop a network of grassroots-level social assistance centres (Decision No. 524/2015/QD-TTg). Provide food for up to three months for those who lack food due to (natural) disasters or other reasons; provide cash for people injured or killed by disasters; provide financial support for (re)constructing houses due to disasters; provide (financial and/or in-kind) support for recovery from disasters (Decree No. 136/2013/ND-CP).
	Preservation of local culture	
11	Less attention to the preservation of local cultures and customs	Facilitate the transfer of skills and knowledge by (traditional) artists to young generations (Decision No. 1781/2012/QD-TTg).

References

- Briones, R.M. *Transformation and Diversification of the Rural Economy in Asia*; International Fund for Agricultural Development: Rome, Italy, 2017; ISBN 9789290727941.
- Tarp, F. Viet Nam: Setting the scene. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 1–25.
- Berdegúe, J.A.; Rosada, T.; Bebbington, A.J. The rural transformation. In *International Development: Ideas, Experience, and Prospects*; Currie-Alder, B., Kanbur, R., Malone, D., Medhora, R., Eds.; Oxford Scholarship: Oxford, UK, 2014; ISBN 9780199671656.
- IFAD. *Chapter 2: Structural and Rural Transformation in Asia and the Pacific*; IFAD: Rome, Italy, 2016.
- Imai, K.S.; Bresciani, F. *Remittances, Growth and Poverty Reduction in Asia: A Critical Review of the Literature and New Evidence from Cross-Country Panel Data*; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD): Rome, Italy, 2017.
- Christiaensen, L.; Todo, Y. Poverty reduction during the rural-urban transformation: The role of the missing middle. *World Dev.* **2014**, *63*, 43–58. [[CrossRef](#)]
- World Bank. *Migration and Remittances: Recent Developments and Outlook*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2019.
- ADB; World Bank. *Migration and Remittances for Development in Asia*; Asian Development Bank: Manila, The Philippines; World Bank Group: Washington, DC, USA, 2018; ISBN 978-92-9261-129-3.
- Haggblade, S.; Hazell, P.; Reardon, T. The rural non-farm economy: Prospects for growth and poverty reduction. *World Dev.* **2010**, *38*, 1429–1441. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Reardon, T.; Berdegúe, J.; Barrett, C.B.; Forthcoming, K.S.; Haggblade, S.; Hazell, P. Household income diversification into rural nonfarm activities. In *Transforming the Rural Nonfarm Economy*; Haggblade, S., Hazell, P., Reardon, T., Eds.; Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD, USA, 2006; p. 34.
- Ellis, F. The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *J. Agric. Econ.* **2000**, *51*, 289–302. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mulyoutami, E.; Lusiana, B.; Van Noordwijk, M. Gendered migration and agroforestry in Indonesia: Livelihoods, labor, know-how, networks. *Land* **2020**, *9*, 529. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Bacud, E.S.; Puskur, R.; Duyen, T.N.; Sander, B.O.; Luis, J. Rural outmigration-feminization-agricultural production nexus: Case of Vietnam. *Migr. Dev.* **2019**. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Slavchevska, V.; Doss, C.; Mane, E.; Kaaria, S.; Kar, A.; Villa, V. *Rural Outmigration and the Gendered Patterns of Agricultural Labor in Nepal*; IFPRI Discussion Paper 1981; International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI): Washington, DC, USA, 2020.

15. Deshingkar, P. *Internal Migration, Poverty and Development in Asia, Session 3: Realising the Potential for Poverty Reduction Parallel Group 3A: Topic Paper 2*; Institute of Development Studies and Overseas Development Institute: London, UK, 2006.
16. Gioli, G.; Khan, T.; Bisht, S.; Scheffran, J. Migration as an adaptation strategy and its gendered implications: A case study from the Upper Indus Basin. *Mt. Res. Dev.* **2014**, *34*, 255–265. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Roy, A.; Basu, S. Determinants of livelihood diversification under environmental change in coastal community of Bangladesh. *Asia. Pac. J. Rural Dev.* **2020**, *30*, 7–26. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Le, L.H.; Le, T.N. Determinants of income diversification among rural households in the Mekong River Delta: The economic transition period. *J. Asian Financ. Econ. Bus.* **2020**, *7*, 291–304. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Barrett, C.B.; Bezuneh, M.; Aboud, A. Income diversification, poverty traps and policy shocks in Côte d’Ivoire and Kenya. *Food Policy* **2001**, *26*, 367–384. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Losch, B.; Freguin-Gresh, S.; White, E.T. *Structural Transformation and Rural Change Revisited: Challenges for Late Developing Countries in a Globalizing World*; The World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2012.
21. Cazzuffi, C.; McKay, A.; Perge, E. Commercialization in agriculture, 2006–2014. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 68–90.
22. Narciso, G. Labour and migration. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarps, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 139–157.
23. Newman, C.; Kinghan, C. *Economic Transformation and the Diversification of Livelihoods in Rural Viet Nam*; World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER): Helsinki, Finland, 2015.
24. Benedikter, S.; Waibel, G.; Birtel, S.; Bui, T.C.; Be, T.T. *Local Entrepreneurship in Vietnam’s Rural Transformation. A Case Study from the Mekong Delta*; WISDOM—A German Vietnamese Initiative: Bonn, Germany, 2013.
25. Brünjes, J.; Revilla Diez, J. Obtaining non-farm wage employment in rural Vietnam. *Asia Pac. Viewp.* **2016**, *57*, 263–279. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Ong, B.; Chuong, N.; Thi, N.; Thao, P.; Le, T.; Ha, Y. *Rural Livelihood Diversification in the South Central Coast of Vietnam*; University of Da Nang, College of Economics: Da Nang, Vietnam, 2014.
27. Ellis, F. *Rural Livelihood Diversity in Developing Countries: Evidence and Policy Implications*; Natural Resource Perspectives, ODI (NRP): London, UK, 1999; Volume 40.
28. Briones, R.; Felipe, J. *Agriculture and Structural Transformation in Developing Asia: Review and Outlook*; Asian Development Bank: Manila, Philippines, 2013.
29. Mulia, R. *Rural Transformation and Economy in Viet Nam: Progress in Eradicating Poverty, Hunger and Malnutrition*; Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences: Uppsala, Sweden, 2019.
30. Rosegrant, M.W.; Hazell, P.B.R. *Transforming the Rural Asian Economy: The Unfinished Revolution*; Oxford University Press: Hongkong, China, 2000.
31. Le, T.N. *Activity and Income Diversification: Trends, Determinants and Effects on Poverty Reduction: The Case of the Mekong River*; Erasmus University: Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2010.
32. Le, X.B.; Nguyen, M.H.; Tran, T.T.; Vu, X.N.H.; Luu, D.K. *Factors Affecting the Process of Restructuring Rural Labor in Vietnam*; Institute for Policy and Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development (IPSARD): Hanoi, Vietnam, 2006.
33. World Bank. *Transforming Vietnamese Agriculture: Gaining More from Less*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2016.
34. Khai, L.D.; Kinghan, C.; Newman, C.; Talbot, T. *Non-Farm Income, Diversification and Welfare: Evidence from Rural Vietnam*; Central Institute for Economic Management (CIEM): Hanoi, Vietnam, 2013.
35. Hoang, T.X.; Pham, C.S.; Ulubaşoğlu, M.A. Non-farm activity, household expenditure, and poverty reduction in rural Vietnam: 2002–2008. *World Dev.* **2014**, *64*, 554–568. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Pham, H.T.; Tuan, B.A.; Le Thanh, D. *Is nonfarm diversification a way out of poverty for rural households? Evidence from Vietnam in 1993–2006*; PEP Working Paper serie 2010-17; Poverty and Economic Policy Research Network: Manila, the Philippines, 2010.
37. Hoang, X.T.; Dang, N.A.; Tacoli, C. *Livelihood Diversification and Rural-Urban Linkages in Vietnam’s Red River Delta*; FCND Discussion Paper; IFPRI—International Food Policy Research Institute: Washington, DC, USA, 2005; 56p.
38. Kawarazuka, N.; Duong, T.M.; Simelton, E. Gender, labor migration and changes in small-scale farming on Vietnam’s north-central coast. *Crit. Asian Stud.* **2020**, *52*, 550–564. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Beck, U. Local transformation. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 51–67.
40. Kinghan, C.; Newman, C. The rural non-farm economy. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 91–114.
41. OECD. *Agricultural Policies in Viet Nam 2015*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2015.
42. FAO. *Forests and Agriculture: Land-Use Challenges and Opportunities State of the World’s Forests*; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2016.
43. OECD. *Overview of Household Wealth Statistics*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2013.
44. OECD. *Social Impact Measurement for Social Enterprises: Policies for Social Entrepreneurship*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2015.
45. Markussen, T. Social and political capital. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017.
46. OECD. *Guidance on Sustainability Impact Assessment*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2010.
47. Hoang, B.T. *Rural Employment and Life: Challenges to Gender Roles in Vietnam’s Agriculture at Present*; Research Centre for Gender, Family and Environment in Development: Hanoi, Vietnam, 2009.

48. Baada, J.N.; Najjar, D. A review of the effects of migration on the feminization of agrarian dryland economies. *J. Agric. Genet. Food Secur.* **2020**, *5*, 1–12.
49. Pattnaik, I.; Lahiri-Dutt, K.; Lockie, S.; Pritchard, B. The feminization of agriculture or the feminization of agrarian distress? Tracking the trajectory of women in agriculture in India. *J. Asia Pacific Econ.* **2018**, *23*, 138–155. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Zuo, J. Feminization of agriculture, relational exchange, and perceived fairness in China: A case in Guangxi Province. *Rural Sociol.* **2004**, *69*, 510–531. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Le, V.K. Greening Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Evaluating Environmental Policy in Viet Nam. Ph.D. Thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands, 2006.
52. Tarp, F.; McKay, A. Welfare dynamics: 2006–2014. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 205–221.
53. Tarp, F. Lessons learnt and policy implications. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 279–293.
54. World Bank; MPI. *Viet Nam 2035: Toward Prosperity, Creativity, Equity, and Democracy*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2016.
55. Catacutan, D.C.; Do, T.H.; Simelton, E.; Hanh, V.T.; Hoang, T.L.; Patton, I.; Hairiah, K.; Le, T.T.; van Noordwijk, M.; Nguyen, M.P.; et al. *Assessment of the Livelihoods and Ecological Conditions of Bufferzone Communes in Song Thanh National Reserve, Quang Nam Province, and Phong Dien Natural Reserve, Thua Thien Hue Province*; World Agroforestry (ICRAF): Hanoi, Vietnam, 2017.
56. Simelton, E.; Duong, T.M.; Houzer, E. When the “strong arms” leave the farms—Migration, gender roles and risk reduction in Vietnam. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 4081. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. UNESCO. Sustainable Development. Available online: <https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/what-is-esd/sd> (accessed on 27 March 2021).
58. Truong, X.T. Regarding Rural Development and the Role of Culture in Rural Development in Vietnam. Available online: https://www.tapchiconsan.org.vn/web/english/economy/detail/-/asset_publisher/mqd1ARxqSOBp/content/regarding-rural-development-and-the-role-of-culture-in-rural-development-in-vietnam (accessed on 27 July 2021).
59. Thi Tuong Anh, N.; Quynh Anh, T. Social capital in rural areas of Vietnam and its impact on households’ life satisfaction. *J. Econ. Dev.* **2015**, *17*, 61. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Vo, T.T. *Social Capital and Household Vulnerability—New Evidence from Rural Vietnam*; WIDER Working Paper 2018/167; World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER): Helsinki, Finland, 2018.
61. Claridge, T. *Functions of Social Capital—Bonding, Bridging, Linking*; Social Capital Research and Training: Dunedin, New Zealand, 2018.
62. Claridge, T. Solving Sustainability with Social Capital? A Paradoxical Reframing of Modernity? Available online: <https://www.socialcapitalresearch.com/solving-sustainability-with-social-capital/> (accessed on 5 August 2021).
63. Dale, A.; Newman, L. Social capital: A necessary and sufficient condition for sustainable community development? *Community Dev. J.* **2010**, *45*, 5–21. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Brennan, M. Importance of Incorporating Local Culture into Community Development. Available online: <https://extension.psu.edu/importance-of-incorporating-local-culture-into-community-development> (accessed on 12 April 2021).
65. Duxbury, N.; Hosagrahar, J.; Pascual, J. *Why Must Culture Be at the Heart of Sustainable Urban Development?* The Committee on Culture: Buenos Aires, Argentina; Mexico City, Mexico, 2016.
66. Mai, T.; Samsura, D.; van der Krabben, E. Land conversion for tourism development under Vietnam’s ambiguous property rights over land. *Land* **2020**, *9*, 204. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Nguyen, T.T. Conversion of land use and household livelihoods in Vietnam: A study in Nghe An. *Open Agric.* **2021**, *6*, 82–92. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Do, N.K. The Impact of Non-Farm Diversification Activities on Economic Well-Being in Rural Vietnam: A Propensity Score Matching Approach. *Res. Glob. Gov.* **2018**, *3*, 17.
69. Imai, K.S.; Gaiha, R.; Thapa, G. Does non-farm sector employment reduce rural poverty and vulnerability? Evidence from Vietnam and India. *J. Asian Econ.* **2015**, *36*, 47–61. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. Nguyen, D.; Lebaillly, P. Evolution of livelihood strategy and income of the households in the Coastal Sandy Area of the Central Region, Vietnam—The case of Thua Thien Hue province during period 2003–2008. In Proceedings of the 2011 ASAE 7th International Conference, Hanoi, Vietnam, 13–15 October 2011.
71. Pham, B.D.; Thanh, P.T.; Ancev, T. Impacts of off-farm employment on welfare, food security and poverty: Evidence from rural Vietnam. *Int. J. Soc. Welf.* **2020**, *30*, 84–96. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Tran, T.Q. *A Review on the Link between Nonfarm Activities, Land and Rural Livelihoods in Vietnam and Developing Countries*; Faculty of Political Economy, University of Economics and Business, Vietnam National University: Hanoi, Vietnam, 2012.
73. Tran, T.; Nguyen, N. Determinants of income diversification and its effects on household income in rural Vietnam. *JED* **2014**, *221*, 20–41.
74. Singhal, S.; Beck, U. Ethnic disadvantage: Evidence using panel data. In *Growth, Structural Transformation, and Rural Change in Viet Nam: A Rising Dragon on the Move*; Tarp, F., Ed.; Oxford University Press: Helsinki, Finland, 2017; pp. 256–275.
75. Nguyen, C.V.; Tran, T.Q.; Van Vu, H. Ethnic minorities in Northern mountains of Vietnam: Employment, poverty and income. *Soc. Indic. Res.* **2017**, *134*, 93–115. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Tuyen, T.Q. Income sources and inequality among ethnic minorities in the Northwest region, Vietnam. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* **2016**, *18*, 1239–1254. [[CrossRef](#)]

77. Santarelli, E.; Tran, H.T. The interplay of human and social capital in shaping entrepreneurial performance: The case of Vietnam. *Small Bus. Econ.* **2013**, *40*, 435–458. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Nguyen, H.C.; Nordman, C.J. Household entrepreneurship and social networks: Panel data evidence from Vietnam. *J. Dev. Stud.* **2018**, *54*, 594–618. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Kinghan, C.; Newman, C. *Social Capital, Political Connections, and Household Enterprises: Evidence from Vietnam*; World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER): Helsinki, Finland, 2015.
80. Gallup, J.L. *The Wage Labor Market and Inequality in Vietnam in the 1990s*; The World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2002.
81. Cao, T.C.V.; Akita, T. *Urban and Rural Dimensions of Income Inequality in Vietnam*; GSIR Working Papers; Economic Development & Policy Series; International University of Japan: Niigata, Japan, 2008.
82. Van De Walle, D.; Cratty, D. *Is the Emerging Nonfarm Market Economy the Route out of Poverty in Vietnam*; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2003.
83. Development Analysis Network. *Off-Farm and Non-Farm Employment in Southeast Asian Transitional Economies and Thailand*; Development Analysis Network: Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 2003.
84. Jirstrom, M.; Rundquist, F.-M.; Nasrin, S.; Holmquist, B.; Shlyk, A.; Chin, D.; Chi, T.; Lan, L.; Tan, J.-F.T. Changes in diversification profiles and its impacts on total income among rice farming households in the Mekong and Red River Deltas in Vietnam 1999–2005. In *Statistical Aspects of Modeling Panel Data Originating from Smallholder Household Surveys in Sub-Saharan Africa and Vietnam*; Nasrin, S., Ed.; Lund University: Lund, Sweden, 2014.
85. Chant, S. Re-thinking the “feminization of poverty” in relation to aggregate gender indices. *J. Hum. Dev.* **2006**, *7*, 201–220. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Bieri, S. New ruralities—Old gender dynamics? A reflection high-value crop agriculture in the light of the feminisation debates. *Geogr. Helv.* **2014**, *69*, 281–290. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Thompson, L. Financial Remittances—A Tool for Development? Available online: <https://www.iom.int/oped/financial-remittances-tool-development> (accessed on 2 August 2021).
88. La, H.A.; Xu, Y. Remittances, social security, and the crowding-out effect: Evidence from Vietnam. *J. Asian Econ.* **2017**, *49*, 42–59. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Mohapatra, S.; Joseph, G.; Ratha, D. Remittances and natural disasters ex-post response and contribution to ex-ante preparedness. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* **2012**, *14*, 365–387. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Pant, B. Remittance Inflows: Risks and Realities. Available online: <https://thehimalayantimes.com/opinion/remittance-inflows-risks-realities/> (accessed on 15 May 2021).
91. Nguyen, Q. *Forest Devolution in Vietnam: Pattern of Differentiation in Benefits Among Local Households*; Humboldt University of Berlin: Berlin, Germany, 2004.
92. Nguyen, Q. *What Benefits and for Whom? Effects of Devolution of Forest Management in Dak Lak, Vietnam*; Shaker Verlag GmbH: Berlin, Germany, 2005; ISBN 978-3832239053.
93. Nguyen, H.; Tran, Q. Enhancing people’s living standards in the process of industrialization and modernization in Vietnam: Achievements and challenges. *VNU Sci. J. Econ. Bus.* **2014**, *1*, 30–38.
94. Tran, T.; Nguyen, T. Factors influencing off-farm employment availability in rural Hanoi city. *Sci. Dev. J.* **2014**, *12*, 829–835.