

## **Natural resource extraction and ethnic inequality in Dak Lak, Vietnam**

Sina Bierkamp<sup>1</sup>\*, Trung Thanh Nguyen<sup>1</sup>, Ulrike Grote<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Environmental Economics and World Trade, Leibniz University Hannover,  
Hannover, Germany

\* Corresponding author. E-mail: [bierkamp@iuw.uni-hannover.de](mailto:bierkamp@iuw.uni-hannover.de)

## **ONLINE APPENDIX**

**Table A1.** Overview of surveyed districts and communes

District	Commune	Number of household observations	Per cent
<b>Buôn Ma Thuột</b>	Hòa Thuận	50	2.44
	Hòa Thắng	52	2.53
	Hòa Xuân	58	2.83
<b>Ea Hleo</b>	Ea Hleo	48	2.34
	Cư Mót	52	2.53
<b>Ea Súp</b>	Ea Lê	45	2.19
<b>Krông Năng</b>	ĐLiê Ya	47	2.29
	Tam Giang	56	2.73
<b>Krông Búk</b>	Cư Né	55	2.68
	Pong Drang	59	2.87
	Ea Blang	58	2.83
	Bình Thuận	60	2.92
<b>Buôn Đôn</b>	Ea Wer	53	2.58
	Ea Nuôl	58	2.83
<b>Cư Mgar</b>	Cư Dliê Mnông	57	2.78
	Ea Kpam	59	2.87
	Ea DRong	57	2.78
	Cuor Đăng	46	2.24
<b>Ea Kar</b>	Cư Huê	55	2.68
	Ea Kmút	55	2.68
	Cư Bông / Cu Elang	57	2.78
<b>MĐrăk</b>	Krông Jing	56	2.73
	Ea Trang	52	2.53
<b>Krông Pắc</b>	Ea Kly	54	2.63
	Ea Knuec	55	2.68
	Hòa An	54	2.63
	Hoà Đông	55	2.68
	Hòa Tién	60	2.92
	Vụ Bồn	45	2.19
<b>Krông A Na</b>	Cư Ê Wi	55	2.68
	Ea Tiêu	55	2.68
	Dray Sáp	53	2.58
	Ea Bông	48	2.34
	Dur KMăl	52	2.53
<b>Krông Bông</b>	Hòa Tân	60	2.92
	Khuê Ngọc Diên	58	2.83
<b>Lăk</b>	Đăk Liêng	58	2.83
	Ea RBin	52	2.53
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,053</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table A2.** Overview of ethnic groups in the sample

	Number of household observations	Per cent
<b>Ethnic majority (n=1,292)</b>		
<b>Kinh</b>	1,289	62.79
<b>Hoa</b>	3	3.31
<b>Ethnic minorities (n=761)</b>		
<i>Indigenous</i>		
<b>Ede</b>	493	24.01
<b>Mnong</b>	43	2.09
<i>Immigrated</i>		
<b>Tay</b>	68	3.31
<b>Thai</b>	8	0.39
<b>Nung</b>	76	3.7
<b>San chay (Cap lan – San chi)</b>	29	1.41
<b>Muong</b>	11	0.54
<b>Ngai</b>	1	0.05
<b>Hmong (Meos)</b>	23	1.12
<b>Dao</b>	6	0.29
<b>Bru – Van kieu</b>	2	0.05
<b>Sedang</b>	1	0.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,053</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table A3.** Definition of predictor variables

<b>Dependent variables</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Scale</b>
<b>Environmental income (per capita)</b>	(Per capita) net revenue from extraction, i.e., difference between total revenue from extraction at market price and extraction cost	Metric, in PPP\$
<b>Extraction participation</b>	If the household engages in natural resource extraction	Binary, yes=1
<b>Consumption per capita</b>	Annual per capita consumption	Metric, in PPP\$
<b>Predictor variables</b>		
<b>Age</b>	Average age of household members	Metric, in years
<b>Education</b>	Average education of household members	Metric, in years
<b>Household size</b>	Number of household members	Metric
<b>Dependency ratio</b>	Household size / independent members (15-64 years)	Metric
<b>Gender</b>	Gender of household head	Binary, female=1
<b>Asset value</b>	Value of household assets	Metric, in PPP\$
<b>Farmland size</b>	Size of farmland	Metric, in 1,000m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Distance</b>	Average distance from the household's home to the extracting ground	Metric, in km
<b>Off-farm</b>	If the household engages in off-farm employment	Binary, yes=1
<b>Year 2010</b>	If the observation is from 2010	Binary, 2016 as basis
<b>Year 2013</b>	If the observation is from 2013	Binary, 2016 as basis

**Table A4.** Variance inflation factor (VIF) values

	VIF	1/VIF
<b>Age</b>	1.24	0.81
<b>Education</b>	1.36	0.74
<b>Household size</b>	1.31	0.77
<b>Dependency ratio</b>	1.12	0.89
<b>Gender</b>	1.07	0.93
<b>Asset value</b>	1.49	0.67
<b>Farmland size</b>	1.34	0.75
<b>Distance</b>	1.12	0.89
<b>Off-farm</b>	1.29	0.77
<b>Year 2010</b>	1.68	0.60
<b>Year 2013</b>	1.48	0.68

**Table A5.** Testing the exclusion restriction of the selection instrument

	Extraction participation	Per capita consumption (ln)
<b>Selection instrument</b>		
<b>Distance (ln)</b>	-0.19 (0.029)	-0.0002 (0.014)
<b>Other variables</b>		
<b>Age</b>	-0.004 (0.001)	0.006 (0.001)
<b>Education</b>	-0.026 (0.004)	0.041 (0.004)
<b>Household size</b>	0.029 (0.005)	-0.11 (0.007)
<b>Dependency ratio</b>	0.02 (0.016)	-0.14 (0.021)
<b>Gender (female=1)</b>	0.003 (0.29)	-0.04 (0.03)
<b>Asset value (ln)</b>	-0.078 (0.01)	0.26 (0.012)
<b>Farmland size (ln)</b>	0.048 (0.01)	0.019 (0.013)
<b>Off-farm (yes=1)</b>	-0.12 (0.026)	0.19 (0.023)
<b>Year 2010</b> (2016 as basis)	0.053 (0.035)	-0.064 (0.026)
<b>Year 2013</b> (2016 as basis)	0.15 (0.022)	-0.052 (0.031)
<b>Constant</b>	1.4 (0.089)	5.43 (0.11)
<b>Number of observations</b>	2,053	2,053
<b>Prob. &gt; F</b>	0.000	0.000
<b>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.305	0.58

*Note:* Standard errors (in parentheses) bootstrapped with 1,000 replications.

**Table A6.** Descriptive statistics of sampled households by year and ethnic status

	2010				2013				2016			
	Whole sample (n=714)	Majority (n=449)	Minority (n=265)	Test statistics	Whole sample (n=702)	Majority (n=439)	Minority (n=263)	Test statistics	Whole sample (n=637)	Majority (n=404)	Minority (n=233)	Test statistics
<b>Age</b> (in years)	28.47 (9.4)	29.48 (8.95)	26.75 (9.91)	4.8 <sup>a</sup>	30.89 (9.3)	32.02 (8.77)	28.99 (9.85)	5.25 <sup>a</sup>	34.32 (11.86)	36.16 (12.31)	31.15 (10.33)	5.67 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Education</b> (in years)	7.8 (2.74)	8.51 (2.65)	6.54 (2.46)	9.26 <sup>a</sup>	7.95 (2.89)	8.64 (2.79)	6.8 (2.69)	8.21 <sup>a</sup>	8.38 (3.04)	9.09 (2.98)	7.16 (2.75)	7.4 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Household size</b>	5.5 (1.98)	5.2 (1.64)	6 (2.38)	-3.79 <sup>a</sup>	4.87 (1.76)	4.58 (1.51)	5.35 (2.03)	-4.74 <sup>a</sup>	4.69 (1.67)	4.41 (1.5)	5.18 (1.85)	-5.18 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Dependency ratio</b>	1.6 (0.58)	1.54 (0.56)	1.69 (0.59)	-3.97 <sup>a</sup>	1.54 (0.58)	1.48 (0.55)	1.64 (0.6)	-3.86 <sup>a</sup>	1.45 (0.53)	1.41 (0.52)	1.51 (0.56)	-3.29 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Gender</b> (female=1)	0.15 (0.36)	0.15 (0.35)	0.15 (0.36)	0.14 <sup>b</sup>	0.18 (0.38)	0.17 (0.38)	0.18 (0.39)	0.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.18 (0.39)	0.17 (0.37)	0.21 (0.41)	1.67 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Asset value</b> (in PPP\$)	2,786 (3,282)	3,428 (3,746)	1,699 (1,841)	9.26 <sup>a</sup>	4,203 (6,632)	5,282 (7,802)	2,402 (3,272)	8.37 <sup>a</sup>	4,391 (6,516)	5,469 (7,682)	2,531 (2,919)	7.68 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Farmland size</b> (in 1,000m <sup>2</sup> )	10.73 (10.76)	10.18 (10.57)	11.65 (11.02)	-1.62 <sup>a</sup>	11.35 (15.01)	9.26 (10.57)	14.84 (19.91)	-4.58 <sup>a</sup>	11.3 (16.94)	9.94 (17.64)	13.66 (15.42)	-4.53 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Off-farm</b> (yes=1)	0.49 (0.5)	0.66 (0.47)	0.21 (0.41)	136.91 <sup>b</sup>	0.51 (0.5)	0.63 (0.48)	0.33 (0.47)	59.03 <sup>b</sup>	0.61 (0.49)	0.74 (0.44)	0.38 (0.49)	79.26 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Distance</b> (in km)	3.29 (5.78)	3.12 (6.44)	3.57 (4.42)	-1.81 <sup>a</sup>	2.92 (6.04)	2.59 (6.77)	3.48 (4.53)	-6.17 <sup>a</sup>	3.47 (3.14)	2.99 (2.29)	4.3 (4.11)	-4.01 <sup>a</sup>

Notes: Standard deviations in parentheses. <sup>a</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum test. <sup>b</sup>  $\chi^2$ -test.

**Table A7.** Indicators on natural resource extraction by year and ethnic status

	2010				2013				2016			
	Whole sample (n=714)	Majority (n=449)	Minority (n=265)	Test statistics	Whole sample (n=702)	Majority (n=439)	Minority (n=263)	Test statistics	Whole Sample (n=637)	Majority (n=404)	Minority (n=233)	Test statistics
<b>Environmental income (in PPP\$)</b>	136.4 (322.63)	95.34 (339.3)	205.99 (279.34)	-11.29 <sup>a</sup>	116.57 (269.41)	85.88 (222.96)	167.79 (326.92)	-7.39 <sup>a</sup>	85.99 (408.85)	28.89 (148.52)	184.56 (635.16)	-13.8 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Environmental income per capita (in PPP\$)</b>	26.14 (63.57)	19.75 (68.75)	36.97 (52)	-10.61 <sup>a</sup>	25.24 (59.41)	19.84 (53.1)	34.24 (67.82)	-6.92 <sup>a</sup>	17.51 (71.49)	6.16 (30.17)	37.11 (108.58)	-13.63 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Extraction participation (yes=1)</b>	0.61 (0.49)	0.47 (0.5)	0.85 (0.36)	97.13 <sup>b</sup>	0.64 (0.48)	0.54 (0.5)	0.83 (0.38)	60.23 <sup>b</sup>	0.38 (0.49)	0.19 (0.39)	0.72 (0.45)	174.21 <sup>b</sup>

Notes: Standard deviations in parentheses. <sup>a</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum test. <sup>b</sup>  $\chi^2$ -test.