

**SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC SPACE: FROM THE  
PERSPECTIVES OF MIGRANT WORKERS IN THE INFORMAL SECTOR IN  
HANOI**

**ABSTRACT**

The article focused on answering the following research questions: 1) What are the perceptions of migrant workers in the informal sector towards social discrimination against them when coming to public space? 2) Are there any differences of opinions between migrant groups working in the informal sector about this issue by gender, age and type of migration? The quantitative data collected by survey questionnaires among migrant workers in the informal sector were used for analysis with the differences of opinions across groups classified by gender, age and type of migration. While the findings indicated a neutral viewpoint among those, it also highlighted differences across groups by gender and type of migration.

*Keywords: Migrant, informal sector, public space, social discrimination*

**1. INTRODUCTION**

In Vietnam, the majority of the population resides in rural and urban areas, accounting for 37.6% (equivalent to over 62 million people) and 62.4% (equivalent to more than 37 million people) respectively (General Statistics Office, 2023). There has been continuing intensive and extensive urbanization with an increasing number of urban areas over periods as well as constantly improved urban facilities and infrastructure. This has generated a rural-urban migration flow, which has taken up the second largest share of migration flows over the last three decades. On the other hand, it is the incoming migration flows that boost urban development and expansion [2].

Employment in the informal sector has made great contributions to satisfying the job-seeking demands of unemployed or underemployed people coming from rural areas or even trained workers who have not found suitable jobs and chosen to work temporarily in this sector because of the flexibility of its employment. The images of street vendors, service workers (barbers, mobile repairmen, etc.) along the streets and sidewalks with thousands of people are an indispensable part of big cities like Hanoi. Workers in this informal sector may be permanent, temporary, seasonal or pendulum migrants.

Migrant workers in the informal sector can be seen on any sidewalks, streets, flower gardens, squares or school gates in Hanoi owing to the openness of these public spaces where they can easily approach their customers with no or low rental fees. Moreover, public space is also a good alternative to save costs for social activities such as entertainment, culture, social exchange and integration.

Public space is functionally open, which means that everyone has equal rights when being present here. However, how do migrant workers in the informal sector perceive social discrimination against them in public space, and are there any differences of opinions between migrant groups working in the informal sector about this issue by gender, age group and type of migration? This article will examine the issue through the use of survey questionnaires conducted with migrant workers in the informal sector in Hanoi.

**2. METHODOLOGY**

**2.1. Instrument**

The independent variables selected for analysis included gender (male and female), age (15-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-59 and over 60) and type of migration by duration of stay in Hanoi. Criteria for age grouping were based on the Law on Youth (Vietnam) promulgated in 2020 and the Law on the Elderly (Vietnam) promulgated in 2009.

The dependent variable "opinions of the survey sample about social discrimination and differences between migrants and local people" consists of 9 statements corresponding to 9 items shown in the following table.

**Table 1. Social discrimination against migrant workers in the informal sector (used in the questionnaire)**

Code	Items
SD01	Urban dwellers have more rights and privileges in public space
SD02	Migrants are discriminated against in public space
SD03	Urban dwellers are unfriendly
SD04	Urban dwellers have better awareness in public places than migrants
SD05	Migrants have better awareness in public places than urban dwellers
SD06	Migrants find it difficult to make friends and socialize in public places
SD07	There exists discrimination against freelancers going to public space
SD08	Migrants are vulnerable to bullying in public places
SD09	Freelancers are underrated/discriminated against in public places

The survey instrument utilized in this research was the questionnaire, which used the 5-point Likert scale. Accordingly, the formula to calculate the interval was as follows: Interval = (Maximum – Minimum) / n = (6-1)/6 = 0.8. Thus, the significance of the interval scale was determined in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. The significance of the interval scale**

Level	Range	Pervasiveness
1	1.00 – 1.80	Strongly disagree
2	1.81 – 2.60	Disagree
3	2.61 – 3.40	Neutral
4	3.41 – 4.20	Agree
5	4.21 – 5.00	Strongly agree

## 2.2. Sampling

The research objects were migrant workers in the informal sector. Within the scope of this study, migrants were defined as those who were born and raised in provinces/cities other than Hanoi but came there to live and work due to various reasons.

In the context of Vietnam, the informal sector is understood as unregistered individual household businesses [1, 6, 8]. Rural-to-urban migrants often participate in the informal sector, being self-employed or employed by other individual household businesses. They may work in private spaces such as restaurants, factories, households, and so on or in public spaces (streets, alleys, neighborhoods, empty spaces near parks or flower gardens, etc.). With this method for distinction, workers in the informal sector might include individual traders with unregistered shops/factories, street vendors, hired laborers (builders, craftsmen, loaders, etc.), and service workers (shoe shiners, locksmiths, etc.).

The total number of survey samples was more than 322; nevertheless, after the process of survey data cleaning, the number of questionnaires/forms meeting the quality requirements was 300.

**Table 3. Research sample**

Gender	Number	Percentage (%)
Male	128	42.8
Female	171	57.2
Total	300	100.0

## 2.3. Data collection

The survey sample included a group of people with fixed and mobile working locations; as a result, the sampling method applied was snowball sampling. In order to do this, a map of the distribution of public spaces (flower gardens, parks, community playgrounds, sidewalks and commercial streets) in Thanh Xuan district was created. The team of researchers and enumerators went to each identified location to find ways to approach the research objects and then asked them to introduce relatives, friends, and acquaintances, who were relevant subjects of the research.

#### 2.4. Data analysis

So as to answer the research questions, this study implemented two statistical analysis methods, namely (1) Descriptive statistics and (2) one-way ANOVA. At first, descriptive statistics was applied to determine views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space. The study then explored whether there were any differences in the views of migrant workers in the informal sector on the issue in three groups through the use of the one-way ANOVA: (1) Gender; (2) Age; and (3) Type of migration. To analyze the differences in these groups, the study initially tested differences between variances of the groups by Levene's test. When the Sig. value of the items in Levene's test was less than 0.05, then it indicated that there was a difference between variances in the group; in this case, results of Welch's test would be utilized. Meanwhile, when the Sig. value of the items in Levene's test was more than 0.05, results of the ANOVA were used due to no differences between variances in the group.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space

The analysis of the data in Table 4 indicated that overall, the views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space were averagely neutral (mean scores ranging from 2.66 to 3.04). Item SD01 ("Urban dwellers have more rights and privileges in public space") had the highest mean (3.04), while item SD08 ("Migrants are vulnerable to bullying in public places") had the lowest mean (2.66).

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics on views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space**

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Level	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
SD01	300	3.04	1.103	Neutral	.599	.141	-.153	.281
SD02	300	2.72	1.033	Neutral	1.066	.141	.949	.281
SD03	300	2.74	1.019	Neutral	.872	.141	.687	.281
SD04	300	3.00	1.010	Neutral	.732	.141	.616	.281
SD05	300	2.90	.936	Neutral	1.153	.141	1.918	.281
SD06	300	2.77	1.021	Neutral	.974	.141	1.067	.281
SD07	300	2.70	1.042	Neutral	1.047	.141	.984	.281
SD08	300	2.66	1.096	Neutral	1.044	.141	.826	.281
SD09	300	2.68	1.043	Neutral	.974	.141	.663	.281

#### 3.2. Differences in views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space by gender group

The analysis of descriptive statistics by gender group in Table 5 revealed that means of both male and female groups ranged from 2.62 to 3.16, corresponding to "Neutral". It also showed that there were disparities between male and female workers in terms of views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space. It is also clear from Table 5 that, in general, male migrant workers tended to give higher ratings of social discrimination against them in public space than female ones, except SD01 ("Urban dwellers have more rights and privileges in public space") with a mean score of 3.16 and SD04 ("Urban dwellers have better awareness in public places than migrants") with a mean score of 3.04.

**Table 5. Descriptive statistics by gender group**

Items	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
-------	--------	---	------	----------------	------------

SD01	Male	128	2.88	1.069	.095
	Female	171	3.16	1.119	.086
SD02	Male	128	2.75	1.122	.099
	Female	171	2.69	.966	.074
SD03	Male	128	2.85	1.102	.097
	Female	171	2.65	.949	.073
SD04	Male	128	2.95	1.006	.089
	Female	171	3.04	1.017	.078
SD05	Male	128	2.96	.917	.081
	Female	171	2.86	.954	.073
SD06	Male	128	2.85	1.036	.092
	Female	171	2.70	1.011	.077
SD07	Male	128	2.70	.991	.088
	Female	171	2.70	1.084	.083
SD08	Male	128	2.77	1.081	.096
	Female	171	2.57	1.106	.085
SD09	Male	128	2.76	1.040	.092
	Female	171	2.62	1.047	.080

Results of Levene's test (Appendix 1) indicated that none of the items had a Sig. less than 0.05; accordingly, differences between gender groups were assessed on the basis of the F-value in the ANOVA in Table 6. As can be seen from Table 6, only item SD01 had a Sig. less than 0.05; thus, it could be concluded that there was a statistically significant disparity in the views of workers in the informal sector that "Urban dwellers have more rights and privileges in public space" ( $F=4.596$ ,  $p=0.033$ ).

**Table 6. Results of the ANOVA on views of workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by gender**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SD01	Between Groups	5.539	1	5.539	4.596	.033*
	Within Groups	357.979	297	1.205		
	Total	363.518	298			
SD02	Between Groups	.263	1	.263	.245	.621

	Within Groups	318.573	297	1.073		
	Total	318.836	298			
SD03	Between Groups	3.000	1	3.000	2.901	.090
	Within Groups	307.127	297	1.034		
	Total	310.127	298			
SD04	Between Groups	.590	1	.590	.576	.449
	Within Groups	304.407	297	1.025		
	Total	304.997	298			
SD05	Between Groups	.751	1	.751	.853	.356
	Within Groups	261.436	297	.880		
	Total	262.187	298			
SD06	Between Groups	1.643	1	1.643	1.574	.211
	Within Groups	309.969	297	1.044		
	Total	311.612	298			
SD07	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.991
	Within Groups	324.508	297	1.093		
	Total	324.508	298			
SD08	Between Groups	2.938	1	2.938	2.449	.119
	Within Groups	356.266	297	1.200		
	Total	359.204	298			
SD09	Between Groups	1.393	1	1.393	1.277	.259
	Within Groups	323.785	297	1.090		
	Total	325.177	298			

\* Sig. <0.05

### **3.3 Differences in views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by age group**

Descriptive statistics of 05 age groups in Table 7 demonstrated that the assessment made by migrant workers in the informal sector of social discrimination against them in public space ranged between 2.34 and 3.29, corresponding to two levels: Disagree and Neutral. Analysis of the results of each item by age group revealed the following:

- The age group with the highest rating: (i) workers aged over 60 gave the highest rating on SD02 (2.89), SD03 (2.92), SD04 (3.29), SD05 (3.07), SD09 (2.80); (ii) workers in the 41 – 50 age group rated SD01 (3.21) and SD06 (2.87) the highest, and (iii) workers at the age of 31 - 40 gave the highest rating on SD07 (2.85) and SD08 (2.87).
- The age group with the lowest rating: (i) workers aged 51 - 59 gave the lowest rating on SD02 (2.57), SD03 (2.63), SD06 (2.55), and SD08 (2.34), and (ii) workers in the 15 – 30 age group gave the lowest rating on SD01 (2.70), SD04 (2.78), S05 (2.76), SD07 (2.48), and SD09 (2.52). In particular, the assessment of SD02, SD06, SD07, and SD09 made by workers across different age groups was at the “Disagree” level (means ranging from 1.81 to 2.60).

The disparity in the assessment made by migrant workers in the informal sector of social discrimination against them in public space between ages across different age groups ranged between 0.28 and 0.53.

**Table7. Descriptive statistics by age group**

Items	Age group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
SD01	15 - 30	46	2.70	1.072	.158
	31 - 40	61	3.08	1.038	.133
	41 - 50	71	3.21	1.275	.151
	51 - 59	67	2.94	1.057	.129
	>= 60	55	3.18	.964	.130
SD02	15 - 30	46	2.63	1.181	.174
	31 - 40	61	2.72	.933	.119
	41 - 50	71	2.77	1.031	.122
	51 - 59	67	2.57	.925	.113
	>= 60	55	2.89	1.133	.153
SD03	15 - 30	46	2.65	.766	.113
	31 - 40	61	2.77	.920	.118
	41 - 50	71	2.73	1.146	.136
	51 - 59	67	2.63	1.057	.129
	>= 60	55	2.91	1.093	.147
SD04	15 - 30	46	2.78	.814	.120
	31 - 40	61	2.89	.915	.117
	41 - 50	71	2.99	1.115	.132
	51 - 59	67	3.01	1.022	.125
	>= 60	55	3.29	1.066	.144
SD05	15 - 30	46	2.76	.736	.109
	31 - 40	61	2.82	.785	.101
	41 - 50	71	2.96	1.101	.131
	51 - 59	67	2.88	.913	.112
	>= 60	55	3.07	1.034	.139
SD06	15 - 30	46	2.76	.822	.121
	31 - 40	61	2.84	.934	.120
	41 - 50	71	2.87	1.081	.128
	51 - 59	67	2.55	.875	.107
	>= 60	55	2.82	1.307	.176
SD07	15 - 30	46	2.48	.691	.102
	31 - 40	61	2.85	1.108	.142
	41 - 50	71	2.77	1.072	.127
	51 - 59	67	2.55	.989	.121
	>= 60	55	2.82	1.203	.162
SD08	15 - 30	46	2.67	.990	.146
	31 - 40	61	2.87	1.147	.147
	41 - 50	71	2.66	1.108	.131
	51 - 59	67	2.34	.930	.114
	>= 60	55	2.80	1.238	.167
SD09	15 - 30	46	2.52	.722	.106
	31 - 40	61	2.74	1.047	.134
	41 - 50	71	2.73	1.121	.133
	51 - 59	67	2.58	1.047	.128
	>= 60	55	2.80	1.161	.157

Results of Levene's test in Appendix 2 showed that only items SD06, SD07 and SD09 had a Sig. less than 0.05; consequently, results of Welch's test in Table 9 were used for assessment. Meanwhile, as for the remaining items with a Sig. more than 0.05, results of the ANOVA in Table 8 were utilized to assess the differences between the groups.

The results of the ANOVA in Table 8 below indicated that all social discrimination items had a Sig. more than 0.05; therefore, it could be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in the views of workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by age group.

**Table8. Results of the ANOVA on views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by age group**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SD01	Between Groups	9.417	4	2.354	1.961	.100
	Within Groups	354.103	295	1.200		
	Total	363.520	299			
SD02	Between Groups	3.749	4	.937	.877	.478
	Within Groups	315.167	295	1.068		
	Total	318.917	299			
SD03	Between Groups	2.842	4	.711	.682	.605
	Within Groups	307.354	295	1.042		
	Total	310.197	299			
SD04	Between Groups	7.657	4	1.914	1.899	.111
	Within Groups	297.339	295	1.008		
	Total	304.997	299			
SD05	Between Groups	3.184	4	.796	.906	.460
	Within Groups	259.013	295	.878		
	Total	262.197	299			
SD08	Between Groups	10.469	4	2.617	2.213	.068
	Within Groups	348.851	295	1.183		
	Total	359.320	299			

\* Sig. <0.05

The results of Welch's test in Table 9 illustrated that the Sig. value of social discrimination items was all more than 0.05; thus, it could be concluded that there was no statistical difference in the views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by age group.

**Table9. Results of Welch's test on views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by age group**

Items	Test	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.*
SD06	Welch	1.237	4	142.422	.298
SD07	Welch	1.866	4	144.663	.120
SD09	Welch	.854	4	144.963	.493

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

\* Sig. <0.05

### 3.4 Differences in views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them in public space by type of migration

Descriptive statistics of 04 types of migration in Table 10 showed that the assessment done by migrant workers in the informal sector of social discrimination against them in public space ranged from 2.42 to 3.36, corresponding to two levels: Disagree and Neutral. Analysis of the results of each item by type of migration indicated the following:

The migration types with the highest rating: (i) workers in the group “Traveling daily (commuting to Hanoi in the morning and returning to the hometown in the evening)” gave the highest rating on SD04 (3.36), SD06 (3.09), SD07 (2.95), SD09 (2.95), (ii) workers in the group “Returning to the hometown weekly” rated SD08 the highest (2.84), (iii) workers in the group “Coming to Hanoi whenever being free from agricultural work or to meet employers’ and customers’ demand” gave the highest rating on SD01 (3.30), and (iv) workers in the group “Living in Hanoi for more than one year (renting accommodation in Hanoi continuously)” rated SD03 (2.78) the highest.

The migration types with the lowest rating: (i) workers in the group “Returning to the hometown weekly” gave the highest rating on SD01 (2.89) and SD04 (2.42), (ii) workers in the group “Coming to Hanoi whenever being free from agricultural work or to meet employers’ and customers’ demand” rated SD03 (2.55), SD05 (2.50), SD06 (2.60), SD07 (2.65), SD08 (2.50), and SD09 (2.65) the highest, and (iii) workers in the group “Living in Hanoi for more than one year (renting accommodation in Hanoi continuously)” rated SD02 (2.69) and SD09 (2.65) the highest.

In particular, the assessment of SD03, SD04, SD05, SD06 and SD08 done by migrant workers in migration-type groups was at the “Disagree” level (means ranging between 1.81 and 2.60). The disparity in the assessment made by migrant workers in the informal sector of social discrimination against them in public space across groups of migration types ranged from 0.23 to 0.94.

**Table 10. Descriptive statistics by type of migration**

Items	Type of migration	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
SD01	1	22	3.23	1.020	.218
	2	19	2.89	.809	.186
	3	20	3.30	1.081	.242
	4	239	3.01	1.132	.073
SD02	1	22	3.05	1.214	.259
	2	19	2.74	.991	.227
	3	20	2.70	.923	.206
	4	239	2.69	1.028	.066
SD03	1	22	2.77	.973	.207
	2	19	2.37	.955	.219
	3	20	2.55	.945	.211
	4	239	2.78	1.032	.067
SD04	1	22	3.36	1.093	.233
	2	19	2.42	.507	.116
	3	20	2.50	.889	.199
	4	239	3.05	1.015	.066
SD05	1	22	3.23	1.110	.237
	2	19	2.63	.761	.175
	3	20	2.50	.889	.199
	4	239	2.93	.925	.060
SD06	1	22	3.09	1.109	.236
	2	19	2.63	.895	.205
	3	20	2.60	.754	.169
	4	239	2.76	1.040	.067
SD07	1	22	2.95	1.174	.250
	2	19	2.84	.834	.191
	3	20	2.65	.745	.167
	4	239	2.67	1.066	.069
SD08	1	22	2.73	1.279	.273
	2	19	2.84	.958	.220

	3	20	2.50	.761	.170
	4	239	2.65	1.116	.072
SD09	1	22	2.95	1.430	.305
	2	19	2.79	.855	.196
	3	20	2.65	.813	.182
	4	239	2.65	1.034	.067

\* Note: 1- Traveling daily (commuting to Hanoi in the morning and returning to the hometown in the evening); 2- Returning to the hometown weekly; 3. - Coming to Hanoi whenever being free from agricultural work or to meet employers' and customers' demand; 4- Living in Hanoi for more than one year (renting accommodation in Hanoi continuously).

Results of Levene's test in Appendix 3 revealed that the results of the ANOVA in Table 11 were used to assess the differences across migration patterns in eight social discrimination items from the first to eighth (Sig. > 0.05), and only SD09 utilized the results of Welch's test in Table 12 (Sig. < 0.05).

The results of the ANOVA in Table 11 below showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the views of migrant workers in the informal sector on two social discrimination items by type of migration: "Urban dwellers have better awareness in public places than migrants" (F=5.059, p=0.002) and "Migrants have better awareness in public places than urban dwellers" (F=2.755, p=0.043).

**Table 11. Results of the ANOVA on views of workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by type of migration**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SD01	Between Groups	2.705	3	.902	.740	.529
	Within Groups	360.815	296	1.219		
	Total	363.520	299			
SD02	Between Groups	2.613	3	.871	.815	.486
	Within Groups	316.303	296	1.069		
	Total	318.917	299			
SD03	Between Groups	3.715	3	1.238	1.196	.311
	Within Groups	306.482	296	1.035		
	Total	310.197	299			
SD04	Between Groups	14.877	3	4.959	5.059	.002*
	Within Groups	290.120	296	.980		
	Total	304.997	299			
SD05	Between Groups	7.121	3	2.374	2.755	.043*
	Within Groups	255.075	296	.862		
	Total	262.197	299			
SD06	Between Groups	3.222	3	1.074	1.031	.379
	Within Groups	308.445	296	1.042		
	Total	311.667	299			
SD07	Between Groups	2.022	3	.674	.618	.604
	Within Groups	322.575	296	1.090		
	Total	324.597	299			
SD08	Between Groups	1.254	3	.418	.346	.792
	Within Groups	358.066	296	1.210		
	Total	359.320	299			

\* Sig. < 0.05

Results of Welch's test in Table 12 indicated that the Sig. value of SD09 was more than 0.05; thus, it could be concluded that there was no statistical difference between types of migration in the statement "Freelancers are underrated/discriminated against in public places".

**Table 12. Results of Welch's test on views of workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them by type of migration**

Items	Test	Statistic <sup>a</sup>	df1	df2	Sig.*
SD09	Welch	.436	3	37.686	.728

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

\* Sig. <0.05

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The sample's views on the statements were all in the "Neutral" range (2.61-3.4). Each individual has different experiences of public space since types of public space in Hanoi city are relatively diverse, and activities of migrant workers in the informal sector in public space also vary. Migrant workers in the informal sector are classified into four occupational groups on the basis of characteristics of their workplace locations: group 1 - street/ mobile vendors, group 2 - traders in fixed shops and business locations (with rental fees), group 3 - workers in households, shops and factories and group 4 - providers of mobile or fixed services (motorbike taxi drivers, loaders, shoe repairmen, etc.). Accordingly, group 1 and 3 have livelihood activities that are closely associated with public spaces such as sidewalks and streets. In such case, is there anything that makes it difficult for them to work there? In particular, do any of them agree that "migrants are vulnerable to bullying in public places"? The survey results indicated that the highest proportion of the survey sample supporting this view belonged to street vendors with 14.7% agreeing with the statement. To street vendors, their livelihoods are closely associated with certain types of public space, namely streets and sidewalks and thus have great mobility.

Certain previous studies have contributed to clarifying problems posed to street vendors in Hanoi. From the approach of street space management policy, Eidse et al. (2016) analyzes that as for state management agencies, sidewalk and street space performs the function of ensuring traffic flows; therefore, vendors' presence in this space is counterfunctional, uncivilized and detrimental to the development of the city. Consequently, there has been a ban on sidewalk vending in several streets aiming to lessen traffic pressure. The Hanoi People's Committee issued Decision No. 46/2009/QĐ-UBND dated January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009: "Regulations on management of street vending in Hanoi City". Accordingly, departments/branches, districts and wards/communes take responsibility for regulating the scope of activities of street vendors while the People's Committees of districts are responsible for planning areas which allow temporary use for street vending (Article 7, Clause 1). The regulations of municipal authorities of Hanoi have raised worries of street vendors for fear of fines, goods confiscation, and livelihood loss. This leads them to think that their work is illegal while in terms of economic terms, they bring various positive aspects to urban dwellers, such as enabling them to buy affordable goods conveniently[7]. Thus, perhaps the sense of being bullied seems to be felt while they find mobile locations to trade. They may obstruct traffic when stopping on the road, be chased away when standing in front of shops and houses or have their goods confiscated and then loaded onto mobile vehicles by ward police.

The study entitled "the use of public space by migrant workers in the informal sector in Thanh Xuan District, Hanoi" conducted by the author with in-depth interviews among street vendors revealed contradictory views on the statements concerning the relationship between them and local people. For those who have been in Hanoi for many years, being bullied in public places is no longer a problem due to their accumulated experience in handling various situations, which helps them tackle bullying effectively; thus, they demonstrate greater emotional resilience. Their experiences also assist them in making multi-dimensional assessments from different angles of emotions and experience in handling situations. As for seasonal workers or those spending a few years in Hanoi, they are more sensitive to situations, and they also lack experience in handling situations to protect their own rights.

Another noteworthy issue was that there existed differences of opinions between groups by gender and type of migration whilst no differences were shown across age groups in terms of their views on social discrimination between migrant workers in the informal sector and local people. Thus, the findings of this study would suggest a direction for further research on gender and differences between types of migration in social discrimination in public spaces. Accordingly, more in-depth research may apply control methods among groups to identify causes and factors influencing views and behaviors of each group.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Perceptions of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination were examined from the angle of the relationship between migrant workers in the informal sectors and local people. This is a limitation of the research data. For further analysis, it is recommended to make comparison and contrast with views of local people, workers in the informal sector and those who manage public space or directly take responsibility for its operation as well as security in order to obtain more multi-dimensional perspectives on this issue.

It can be seen from the findings that as the views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination against them were at the “Neutral” level, it was impossible to state whether those were positive or negative. Variables of gender and type of migration can be further explored in the analysis of the model and relationship with views of migrant workers in the informal sector on social discrimination in public space.

## CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, Participants’ written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

## REFERENCES

1. Cling J.P, Lagrée S., Razafindrakoto M., Roubau F. (2013). The big development challenge: Improving understanding of the informal economy to make appropriate policies. In the book Cling J.P. et al. . Informal economy in developing countries. Knowledge Publishing House and Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences; 2013
2. Do TH (2023). Migration and Urbanization – Accessing. Figures and Events Review of the GSO (MPI). Accessed 14 June 2023  
Available: <https://consosukien.vn/di-cu-va-do-thi-hoa-tai-viet-nam-goc-nhin-tu-nhung-con-so.htm>
3. Eidse N., Turner S. & Oswin N. Contesting street spaces in a socialist city: Itinerant vending-scapes and the everyday politics of mobility in Hanoi, Vietnam. In M.P. Kwan & T. Schwanen (Eds.). Geographies of Mobility (1st ed.). P. 98 - 107. DOI: 10.4324/9781315266336-11; 2018
4. General Statistics of Vietnam, Ministry of Planning and Investment. *Press release on labor and employment in the 4th quarter and 2022*; (2022 Accessed 26 March 2023  
Available: <https://www.gso.gov.vn/du-lieu-va-so-lieu-thong-ke/2023/01/thong-cao-bao-chi-tinh-hinh-lao-dong-viec-lam-quy-iv-va-nam-2022/>
5. General Statistics of Vietnam, Ministry of Planning and Investment. Statistical Yearbook 2022. Statistical Publishing House. Hanoi, Vietnam; 2023
6. Le DD and Nguyen MT. Informal economic sector. International experiences and Practices of Vietnam in the economic transition. National Political Publishing House. Hanoi, Vietnam; 1997
7. Nguyen TAT. Worried mood of street vendors, *Journal of Psychology*, số 121(4), 53-58; 2009
8. Pasquier-Doumer L., Oudin X., Nguyen T. The role of individual business households and the informal sector in inclusive growth in Vietnam. World Publishing House; 2017