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Abstract

This research explores the social life of street food in Hanoi, Vietnam, using a conceptual framework of social sustainability. Although the economic benefits of street vending are widely recognised, little attention has previously been paid to the social aspects. Focusing specifically on the selling of street food through the lens of social sustainability, this research develops a conceptual framework from the literature. The framework comprised eight key themes: social justice, quality of life and well-being, participation, safety and security, social interactions and social networks, social inclusion, sense of place and cultural heritage and was applied empirically to the street food environment of Hanoi. The themes used in the framework were identified as the most pertinent in the literature and were grouped under three broad ideas – social justice, social relations and culture – and used to frame the thesis.

The application of the social sustainability framework revealed important details about the social life and social function of the street food environment. It highlighted key areas where street food in Hanoi can be shown to contribute to the principles of social sustainability, such as regarding social relations, cultural heritage and sense of place. It also drew attention to areas that require improvement, including some aspects of social justice, for example, participation, safety and security and food hygiene. The findings of this research suggest the challenges identified that prevent the social sustainability of street food in Hanoi, often manifested themselves through the inequalities experienced between the different types of street food vendors, specifically itinerant or migrant vendors compared to local vendors with fixed selling locations.

The thesis argues that the approach adopted in the research offers a useful tool for understanding the social functions of street vending which can be applied and adapted to examine the social sustainability of street food vending in other economic and political contexts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction
Introduction

Street food is a phenomenon which exists at varying levels of intensity in some form or another in every major city, but it is in developing world cities that street food is most prevalent and constitutes a key component of the urban food system. Vendors wander the streets selling their goods from bicycles or carts, whilst others sell from stalls or more permanent fixtures. Street food is culturally specific, existing in a variety of forms depending on where and when it is being sold, cooked and consumed. Criticised for causing problems such as congestion, pollution and environmental health problems in cities, street food is often perceived to have negative implications on its surroundings and is frequently the target of removal policies. Yet often these policies give no consideration to the potential social function of street food – a possible result of lack of critical engagement with the issue by social scientists. Except for research which considers the socio-economic benefits of street vending more broadly, little more than passing comments have been made about the social characteristics of street food vending. This research attempts to fill this gap by exploring dimensions of sociality in the street food environment, using a framework of social sustainability.

Research Focus

Street vending makes up a large proportion of the informal economy across the world and very many street vendors sell food as their main product (Bhowmik 2010; Cardoso 2014; Tinker 1997). Selling food on the street is a contested practice; in addition to the usual problems which are related to street vending, such as tainting of the city image, traffic congestion and creating unfair competition for local businesses (Bromley 1998; Cross 2000), selling food presents additional problems for environmental health and waste management (Acho-Chi 20002; Rheinländer et al. 2008). In many cities, an aversion for street vending has resulted in the implementation of policies that aim to remove or relocate vendors from the streets (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Hunt 2009: Mackie et al. 2014; Musoni 2010; Middleton 2003). There is little evidence to suggest that these strategies have been effective or fair and any social benefits offered by street vending are often overlooked in decision-making processes. There has been little academic social research that focuses on the selling of street food since the pioneering work of Irene Tinker (1987) and even less with a geographic focus. Much of the literature to date has centred around exploring the socio-economic role of street food (Bhowmik 2001, 2005; Iyenda 2001; Muyanja et al. 2011; Tinker 1997), establishing levels of knowledge regarding food hygiene (Adjrah et al. 2013; Choudhury et al. 2011), examining the practices of women involved in selling street food (Companion 2014;
Magalhães and da Silva Santos 2014; Tinker 1987; Wardrop 2006) and looking at the role of street food in tourism (Custinger 2000; Henderson 2012; Timothy and Wall 1997).

Street food has been shown to be an essential part of culture in some places (Wardrop 2006) and there is evidence to suggest that it has many social and cultural benefits (Acho-Chi 2002). There are, however, few studies which explore the social element of street food vending in any great depth or which attempt to provide a comprehensive overview on the subject. To address this gap in the literature, this research offers an additional layer of understanding of street food vending using a framework of social sustainability as the least studied element of the normative sustainability model, to explore to what extent street food contributes towards the principles of social sustainability.

**Street Vending**

Street vendors operate in public space and by their very nature are a highly visible component of the urban informal economy. Street vending involves the production and exchange of goods and services outside of legal frameworks (Cross 2000), creating affordable options for consumers. Although not exclusively, as vendors have been found to earn higher than average wages in some places (Cross 2000), many street vendors are from poor backgrounds with few alternative employment opportunities available to them due to a lack of skills and education (Bhowmik 2001). Street vending is often considered a livelihood survival strategy (Bhowmik 2001; Hunt 2009; Peña 1999; Turner and Schoenberger 2012), but despite this many governments oppose the presence of street vendors in the city because of the ‘backward’ image it presents which is not conducive to a clean modern city image that many developing cities are trying to promote (Cross 2000). Furthermore, the informal nature and sheer size of the street vending economy in many cities has made it difficult to regulate; policies to suppress street vendors tend to prevail over efforts to engage with vendors to come up with solutions which work for all. Government approaches to managing street vending activity deviate between tolerance and outright disapproval (Mackie et al. 2014), attempts to manage street vending activities have often failed or increased disparities between vendors (Donovan 2008; Hunt 2009; Musoni 2010; Peña 1999). Removal or formalisation are two main methods which have been applied in several developing world cities but there is little evidence to suggest that they have been effective.

The literature has recognised the social benefits of street vending, particularly its ability to bring life to streets (Bromley 2000; Mackie et al. 2014, Mateo-Babiano 2012); however, few studies explore the social side of street vending in any great depth. As food is the most
prolific product sold by street vendors, this study focuses on the selling and consuming of food to explore the social element of one type of street vending.

**Street Food**

Street food is sold across the world and is commonly associated with Latin American (Arambulo et al. 1994), African (Muyanja et al. 2011; Rheinländer et al. 2008; Von Holy and Makhoane 2006) and Asian cultures (Choudhury et al. 2011; Nirathon 2006), but it is also sold in North American and European countries (Glenn 2010; Newman and Burnett 2013; Mukhija and Loukaitou-Sideris 2014). The ubiquitous nature of street food in many places, particularly in developing world cities, is due to its accessibility as a livelihood opportunity and affordability for low- and middle-income populations: according to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), 2.5 billion people eat street food everyday (Cardoso et al. 2014). The first comprehensive study of street food was conducted by Tinker (1987) across seven developing countries and more recently, research on a range of issues related to street food vending has been published (Cardoso et al. 2014).

Studies on street food vending have explored a range of issues, however, discussions on food hygiene and safety dominate the literature (Arambulo et al. 1994; Rheinländer et al. 2008; von Holy and Makhoane 2006). Research has also been conducted on vendors’ knowledge of food hygiene and food vending practices (Choudhury et al. 2011) which have frequently been found to be inadequate. Food hygiene and safety issues continue to be a key challenge for street food vendors and contribute to a widespread resistance from governments toward the activity, despite studies also demonstrating its socio-economic benefits (Acho-Chi 2002; Tinker 2003), particularly for women (Wardrop 2006; Milgram 2011). Subsequently, many of the policies to remove street vending are based on the negative effects of street food vending and do not consider its potential benefits. Other research studies of street food have focused on its role in tourism (Custinger 2000; Henderson et al. 2012; Timothy and Wall 1997) and recently the contribution of street food to food security (Keck and Etzold 2013; Kimani-Murage et al. 2014; Patel et al. 2014). Studies on street food vending are often underpinned by social issues, and although studies touch on some of these elements (Acho-Chi 2002; Donald and Blay-Palmer 2006), there does not appear to have been any previous attempt to conduct a comprehensive study of the social aspects of street food vending.

**Social Sustainability**

Social sustainability is the least studied dimension of the normative sustainability model and has been labelled as the ‘messy pillar’ (Moore and Bunce 2009). Social sustainability has, in
part, been neglected because it is more difficult to quantify than the economic and environmental pillars of sustainability (McKenzie 2004). Regardless, social sustainability has previously been used as a tool to explore urban environments using both quantitative measures and qualitative approaches. In order to effectively address the gap in the street vending and street food literatures, a comprehensive framework was required. The themes adopted in this social sustainability framework include: social justice, quality of life, participation, safety and security, social interaction and social networks, social inclusion, sense of place and cultural heritage. The themes adopted in the framework were identified as the most pertinent in the literature and most applicable to the street food environment. Exploring the phenomenon of street food using a lens of social sustainability allows the overlapping dimensions to be captured under one framework.

**Case Study: Hoan Kiem, Hanoi**

Hanoi is the capital city and political centre of Vietnam; it is the country’s second largest city with an estimated population of 7 million (2016). Hanoi is undergoing rapid urbanisation and in 2008 the state expanded the boundaries of the city, which more than doubled its size (Turner and Schoenberger 2012). Central to Hanoi is the Hoan Kiem district which has a rich cultural history; the Old Quarter in the north of the district is home to some of the city’s oldest buildings, between which much of the street vending activity takes place. Street vendors are estimated to make up to 11 per cent of the informal workforce in Hanoi (ILO 2013) and although the exact number of traders selling food is unknown, they are anticipated to make up a significant proportion of the street vendor population. In a drive towards modernisation, street vending in Hanoi is opposed by the government; since 2008 efforts have been made to ban street vendors from certain areas of the city (Turner and Schoenberger 2012). However, there is little evidence to suggest that these policies have been effective, with hundreds of vendors continuing to sell on the street daily.

Superficially, street food in Hoan Kiem appears to offer many social and cultural benefits and therefore provides an excellent case study through which to explore the sociality of street food.

**Aims and Objectives**

The aim of this research is to understand the social life of street food in Hanoi, using a social sustainability conceptual framework, comprising eight key themes: social justice, participation, quality of life, safety and security, social interaction and social networks, social
inclusion, sense of place and cultural heritage. These themes have each been incorporated into one of the three objectives.

The first objective of the research is to investigate whether street food in Hanoi is socially just.

Social justice was the most prominent dimension of social sustainability in the literature. The dimensions of social sustainability which constitute social justice are: quality of life and basic needs, participation and safety and security. Five key questions relating to these themes are:

- Does street food vending allow workers and consumers to lead a decent quality of life/meet their basic needs?
- Does street food contribute to the happiness and wellbeing of city life?
- Are street food vendors and consumers engaged in decision-making processes regarding the development of the district? Are they invited to participate?
- Is the street food environment safe? Does it foster negative or socially deviant behaviour?
- Do vendors and consumers have different experiences of safety in the street food environment? What are the differences in perceptions?

The second objective is to examine people’s behaviours and relationships in the street food environment.

Food has a strong reputation of facilitating sociality between people (Bell and Valentine 1997; Warde and Martens 2000). Studies have highlighted several different themes within social sustainability that involve relationships between people and places, these are: social inclusion, social interaction and social networks. The research questions to be answered under this objective are:

- Who is excluded and included in the street food environment?
- What (types of) social interactions are taking place? Between whom, where and how often?
- What social networks exist in the street food environment? How far do they span?

The third objective is to explore the place and culture of street food in Hanoi.

Cultural heritage is a spatial phenomenon which is intrinsically linked with senses of place and belonging (Graham et al. 2000). In order for a place to be considered socially sustainable the literature suggests that certain elements of cultural heritage must be maintained or preserved for future generations to enjoy. Places are often ascribed, whether real or
imagined, with social and cultural meanings which provide people with a sense of place and belonging. The following research questions were developed to examine the cultural significance of street food:

- Is street food a significant part of the city’s identity and how does it contribute to understandings about the cultural heritage? Whose cultural heritage?
- What is the role of street food in people’s sense of place? Is sense of place constructed through street food? If so, how? And what does this mean?

Whilst each element of social sustainability is explored individually in the context of the street food environment, the aim of this research is to bring together the different concepts under one comprehensive framework. This overview of the social sustainability of the street food environment, using Hanoi as a case study, explores the social side of street food in a way that has not previously been attempted.

Structure of Thesis
This thesis is structured into seven subsequent chapters: a literature review, background, methodology, three empirical chapters and the conclusions. The literature review provides an account of the informal economy focusing on street vending; it then moves on to look at street food vending more specifically, drawing on some of the wider food studies literature. The final part of the literature review discusses various frameworks and uses of social sustainability as a concept to understand the urban environment before providing a brief overview of each of the most prominent themes of social sustainability adopted in this research.

The three empirical chapters are organised under the following key themes: Society, Social Relations and Culture. The first of these three chapters, Society, addresses the first research objective concerning social justice; it explores the themes of quality of life and wellbeing, safety and security and participation. This chapter also discusses food justice in relation to street food in Hanoi as this arose as an additional key theme from the analysis. The second empirical chapter, Social Relations, explores the themes of social inclusion, social interactions and social networks to examine the social relationships between street food sellers, consumers and other stakeholders. The final empirical chapter looks at street food from a cultural perspective and explores ideas of culture heritage and sense of place.

The final chapter of the thesis presents the conclusions; it addresses each research objective in turn, highlighting some of the key findings before bringing all three empirical chapters
together to comment on the potential social sustainability of the street food environment. The conclusion also considers the usefulness of the conceptual framework developed and applied as a part of this study and makes recommendations for key areas of future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review
Introduction

Street vending is a common feature of cities the world over and has been a subject of academic research for many years (Bromley 1998; Bromley 2000; Cross 2000; Peña 1999). Street vending accounts for a significant proportion of employment in developing cities (ILO 2013), although accurately measuring the size of this workforce is difficult due to its informal nature. Street vendors contribute significantly to the urban economy, yet their role is often unrecognised by the state; many governments contest street vending and have implemented removal strategies and relocation policies (Bromley and Mackie 2009; Donovan 2008; Musoni 2010). Because of this many street vendors lead difficult lives; their livelihoods are often precarious with many focused on getting by day to day. The challenges facing street vendors are well documented in the literature and research to date has helped to inform policy and broaden understandings of street vendor livelihoods. However, street vendors continue to face daily struggles in their work and more needs to be done to provide a holistic understanding of street vending across different contexts.

Selling food is one of the core activities carried out by street vendors and is the key focus of this research. Street food is an affordable and accessible source of nutrition for people living in developing world cities and makes up a large proportion of the diet in some places (Cohen and Garrett 2010; Ruel et al. 2010). Food is an economically viable product for vendors to sell because it can be cheap and easy to source. Much of the research on street food to date has focused on issues of environmental health; establishing vendor socio-economic profiles; the effects of displacement and formalisation; gender roles; its role in food security and its place within the tourist economy. Little attention has been paid to the sustainability or social contributions of street food, illustrating a clear lens through which street food can be explored. An abundance of literature regarding food systems sustainability exists, but much of this recent discourse focuses on food access (Alkon et al. 2013; Freedman and Bell 2009; Hendrickson et al. 2006; Walker et al. 2010) procurement (Morgan 2008; Sonnino 2009) and consumption (Seyfang 2006) in the global north. There is little evidence of research on the sustainability of food systems in the developing world context which reaches beyond food security and environmental concerns. Furthermore, issues of social sustainability are rarely addressed in this context with an exception of several studies on farmers’ markets (Alkon 2008; Bubinas 2011; O’Kane and Wijaya 2015). However, there are a number of studies that look at the sociality of market places and street markets more generally (Watson and Studdert 2006; Watson, 2009).
This literature review will build a picture of how street food vending fits within the broader contexts of the informal economy, food systems and sustainability; drawing together these three relatively discrete literatures will help frame the research objectives for this study. The literature review is set out in three main parts; firstly an overview of the street vending literature and key areas of work will be reviewed. Secondly, the discussion will move towards exploring studies specifically related to street food vending and highlight gaps in the literature. The third section of the literature review will discuss the sustainability agenda, with focus on the social dimension and breakdown its various themes.

Street Vending

Street vending is one of the most visible features of street life, particularly in the developing world where it is a popular informal activity (Bhowmik 2001; Cross 2000; Maneeppong and Walsh 2012; Maruyama and Trung 2010; Milgram 2011). Despite its prevalence, street vending is a contested practice, criticised for causing congestion, tainting the city image and facilitating clandestine activity in the underground economy (Bromley 1998; Hunt 2009). In addition, street vendors, many of whom are itinerant, are also ostracised because they create unfair competition for local business through evading rent, taxes and utility bills (Cross 2000; Peña 1999; Yatmo 2008). However, despite the negative characteristics associated with street vending it is known to contribute significantly to the economy of many developing nations and is often regarded as an ‘economic safety net’ in times of crisis (Custinger 2000; Bhowmik 2001; Etzold 2008; Madeira da Silva and Monte 2013). Not only does street vending provide jobs for people without the skills or opportunity to enter the formal sector, it is relied upon by poorer populations for access to goods at competitive and more affordable costs (Bromley 1998; Bromley 2000; Donovan 2008). Other positive aspects of street vending include its recognition as a form of entrepreneurship, its ability to revitalise streets and its role in the tourist economy (Custinger 2000; Timothy and Wall 1997).

Street vending has been defined as:

“the production and exchange of legal goods and services that involves the lack of appropriate business permits, violation of zoning codes, failure to report tax liability, non-compliance with labour regulations governing contracts and work conditions, and/or the lack of legal guarantees in relations with suppliers and clients” (Cross 1999, p. 580).

Informality is a challenge for governments particularly in the developing world where many cities are experiencing rapid urbanisation which has resulted in an increase of informal street traders (Bhowmik 2001; Bromley 1998; Madeira da Silva and Monte 2013). This is due to
several different reasons but partly explained by a decline in availability of traditional agricultural work, an increased demand for goods and the recent global economic crisis which exacerbated problems of underemployment and unemployment. A decline in formal job opportunities led many people to set up their own small enterprises selling goods at informal markets (Bhowmik 2001; Maneepong and Walsh 2012; Musoni 2010; Yasmeen 2012) as street trading requires little start-up costs and no formal skills (Bhowmik 2001). Despite the low start-up costs and relative lack of skills required, in some places people have been found to make above average earnings from vending, which may also help explain why people choose vending as their occupation over other activities (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Cross 2000). However, for many people street vending is a survival strategy (Bhowmik 2001; Peña 1999; Turner and Schoenberger 2012) which involves working long hours to earn a basic income that simply allows people to provide a means of subsistence and to send children to school (Hunt 2009). Other vendors may supplement their family income on top of their normal job or educational commitments by working as a street vendor in their spare time (Bromley and Mackie 2009a). The literature undoubtedly identifies the many opportunities that street trading provides for poor populations in easing themselves out of poverty; however, governments worldwide continue to implement policies to regulate and formalise the activity.

To alleviate the issues of street vending multiple interventions have been pursued. Some cities have introduced licensing programmes to regulate the sector, however, this has been shown to exacerbate disparities where only some traders could afford to buy, or bribe, licences from officials, meaning that poorer traders lost out (Donovan 2008; Peña 1999). Under other circumstances street clearing operations have been the preferred action of municipalities to control informal activities. In these scenarios vendors are banned outright (Turner and Schoenberger 2012); forcibly removed from public spaces (Donovan 2008, Hunt 2009; Musoni 1999); relocated to planned markets (Bromley 1998; Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Hunt 2009; Peña 1999) or restricted to sell in certain areas (Seligmann 1989).

The displacement of vendors is often a consequence of plans to modernise cities and create an image of order and dignity (Hunt 2009; Musoni 2010; Turner and Schoenberger 2012). The contested nature of street trading and the actions taken to control it have generally resulted in very few benefits for the vendors. Licensing attempts and removal of traders have left many marginalised and ‘out of place’ (Yamto 2008). In a large relocation operation that took place in Bogota, Columbia, traders were moved to purpose-built marketplaces; Donovan (2008) reports that although vendors’ working conditions improved, their financial
situation declined due to a loss in sales and higher rents, causing traders to abandon the new facility. Hunt (2009) also explored vending in Bogota; the study examined the governmental attempts to educate the informal traders to promote a ‘culture of formality’. Hunt (2009, p. 346) argues that this was part of the state’s efforts to “reconfigure” society which can be viewed as a method of behaviour change, but in doing so it only worsened the situation for the informal traders. The reclamation of the public space by the state aimed to provide an area of citizenship that was available to everyone; consequently, however, the recovery process and relocation of traders further excluded this group from society. One of the largest street cleaning schemes in world, known as ‘Operation Murambatsvina’ (Musoni 2010) took place in Zimbabwe in 2005. This operation was an attempt to remove not just traders but the whole of the informal economy. Musoni (2010) reports that vendors did not resist in violence or protest the operation, but tried to avoid it. Unlike in other cities (Donovan 2008; Peña 1999) Zimbabwe has an absence of vendor associations that could help resist or negotiate such government operations. Despite the lack of political power many traders resumed vending towards the end of the clean-up and after it had finished, proving the operation was ineffective.

One of the key arguments for clearing vendors from the streets lies in governments’ desire to reduce pedestrian and vehicle congestion in order to create more space for people to walk (Hunt 2009). Mateo-Babiano (2012) terms this the ‘walkability’ and agrees with making streets more pedestrian friendly. However, Mateo-Babiano (2012) also argues that the: “total removal [of vendors] from the street has never been effective and therefore, can never be a favourable end solution. The important role they play, not only in economic terms, but also at the cultural level, should lead to a compromise between regulation and diversity” (p. 457).

Street food has been recognised as having cultural strengths, particularly for its ability to bring life and diversity to the streets (Bromley 2000; Duruz et al. 2011; Mateo-Babiano 2012; Namin et al. 2013). Although passing comments are made on the cultural and social aspects of vending in the research to date, there is a lack of literature that explores these aspects in any great depth. There is certainly no comprehensive empirical study which specifically examines the social and cultural significance of street vending. This apparent lack of attention points towards a clear gap in the current literature to explore street vending from a social-cultural perspective.

There are clearly many perceived advantages and disadvantages to street vending and yet policies rarely promote the activity. Researchers have argued that the best way forward
would be for policymakers to acknowledge the positives of the informal sector and create a society whereby the informal and formal sectors can co-exist (Bromley and Mackie 2009a, 2009b; Cross 2000; Mackie et al. 2014) particularly as there is still a strong consumer demand (Bhowmik 2001; Maruyama and Trung 2010).

Street food is one of the most dominant aspects of street vending; given its prominence it has been particularly prone to government attention, primarily for concerns over health and safety. The following section of this literature review examines the studies on street food vending within the field of human geography and related disciplines.

**Street Food Vending**

Street food is defined by Tinker (1987, p. 52) as “any food that can be eaten without further processing and is sold on the street, from pushcarts, or baskets or balance poles, or from stalls or shops having fewer than four permanent walls”. This definition was based upon seven action research projects conducted during the 1980s in Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Bangladesh, Egypt, Senegal and Nigeria (Tinker 1997). Street food vending is an activity often considered an integral part of the informal economy in developing countries and has been growing in most developing world cities since the onset of urbanisation (Acho-Chi 2002; Arambulo et al. 1994; Tinker 2003). Food is one of the most prominent items sold by vendors; however, the selling and often cooking of food outdoors places this type of vending under high levels of scrutiny. Despite the many challenges presented by street food vending this section will also show that it has many positive aspects that are currently underexplored.

The types of people who take up street food vending as an occupation are diverse, but generally confined to those with little formal education or skills. In some countries, educated, skilled workers are documented as street food vendors (Maneepong and Walsh 2012; Yasmeen 2001) but this is largely attributed to the financial crisis in the mid-late 1990s. Many white-collar workers lost their jobs and as a result took up street vending and built their own enterprises (Bhowmik 2005). More generally, women make up a large proportion of street food vendors worldwide, particularly in Southeast Asia (Bhowmik 2005; Tinker 1997), Latin America (Arambulo et al. 1994), South Africa (Wardrop 2006), West Africa (Acho-Chi 2002; Adjrah et al. 2013) and East Africa (Muyanja et al. 2011). Conversely, in India it is predominately men who are found to be selling food on the street (Chakravarty and Canet 1996; Choudhury et al. 2011). Several studies report that when women do take on the role of a street food vendor, they often work shorter hours than men because they have
additional household responsibilities (Tinker 1997). Regarding income, many studies in the literature report that street food vendors have the potential to earn significantly more than the national minimum wage (e.g. Acho-Chi 2002; Tinker 2003). This offers an explanation as to why some educated and/or skilled workers choose this occupation over others. However, despite the potential to earn a good wage, for many street food vending offers a basic survival strategy (Iyenda 2001; Tinker 1993). Left over goods are frequently used for subsistence and any profits are commonly used to pay for children’s education and contribute to family health (Acho-Chi 2002) - vending is often the sole income of the family (Iyenda 2001; Wardrop 2006) or sent as remittances back to the family, in the case of migrant workers (Jensen et al. 2013).

Campaigns to remove street food from public space are often the result of poor hygiene practices. Relationship between street food and hygiene has been widely discussed in the academic literature with ample examples of case studies, for example South Africa (Von Holy and Makhoane 2006), Togo (Adjrah et al. 2013), Uganda (Muyanja et al. 2011), Ghana (Rheinländer et al. 2008) India (Choudhury et al. 2011) and Latin America (Arambulo et al. 1994). Many of the studies reported a lack of basic hygiene knowledge amongst vendors coupled with poor hygiene practice (Adjrah et al. 2013; Choudhury et al. 2011); a lack of adequate sanitation facilities leading to evidence of food contamination (Chakravarty and Canet 1996; Von Holey and Makhoane 2006); and waste management issues (Muyanja et al. 2011). Previous studies highlight the need for training and education of street food vendors (Arambulo et al. 1994; Chakravarty and Canet 1996; Muyanja et al. 2011); a supply of clean water (Tinker 1997); improved sanitation facilities (Muyanja et al. 2011) and better infrastructure (Choudhury et al. 2011).

Inspections are one form of intervention already conducted in some places such as Singapore (Henderson et al. 2012) and have been advocated in other research as ways to manage and improve the hygiene of street food (Adjrah et al. 2013). In cases where inspections already do take place, it has been suggested that checks are carried out more regularly and made more stringent to improve food safety (Chakravarty and Canet 1996). Conversely, a study conducted by Mosupye and von Holy (1999) in South Africa found that foods reasonably safe for consumption were being produced on the streets despite inadequate conditions – such as lack of basic sanitation. Because of these findings Von Holy and Makhoane (2006) argue that food vendors in South Africa have a clear potential to provide safe foods even when the conditions are not ideal, and therefore should not be removed on this basis.
Despite the many hygiene concerns about street food, it does have benefits. Most notably it provides employment opportunities for people who would otherwise be unemployed (Iyenda 2001; Rheinländer et al. 2008), allowing individuals on the margins of society an opportunity to become financially independent and alleviate their poverty. Since formal skills are not required and stalls can be set up relatively cheaply with few resources (Arambulo et al. 1994), street food vending is a viable employment option for many people. As a result, street food makes large contributions to the wider economy in many countries (e.g. Von Holy and Makhoane 2006) but is often not recognised.

Historically street food vending has been associated with informality; however, the distinction between informal/formal is becoming increasingly blurred (Cross 2000; Timothy and Wall 1997). This is a result of vendors becoming more regulated and cities in the developing world becoming more westernised (Henderson et al. 2012; Maruyama and Trung 2010). Research conducted on consumer choice by Maruyama and Trung (2010) in Hanoi, Vietnam found that 73 per cent of those surveyed shopped at informal markets, despite a higher presence of formal markets. Although the results found a tendency for people to use formal markets for reasons of food quality, the authors argue that the informal markets have retained their popularity because they offer cheaper goods and are conveniently located; they also argue that informal markets target a different type of consumer and serve a different purpose to the formal markets managed by the government. Street food is both a cheap (Ab Karim 2012; Maruyama and Trung 2010) and an accessible source of food that feeds a wide range of urban residents (Chakravarty and Canet 1996; Tinker 1993), it also constitutes an important food source for the urban poor in many countries (Bhowmik 2005). A large proportion of low-income salaries are spent on street food (Chakravarty and Canet 1996; Cohen and Garrett 2010; Ruel et al. 2010) and according to Acho-Chi (2002) an increasing number of working women are purchasing meals from street sellers to feed their family, saving themselves both time and money. There is also evidence to suggest that street food has the potential to contribute to urban food security, in the wake of increasing populations (Etzold 2008). It is therefore not surprising that concern has been expressed regarding the removal of vendors from the street, as this would leave many urban poor without adequate access to a food supply that is currently catered for by the street food system (Maruyama and Trung 2010).

In terms of urban landscapes, street food provides towns and cities with a ‘sidewalk culture’ and ‘vibrant streetscapes’ which is much desired in the developed world (Newman and Burnett 2013). In his commentary of street vending, Bromley (2000, p. 5) presents an
argument in favour of street food vending on the grounds that it can “bring life to dull streets”. In her discussion on the informal food economy and streetscapes in Bangkok, Mateo-Babiano (2012, p. 457) comments, “the variety of food sold on Bangkok streets, especially on its sois (side streets) brings forth a combination of visual, olfactory and gustatory sensations which compel passers-by to taste its flavours.” Mateo-Babiano (2012) argues for a revival in street culture through appropriate design that encourages social interaction, walkability and the promotion of sustainable street practices. Not only does street food contribute to the urban fabric, but it also links the urban with the rural in many ways – most predominately through the procurement of produce (Etzold 2008) but also through the people that commute daily from rural areas. This helps to integrate “rural and urban areas economically, socially and culturally” (Chakravarty and Canet 1996, p. 32).

In addition to the clear economic benefits, the literature indicates that there are several social and cultural benefits offered by street food trading. Eating street food with others has been found to be an essential social activity which constitutes an important part of local culture (Wardrop 2006) and research has shown that street food has the potential to foster sustainable economic and social development through local capacity building (Acho-Chi 2002). Accordingly, Acho-Chi argues; “street food service points have also become empowering public sites for social networking where people relax, tell stories, brag, and discuss politics, sports and business ventures” (2002, p. 139). Acho-Chi recognises street food as a hub of social interaction and clearly believes in the importance of sustaining it. There is currently a lack of empirical studies that explore the social and cultural benefits of street food vending in any great detail, but the need to understand the social importance of the informal sector to ensure the sustainability of livelihoods has been recognised. Iyenda (2001, p. 241), for example, has identified vendors as an “ideal form of social organisation” and their “friendliness”, in other words the sociality of the street food, has been found to be important to the popularity of the experience.

Street food is often unique to a city or region and because of this it is sometimes used as a tourist attraction. This aspect of street food vending has been widely discussed in the literature in a variety of contexts (Ab Karim 2012; Arambulo et al. 1994; Bhowmik 2005; Henderson et al. 2012; Timothy and Wall 1997). The literature suggests that street foods (whether bought in the street or from a stall in a hawker centre) appeal to tourists because it offers them chance to become involved with a local cultural practice and thus contribute to the ‘authentic’ experiences that many tourists seek (Cohen and Avieli 2004; Sims 2009).

In their study on hawker centres in Singapore, Henderson et al. (2012) argue that hawkers
have an unrealised potential to become a tourist attraction and contribute to the sustainability of food hawking, and perhaps most importantly – culturally – as questions surrounding the future of these centres arise.

Tinker (1999) comments on the future of street food as the world becomes increasingly globalised; she believes that the proliferation of street food will increase throughout the 21st century due to the high prices of supermarkets and a continued desire for convenience foods by students and workers. As cities in the developing world become more westernised street food gains further competition from multinational fast-food corporations. A study by Aloia et al. (2013) found that despite its increasing prevalence, fast food consumption in Chandigarh, India was low overall in both high-income and low-income neighbourhoods. A study in Penang, Malaysia, in contrast however, found that the increased number of restaurants had significantly impacted trade of street food vendors (Ab Karim 2012).

Street food vending is obviously fraught with challenges; however, the literature clearly highlights some perceived benefits. To date, little effort has been made to explore the social and cultural characteristics of street food in any great depth, despite the many passing comments made about its potential social and cultural role within the urban environment. Some attempts have been made to draw attention to the need for policymakers and planners to consider the social side of street food vending, but research is still largely focused on its economic importance. To better understand the social aspects of street food vending a rigorous and comprehensive framework is needed. Considering previous research has explored the environmental and economic impacts of street vending, the social dimension of sustainability appears to offer a potentially suitable lens in which to explore the phenomena of street food. Given this, the remainder of the literature review will explore the concept of social sustainability in detail.

**Social Sustainability**

The aim of this section is to reflect on and bring together the disparate literatures on social sustainability and move towards developing a framework against which street food vending might be explored.

It has been three decades since the Brundtland report (Brundtland 1987) was published and subsequently initiated the widespread interest in sustainable development into the wider realm beyond purely ecological interests. It is in this report and the succeeding Rio Declaration in 1992 (UN 1992) that the sustainability agenda for future decades was decided and situated as a core political component worldwide. Despite the concept’s prevalent usage
and alleged importance, the term is somewhat contested, confused and without sound equilibrium between its three central components – the environmental, economic and the social. The social feature of sustainability has received relatively little attention in comparison to the other key streams (Littig and Griessler 2005; McKenzie 2004; Polèse and Stren 2000) despite the anthropocentric nature of the Brundtland report’s definition of sustainability. Copious reasons exist for this neglect, one being that sustainable development policies introduced after the Brundtland report were largely concerned with achieving economic growth whilst managing the natural environment and balancing the use of its resources. The emphasis on the environmental and economic pillars in the literature has been attributed to the fact that arguments for these dimensions are, respectively, least disputed and more convincing (Littig and Griessler 2005). The social aspect of sustainability, on the other hand, is more difficult to quantify (McKenzie 2004) and concepts associated with it have been mostly approached from social policy and development perspectives dealing with hard issues such as poverty reduction and deprivation.

The complexities involved in unravelling what social sustainability is, has led to it being described as the ‘messy pillar’ (Moore and Bunce 2009) and as a ‘concept in chaos’ (Vallance et al. 2011). Despite the increasing attention paid to the notion in recent years no one all-encompassing definition of social sustainability has been agreed upon (Dempsey et al. 2011; Littig and Griessler 2005; Yiftachel and Hedgcock 1993). Rather, what exists are a number of definitions that have evolved out of different types of research across several disciplines within the social sciences and related fields. A summary of the key referenced definitions can be found in Table 2.1 below.
Table 2.1 Social Sustainability Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polèse and Stren (2000)</td>
<td>“Social Sustainability for a city is defined as development (and/or) growth that is compatible with the harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of the population (pp. 15–16).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie (2004)</td>
<td>“Social sustainability is a positive condition within communities, and a process within communities that can achieve that condition” (p. 23).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littig and Griessler (2005)</td>
<td>“Social sustainability is a quality of societies. It signifies the nature-society relationships, mediated by work, as well as relationships within the society. Social sustainability is given, if work within a society and the related institutional arrangements: (1) satisfy an extended set of human needs (2) are shaped in a way that nature and its reproductive capabilities are preserved over a long period of time and the normative claims of social justice, human dignity and participation are fulfilled” (p. 72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley and Power (2009)</td>
<td>“There are two recognisable, overarching concepts at the core of the notion of social sustainability within an area context. These are social equity issues (access to services, facilities, and opportunities) and issues to do with the sustainability of community itself” (p. 32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiftachel and Hedgcock (1993)</td>
<td>“Urban social sustainability is defined here as the continuing ability of a city to function as a long-term viable setting for human interaction, communication and cultural development” (p. 140).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs (1999)</td>
<td>“It is the conservation of local cultures and communities, along with equity and a third ideal, participation, which can broadly speaking be said to make for ‘social sustainability’” (p. 41).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachs (1999)</td>
<td>“A strong definition of social sustainability must rest on the basic values of equity and democracy, the latter meant as the effective appropriation of all human rights – political, civil, economic, social and cultural – by all people” (p. 27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron and Gauntlett (2002)</td>
<td>“Social sustainability occurs when formal and informal processes, systems, structures and relationships actively support the capacity of future generations to create healthy and livable communities. Socially sustainable communities are equitable, diverse, connected and democratic and provide a good quality of life” (p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colantonio (2010)</td>
<td>“Social sustainability concerns how individuals, communities and societies live with each other and set out to achieve the objectives of the development models that they have chosen for themselves, while also taking into account the physical boundaries of their places and planet Earth as a whole” (p. 81).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definitions of social sustainability generally take one of three perspectives. Definitions by Yiftachel and Hedgcock (1993) and Polese and Stren (2000) view social sustainability as a condition to be achieved or maintained (Ghahramanpour 2013). Definitions by Bramley and Power (2009), Colantonio (2010), Sachs (1999) and Jacobs (1999) use a measurement
framework, identifying the main indicators of social sustainability in their definition. Thirdly, McKenzie (2004) and Barron and Gauntlett (2002) approach social sustainability as a process which focuses on the future (Ghahramanpour 2013). The final type of definition captured here embraces the essence of sustainability itself by acknowledging that the purpose of achieving social sustainability is for it to be sustained into future generations. The various approaches taken to defining social sustainability appeal to the context in which the term is applied, regardless of their differences; however, common themes are shared by all of the above definitions. These are a desire for a society that is equitable, democratic and socially inclusive.

If, as emphasised in many definitions, social sustainability is considered something to be achieved or maintained, then we must examine what makes a society socially sustainable through exploring the key themes that help to make something socially sustainable or not. Dempsey et al. (2011) provide perhaps the most comprehensive account of the various dimensions of social sustainability, however, they fail to differentiate between the various contributions. Neither have they grouped similar concepts together, resulting in a list of synonymous terms, appearing to add to the ambiguity of the concept. The use of fewer terms could help convey the concept more succinctly and with greater clarity. In an attempt to reduce the number of items, Table 2.2 groups the key dimensions under similar themes to produce a list of eight. These eight key themes and the reason for their grouping are then discussed below using the terminology identified in the second column of Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2 Grouped Dimensions of Social Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes in the literature</th>
<th>Terms adopted in this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Social Justice /Social Equity</td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Participation in Local Democracy/Engaged Governance</td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Quality of Life/Social Equality/Well-being</td>
<td>Quality of Life and Well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Safety and Security</td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Social and Cultural Diversity/Social Inclusion/Integration/Tolerance</td>
<td>Social Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Social Networks/Social Interactions/Social Capital</td>
<td>Social Interactions and Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cultural Traditions/Heritage</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Senses of Belonging/Sense of Place/Sense of Community</td>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity, tantamount with social justice, is a multifaceted term that is considered the most important aspect in the literature to achieve social sustainability (Axelsson et al. 2013; Bramley et al. 2009; Cuthill 2010; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Jacobs 1999; Littig and Griessler 2005; McKenzie 2004; Rogers 2005; Scott et al. 2000; Sharifi and Murayama 2013; Yiftachel and Hedgcock 1993). Participation in local democracy, also referred to as engaged governance, was another highly cited aspect of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Cuthill 2010; Dempsey et al. 2011; Jacobs 1999; Littig and Griessler 2005; McKenzie 2004; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). Participation adheres to ideas about community involvement and bottom-up approaches that complement other indicators such as social capital (Putnam 1993). Quality of life and social well-being are the third most popular cited indicators of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Dave 2011; Littig and Griessler 2005; Polèse and Stren 2000; Sharifi and Murayama 2013), followed by safety and security (Bramley et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Rogers 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). Colantonio (2010) has labelled quality of life and well-being as emerging ‘softer themes’ of social sustainability which are removed from traditional ‘harder’ issues, commonly acknowledged as themes surrounding equity, social justice, fulfilment of basic needs, poverty, employment and human rights and gender equality. In contrast, Holden (2012) argues that rather than a simple transition from hard to soft themes of social sustainability we are witnessing a shift in responsibility of issues to the city level that includes both a mix of traditional hard social policy challenges as well as an increased attention to softer issues, at least in developed countries.

Social and cultural diversity appeared as another important theme of social sustainability (Axelsson et al. 2013; Brindley 2003; McKenzie 2004; Polèse and Stren 2000; Rogers 2005) which encompasses complementary ideas of tolerance (Rogers 2005) and social inclusion (Holden 2012; Rogers 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013) and social integration (Brindley 2003; Littig and Greissler 2005; Polèse and Stren 2000). Further dimensions regarding relationships between people have also been grouped, such as social networks (Demspey et al. 2011; Littig and Greissler 2005) social interactions (Bramely et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Demspey et al. 2011; Sharifi and Murayama 2013) and social capital (Cuthill 2010; Dempsey et al. 2011; Rogers 2005; Scott et al. 2000). In the literature social capital was not always considered a direct dimension of social sustainability but is often discussed alongside it or in place of it, implying that high levels of social capital itself may be indicative of a socially sustainable society (O’Hara 1999; Rogers 2005; Scott et al. 2000).
Socio-cultural traditions and heritage were also popular features of social sustainability (Axelsson et al. 2013; Jacobs 1999; McKenzie 2004); however, there is still concern as to whether cultural sustainability should constitute an independent pillar of sustainability (Sachs 1999). Despite this, there was a strong emphasis on the desire to maintain local culture and traditions for future generations, but not at the expense of innovation (Sachs 1999). Linked somewhat to the idea of local culture and traditions and also themes surrounding social inclusion, sense of place, community and belonging were the final dimensions drawn from the literature that have been grouped under one theme (Bramley et al. 2009; Brindley 2003; Chan and Lee 2008; Rogers 2005). The next section describes a previous attempt to develop a framework for social sustainability, before moving on to discuss each of the themes in more detail in their own sections.

The diversity of the eight key themes which underlie social sustainability make it a difficult notion to define, hence there is limited research to date which has attempted to conceptualise these dimensions holistically. In an attempt to address the complexities of the concept Vallance et al. (2011) propose three types of social sustainability, development, bridge and maintenance, and relate them to the wider sustainability agenda. The framework offered by Vallance et al. (2011) recognises that social sustainability is not just a one-dimensional concept, but one which is made up of a multitude of conflicting aspirations. Each type of social sustainability proposed addresses a different concern, allowing closely related dimensions to be explored together. Development sustainability is concerned with “basic needs, creation of social capital, justice, equity” (Vallance et al. 2011, p. 342). This type of social sustainability draws on the literature which has addressed the social dimension of sustainability as social development – i.e. research which is concerned with inter and intra-generational equity and other associated development issues, both tangible and intangible. The fulfilment of basic needs is considered an essential part of alleviating poverty and therefore must be addressed ahead of environmental concerns. Given that in some places basic needs have largely been addressed, Vallance et al. (2011) suggest that ‘higher order needs’ such as social capital could also be explored under this part of the social sustainability framework.

Bridge social sustainability is associated with “change in behaviour so as to achieve biophysical environmental goals” (Vallance et al. 2011, p. 342). This second type of social sustainability is concerned with the relationship between humans and their physical environment. Bridge social sustainability aims to build connections between people and the environment to create positive environmental outcomes through transformative and non-
transformative approaches. Maintenance social sustainability on the other hand refers to the “preservation – or what can be sustained of socio-cultural characteristics in the face of change, and the ways in which people actively embrace or resist those changes” (Vallance et al. 2011, pp. 342–343). This third type of social sustainability is interested in maintaining or improving certain cultural practices and traditions that underpin aspects of people’s everyday lives. Maintenance social sustainability, however, is fraught with challenges as efforts to introduce sustainability may compromise social and cultural practices which people may prefer to remain.

Vallance et al. (2011) argue that their approach avoids denying the complexity of the subject and thus contributes a new perspective to the social sustainability debate. The authors also recognise that there will be contradictions between the different components, however, the achievement of sustainability will always be fraught with trade-offs in one area or another.

The framework proposed by Vallance et al. (2011) offers a potential way to approach the various dimensions of social sustainability identified in the literature by grouping them under the separate headings. Drawing upon the approach taken by Vallance et al. (2011) and the most cited themes of social sustainability identified in the literature (see Table 2.2), this research loosely uses and adapts the framework proposed by Vallance et al. (2011) to develop a new conceptual framework which can be applied to the street food context.

Equity, quality of life, participation and safety and security most suitably sit under the heading of development social sustainability (Vallance et al. 2011) because they are concerned with meeting basic needs of the population. The themes of social and cultural traditions, heritage and sense of place are concerned with social and cultural aspects of everyday life and the idea of maintenance social sustainability proposed by Vallance et al. (2011) offers a suitable place to position these dimensions. Bridge social sustainability is a challenging part of the framework proposed by Vallance et al. (2011) to apply to the street food context. Its primary concern regards people’s ecological behaviours and it is difficult to explore this area specifically using the social sustainability dimensions identified, without opening wider environmental debates. However, fundamentally bridge sustainability is concerned with people’s behaviour in their environment. Given this, the current framework could be adapted to explore the social actions of people, taking into consideration the design of the built environment which in this research this would be the street. Under this heading the social sustainability themes covered would be social interactions, social networks and social inclusion. Here, bridge social sustainability could be considered a tool to advocate the connection between people, place and communities through the built environment.
It is clear in the review of the literature that one of the difficulties involved in defining social sustainability is because the term is often adapted to suit the context in which it is being used. Furthermore, some argue that social sustainability should be treated independently of the economic and environmental aspects (McKenzie, 2004) whereas others argue for the pillars to be approached simultaneously with more attention given between the links (Murphy 2012; Sachs 1999). Boström (2012) recognises the that there is a missing link between the pillars of sustainability, but argues that social sustainability is not necessarily always the best term for describing the relationship between society and environment. Similarly Davidson (2010) critiques the use of the notion in its entirety, arguing that it does nothing other more than bundle existing independent concepts under an umbrella term.

The remainder of the literature review will individually address the eight themes of social sustainability. The focus of these sections is to provide a key account of the primary literatures in each field to understand how each one may be explored in the context of street food.

**Social Justice and Equity**

Social equity is considered fundamental to the achievement of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Bramley and Power 2009; Cuthill 2009; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Jacobs 1999; Rogers 2005; Scott et al. 2000; Sharifi and Murayama 2012; Vallance 2011; Yiftachel and Hedgecock 1993). However, what is exactly meant by equity is less well asserted in this literature. For the purpose of streamlining the various social sustainability components, the terms equity and social justice will be used synonymously as they generally refer to the same goal. For example, Fainstein (2010) claims that to be just a society must also be equitable. Equality is also a term frequently used interchangeably with equity and justice in these discussions; however, there are some differences. Equality suggests ‘equal’ and therefore the same; equity on the other hand implies something is fair, and this does not necessarily mean the same as equality. The literature does not distinguish very clearly between the two terms.

Sen (1979) proposes three strands of thought concerning equality that can be summarised as: utilitarian equality, total utility equality and Rawlsian equality. The traditional discussions on equality originate from the utilitarian perspective which involved the distribution of utility that results in maximising the total sum; this would often result in the favouring of one section of the population at the expense of another (Nussbaum 1997). The major critique of the utilitarian perspective is that it ignores the individual’s needs and subsequently not
everybody’s needs are satisfied the same. With total utility the aim is for everyone to receive the same utility so people with more are distributed with less and the people with less are given more in order to create an overall balance. This approach is criticised by Sen (1979) on the basis that those worse off are in a stronger position than those who happen to be better off in the first instance, making it better to have least initially in order to receive more. Rawls (1971) criticised utilitarianism for ignoring the individuality of persons which leads to an imbalance of resources, instead Rawls argues for a fairer implementation of justice, the key of which is his theory of ‘primary goods’. For Rawls, primary goods are considered broadly to be rights, liberties and opportunities and income and wealth. The ‘primary goods’ approach has been criticised by Sen (1980) and Nussbaum (1997) for being too materialistic; providing people with basic ‘goods’ does not automatically ascribe people with the same abilities to convert these goods into useful outputs and therefore this does not help to achieve a just society. Instead Sen argues for a focus on capabilities.

The general rhetoric of equality of ‘all men are created equal’ leads us to ignore the diversity of humans that influences the way inequality has been measured and evaluated. What Sen (1992, p. 30) means by this is that by assuming all men were born as equals leaves us to overlook inequalities that stand outside of simple economic distribution of income. Sen (1992) recognises the diverse characteristics of the population, emphasising throughout his work that we cannot simply have equality of everything because the determination to achieve equality in one area only leads to the elimination of egalitarianism in another. As an alternative to the distribution of utilities, Sen (1992) introduces the concept of capabilities as offering a better way of achieving social justice. Nussbaum (2003) is also an advocate of the capabilities approach; however, Nussbaum argues that Sen’s ‘perspective of freedom’ is too vague without a definite list of core capabilities. Nussbaum (2003, pp. 41–42) puts forward a list of capabilities named ‘fundamental entitlements’ that includes: life, bodily health, bodily integrity, senses, imagination and thought, emotions, practical reason, affiliation, other species, play and control over one’s environment.

Drawing upon Rawls’ (1971) concept of fairness in her discussion of the Just City Fainstein (2010) argues that more attention should be given to just processes in policymaking to ensure the mitigation of unfair practices on those less powerful, for example the displacement of and demolition of communities often results in devastating consequences for many and benefits few. Democratic processes, as discussed elsewhere in this literature review, are often cited as an important step to achieving an equitable society (Devas 2004). Although Fainstein (2010) advocates democracy, alongside equity and diversity as the key to
achieving justice, it is recognised that the simple promotion of democratic processes threatens to oversimplify the situation by romanticising positive aspects of open communication and disregarding negative debates. Regardless of this, Fainstein maintains that if more consideration is given to creating more just cities, rather than competitive cities, there is the potential for policies to be developed that will result in cities characterised by accessibility, diversity, inclusivity and ability to give voice to all. However, Iveson and Fincher (2011), argue that not much attention has been paid to the tensions that are likely to arise between the three potentially competing aims of democracy, equity and diversity.

The debates around equity, justice and equality are fraught with tension and disparities in their detail; however, the overall consensus of achieving fairness and a ‘good life’ for everyone is a sentiment shared by all. Fundamental to Nussbaum and Sen’s (1993) capabilities approach is the idea that people should not be denied the opportunity to access and act upon the list of basic capabilities that are identified as being important to the achievement of just societies by enabling individuals to choose their own life path. Through their critique of equality and the development of their capabilities approach it appears Sen and Nussbaum have arrived at what is commonly referred to as equity – a system of fair opportunities.

**Participation**

It is widely recognised that economic growth does not simply solve poverty issues and, if anything, it has been shown to increase disparities between rich and poor. A potential solution to solving some of the issues unresolved by economic means is to promote a democratic civil society (Devas 2004). Democratic participation, also referred to as engaged governance, is a widely cited criterion identified for social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Cuthill 2009; Jacobs 1999; Littig and Greißler 2005; McKenzie 2004; and Sharifi, and Murayama 2013). Participation has become somewhat of a buzzword in recent years in the urban and political literatures as societies, particularly cities, aspire to become more democratic (Silver et al. 2010). Purcell (2006) notes, however, that it is becoming increasingly difficult for cities to become democratic due to neo-liberalisation processes which dominate the functioning of cities and encourage their global competitiveness. Democratic participation, although egalitarian, has also been criticised as being “slow, messy, [and] inefficient” (Purcell 2006, p. 1923) and subject to class bias (Mueller and Stratmann 2003).
Putnam’s (1993) thesis on social capital highlighted the benefits of participation in community associations, whether a religious, community action group or local sports club. Putnam (1993, p. 185) states “building social capital will not be easy, but it is the key to making democracy work” although, it is not exactly clear how high levels of social capital contribute to greater political participation (Krishna 2002). Fukuyama (2001) however, criticizes Putnam, questioning how members of bowling clubs, or similar, can have any real influence on important political matters. Correspondingly, research by Seligson (1999) in Central America found that participation in other types of groups such as school associations and civic clubs did not produce increased democratic participation; however, involvement in community associations is likely to result in citizens becoming more politically active (Seligson 1999). Participation in local democracy is also underpinned by cultural differences within societies; Krishna (2002) for example, found that men were significantly more likely to participate in public decision-making than women. In addition, despite the increasing universal recognition given to democratic political process, it does not guarantee all citizens’ opinions will be listened to, let alone acted upon (Krishna 2002).

The literature points to a political transition in society from government to governance, particularly in Western countries. Governance is defined by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as:

“the exercise of political, economic and administrative authority to manage a nation’s affairs. It is the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their right and obligations and mediate their differences” (UNDP, 1997b, p. 9 as quoted in Devas 2004, p. 24).

Governance, unlike government, involves a number of actors in decision and policymaking processes. In a society of governance, informal relationships are as important as the formal (Devas 2004); however, the increased involvement of private companies and public-private partnerships in local government actions may undermine the democratic process of local government elections in the first place and result in less transparency for the public (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998; Sorensen and Torfing 2009). How then, real democracy and public decision-making can be fostered is presented as increasingly challenging.

Much of the literature on democratic participation is focused at the community or city level; introducing the concept of scale, Purcell (2006) argues that this offers the temptation for concepts such as ‘the right to the city’ to become subject to the ‘local trap’ whereby the needs of the local are prioritised over others. Arguably however, given that many decisions
and actions are initially made at the local level by municipal governments, it would seem imprudent for citizens not to voice their opinions when given the opportunity to make an impact, even at the local scale, as this is the arena most likely to be open to influence (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998). However, voice is not a privilege of all, even at the local level. In the developing world, street traders are one group that are often excluded in decision-making processes, particularly in cities that seek to promote a modern city image that omits vending activity (Brown et al. 2010). Research by Brown et al. (2010) in African cities shows the most effective way for vendors to have influence on decision-making is through structured associations or grassroots organisations, although the success of the groups is context specific and can depend upon the status of its members and ability to access political negotiations. In Vietnam, such associations and participatory organisations are limited given the political context, however the literature suggests an increasing number of civil society organisations working towards influencing power around “shared-conceptions of common good” (Wells-Dang 2010, p. 98). Although it appears these organisations are far from perfect, with evidence to suggest that personal networks and close alignment with the government play a large role in the success of civil society campaigns (Gray 1999; Parenteau and Nguyen 2005).

In the development literature, a strong relationship has been found between participation and empowerment (Lyons et al. 2001), although they should not be mistaken as synonymous (Silver et al. 2010). Research conducted by Lyons et al. (2001) found participatory development initiatives resulted in the development of empowerment at three levels – personal, project and development. Empowerment helps communities take more control over their activities and in turn helps to sustain development projects and contributes to the overall aims of sustainable development, demonstrating that empowering participation can lead to long-term effects. Devas (2004) found that little work has been done on the interconnections between livelihoods of the poor, urban development and governance. Although research has been carried out in recent years which fills this gap, the relevancy of the subject matter under the context of social sustainability offers an avenue for future research.

The concept of democratic participation invokes a notion of citizenship which “captures this idea of a sense of belonging, through equal access to service and jobs, comprehensible procedures for improved participation, and/or articulated visions of inclusiveness” (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998, p. 109). The aspects of citizenship listed here are not dissimilar to some of the dimensions of social sustainability, and leads to the question as to whether social
sustainability can be rebranded as simply ‘civil society’. Nonetheless, civil society appears the most appropriate terminology in which to explore participation in the Vietnamese context.

**Quality of Life and Well-being**

Quality of life (QOL) is concerned with the relationship between people and their living environments (Pacione 2003). Although there is a general consensus that QOL is a tool or term used to explore the relative standard of life of people or societies, it is a complex and difficult term to define with no universal definition (Dissart and Deller 2000; Massam 2002). Romney et al. (1994) offer three possible explanations for this lack of definition:

“(1) Psychological processes relevant to experience QOL can be described and interpreted through many conceptual filters and languages: (2) the concept of QOL is to a considerable degree value laden: (3) the concept QOL embodies the understanding of human growth and development processes, the average life span of individuals within communities, and the extent to which these psychological processes are influenced by environmental factors and individual value systems” (Romney et al. 1994 cited in Massam 2002, p. 149).

QOL in its very nature is subjective; what one person might consider a ‘good’ quality of life, another may find too extravagant or too basic. Traditionally QOL was measured using objective social, economic or health indicators that relate to basic human needs (Costanza et al. 2007), based at the bottom of Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy. Increasingly however, QOL has been used synonymously with terms such as “well-being, level of living, way of life, life satisfaction, happiness and morale” (Dissart and Deller 2000, p. 136). Dissart and Deller (2000, p. 137) go on to define well-being as consisting of a “complex set of psychologically measurable variables, the most important of those being emotional variables (e.g. happiness, coherence, sense of purpose, and social relations).” Individual and societal senses of well-being can be said to constitute a second dimension of QOL – the psychological (Massam 2002). These two elements, the environmental and psychological, have also been referred to generally as the ‘objective’ and ‘subjective’ aspects of QOL (Costanza et al. 2007; Pacione 2003; Rogerson et al. 1987) or the exogenous and endogenous (Dissart and Deller 2000). The subjective aspects of QOL concerns the way people perceive and evaluate the conditions and environments in which they live and work, subsequently this affects how they feel about their lives and influences their well-being which therefore impacts their quality of life (Pacione 2003). Objective and subjective measures are increasingly recognised as complementary to one another and are often used alongside each other as tools to measure QOL (Costanza et al. 2007; Cutter 1985; Rogerson et al. 1989).
In developing their framework Costanza et al. (2007, p. 269) propose a definition of QOL that recognises both objective and subjective aspects of the term:

“QOL is the extent to which objective human needs are fulfilled in relation to personal or group perceptions of subjective well-being. Human needs are basic needs for subsistence, reproduction, security, affection etc. SWB [sense of well-being] is assessed by individuals’ or groups’ responses to questions about happiness, life satisfaction, utility or welfare.”

In the spirit of Nussbaum and Sen’s (1993) capabilities approach, Costanza et al. (2007) propose a list of human needs that individuals should have the opportunity to access or achieve in order for them to attain their desired standard of QOL. This list includes: subsistence, reproduction, security, affection, understanding, participation, leisure, spirituality, creativity/emotional expression, identity and freedom (Costanza et al. 2007). Accordingly, Costanza et al. (2007) claim four types of capital input are required – social, human, built and natural – to realise these needs, with each type of capital having varying degrees of input in the different categories. The priority given to non-economic forms of capital goes some way towards recognising that we need to move beyond the idea that prosperity brings a greater QOL. That said, money is still a valuable asset that helps to facilitate and maintain the above capitals in the dominant economic system in which the majority of the world’s population lives.

Cutter (1985) explores QOL from a geographic perspective; she has defined QOL as “an individual’s happiness or satisfaction with life and environment, including needs and desires, aspirations, lifestyle preferences and other tangible and intangible factors which determine overall well-being” (Cutter 1985 as quoted in Massam, 2003, p. 146). Cutter (1985) goes on to describe how QOL expands beyond the individual and home life to consider the condition of the wider community. As something which transcends the self and home to the wider environment, QOL is well positioned to be examined across different geographic scales. Most commonly, the local scale is often the subject of geographic research – particularly in urban areas which tend to be home to the most disadvantaged groups in society (Pacione 1986, 2003). Given the link with location, concern for QOL is beginning to take precedence within the planning literature (Dissart and Deller 2000). We already know from Newman (1972) the design of the environment can influence crime rates and promote social inclusion, two key elements that contribute towards QOL as well as the wider aims of social sustainability.

An overview of the literature has shown that QOL is not just about the attainment of basic human needs but also the fulfillment of psychological needs. Furthermore, the achievement
of a ‘good’ QOL is also not an isolated mission but the responsibility of communities, policymakers and planners alike.

**Safety and Security**

This section focuses on the theories of crime and fear. In order for a society to be socially sustainable citizens are required to feel safe and secure (Bramley et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Rogers 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). Interest in the safety and security of cities has grown from studies of crime and delinquency in the wider social sciences from the mid-20th century. In the 1980s interest in researching not just the act of crime but the fear of crime itself rose (Bannister and Fyfe 2001; Herbert 1989); initially this research simply focused on places of crime and the mapping of such incidents but overtime expanded to include more comprehensive studies on wider societal issues. Most recently the literature has focused upon what can be considered a globalisation of fear due to the continued compression of time-space (Pain and Smith 2008). The notable terrorist attacks in 2001 made global fears and macro-scale security the focus of much of the research in this field from the beginning of the 21st century (Ingram and Dodds 2009; Philo 2012), resulting in a shift of focus away from the everyday life of crime and security to the national and international scales. It is this disconnect between the two trajectories – the fear of everyday life and the political geographies of fear – that Pain and Smith (2008) try to combine in order to develop a conceptual framework that recognises the materiality of both scales. Fear, commonly recognised as an urban issue, has been described as:

> “a state of constant or intermittent anxiety: its effects reach beyond the prudent management of risk to impinge on public morale, individual well-being and the quality of social life” (Smith 1989, p. 193).

One such concept that transcends both global fears and the everyday is that of the ‘other’, the sensitivity to which has been heightened in the 21st century; this fear, however, is nothing new and the dualism made between ‘us’ and ‘them’ emanates from Edward Said’s (1978) discussions of Orientalism (Haldrup et al. 2008). The city is commonly imagined as a place where diversity and difference are celebrated, however “images which depict the city as unruly, unsettling and disorderly are increasingly dominant” (Bannister and Fyfe 2001, p. 807). Despite the steps that have been made towards the promotion of greater equality amongst different genders, races and cultures in the developed world, animosity and prejudice still clearly exist. Spatial fragmentation of city centres, accompanied by the decentralisation of leisure and residential facilities has also contributed to a decline of perceived safety and heightened fear of city centre spaces (Thomas and Bromley 2000).
Decline in city centres has resulted in degradation due to a lack of resources and has been known to transform inner city spaces into areas of victimisation and criminal activity.

Fear is a powerful emotion that can affect the well-being of people and subsequently dictate behaviour (Bannister and Fyfe 2001; Madge 1997). Pain (1997) specifically explored women’s fear of violent crime. In her study Pain found that fear is largely related to social inequality and social disadvantage; those with limited resources, social and economic, found it difficult to protect themselves and therefore felt most vulnerable to crime. Fear of public spaces in urban areas has also been the subject of research regarding fear and crime; Pain (1997) found that women feared falling victim to violent crime in public spaces more so than in the private home, despite the fact the evidence shows the contrary. Similarly, Madge (1997) found public parks in the UK to be places of fear, particularly for women, the elderly, Asian and African-Caribbean people; these spaces were not feared at all times of the day, but mostly at night. Similar to Jacobs’ (1961) concept of ‘eyes on the street’, Madge (1997) suggests that a greater public presence would help to provide an informal surveillance in addition to an authoritative figure, although it has been argued elsewhere that the latter type of surveillance actually increases people’s fear (Herbert 1986).

Fear transcends all levels of society, and it is only by creating a sense of security that is felt by all, that worries can be alleviated. The concept of defensible space introduced by Newman (1972) is one way of creating a sense of security. Defensible space is built upon the notion that architecture can influence social behaviours, such as the occurrence of crime, although the idea has been criticised as simply architectural determinism (Jacobs and Lees 2013). Newman’s (1972) research showed that extremely high-density, high-rise buildings like those found in 1960s New York City foster opportunities for criminal activity. In order to overcome this problem Newman (1972) proposed that new housing projects should facilitate natural surveillance of residential areas by the buildings’ inhabitants, through the appropriate positioning of windows and entrances. By providing citizens with a sense of control, it is anticipated that they will feel morally motivated to create safe and secure environments for one another. Newman (1972) suggests that a sense of community and shared responsibility will develop, creating an environment that deters criminals from encroaching in these areas due to the increased chances of them being exposed.

The concept of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) which builds upon Newman’s (1972) work has been used by planners to design and build safe and sustainable urban environments (Cozens 2002). Sustainable urban development is of key concern to the
wider sustainable development initiatives resulting from the Brundtland report (1987). Social equity is a core component which runs through all three pillars of the sustainable development model and the built environment is understood to hold the ability to reduce fear of crime and crime itself, and thus contribute to making communities more socially sustainable (Cozens 2002). In more recent years however, at least in Britain, there has been a shift away from emphasis on pure design towards a holistic approach that encompasses the role of the citizen and promotion of community neighbourhoods (Raco 2007). This initiative is a top-down process introduced by government policies that have goals to make societies more inclusive, however, despite good intentions differences are usually exacerbated and policies end up being counterproductive (Raco 2007); in this vein Askins (2008, p. 5) criticises community cohesion initiatives in the UK on the basis that they do not recognise the social construction of others but rather impose traditional ideals and values which are determined by the most dominant group in society.

In regard to the Vietnamese context, there appears to be very little research on the fear of crime or explicitly criminal offences in Vietnamese cities, except for a study on Australian expatriates’ fear of crime in Ho Chi Minh City (Coyne and Bell 2012). As a result of the Doi Moi policy, crime and social problems are reported to have grown (Waibel 2004), although there are few specific studies focused on this area. More generally, themes of corruption, trafficking, illegal cross-border trade, and increased drug use are commented upon in the literature at a wider scale.

Social Inclusion

The literature argues social and cultural diversity, social inclusion, integration and tolerance are vital components of social sustainability (Axelsson et al. 2013; Brindley 2003; Holden 2012; Littig and Greissler 2005; McKenzie 2004; Polèse and Stren 2000; Rogers 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). However, social inclusion is often defined on the basis of what exclusion is not (Cameron 2006). Cameron (2006) argues that social inclusion is therefore conceptualised in a negative light dominated by exclusion. The literature implies that the eradication of problems which cause exclusion will result in social inclusion; however, this supposes that the two terms are mutually exclusive opposites, which they are not – their practical application is actually underpinned by two very different philosophies (Cameron 2006). There are said to be two broad opinions of social inclusion – the first claims mere integration into market structures and society as sufficient to achieve social inclusion regardless of inequalities. The second argues that equality of resources and opportunity to
participate in decision-making that affects individual as well as collective life should also be part of inclusion (Stewart 2000, pp. 8–9).

Social exclusion “has been adopted as a catch-all term to encompass poverty, unemployment, marginalization, ghettoization, etc.” (Seyfang 2003, p. 699). People are subject to exclusion from society for many different reasons, including: “poverty; illiteracy and low levels of educational qualifications; unemployment or poor quality employment; poor health and avoidable mortality; criminal victimization; social isolation; discrimination; and alienation from political participation” (Humpage 2006, p. 227). From a social policy perspective, there has been a shift away from concern with the notion of poverty or problems of equality – related to issues of distribution – towards an interest in social exclusion and its relational matters (Room 1999; Stewart 2000). This shift has resulted in the development of policy initiatives targeted at the local or community level that aim to promote active citizenship which fosters engagement and develops social capital (Seyfang 2003). Time banks are an example of one such initiative discussed by Seyfang (2003) that successfully helped to bridge social divides and bring ‘excluded’ groups together that under ordinary circumstances would not meet. Interaction between different types of people resulted in the promotion of diversity and tolerance amongst the community. The case study of Lewisham, UK, discussed in this research by Seyfang offers a model for future policy developments that not only addresses issues of social exclusion but also provides wider benefits such as promoting civic participation, social capital, community building, cost-savings and active citizenship (Seyfang 2003, p. 704), that all contribute to the wider social aims of sustainable development.

Social inclusion policies are not without criticism. Porter and Craig (2004) discuss the application of Third Way politics to the countries of the developing world to combat poverty and promote social inclusion in the wake of ‘inclusive’ liberalism strategies; they argue that aims to promote inclusiveness through reliance on voluntary action and participation is ideological. Additionally, the expectation of individuals to partake in socially inclusive activities creates a stigma of exclusion around those who do not wish to involve themselves. This highlights the very premise that social exclusion is bound with disadvantage; Cameron (2006) however, suggests those who are labelled ‘excluded’ may not actually feel left out. This may be the case whereby social exclusion is caused by one group exerting their influence and power over others – in this instance social exclusion then can be considered a “normal and integral part of the power dynamics of modern society” (Room 1999, p. 172). This leads to the question as to whether issues of poverty and inequality that have been branded as
‘social exclusion’ should be considered more carefully to recognise the difference between those who are socially excluded and those who chose to live on the margins of society.

Cameron (2006, p. 400) states, “[s]ocial inclusion is constituted in a set of normative practices (consumption, lifestyle), velocities and identities rather than a space or a place”. Social exclusion on the other hand, arguably has a clearer geographic dimension, this is perhaps because those who are excluded are ordinarily pushed to the margins of society – both literally and figuratively speaking. Those who are socially ‘included’ however, live within the mainstream and so their spatial dimensions may be less significant. Sibley (1995, p. 14) explores the geographies of social exclusion in detail, he argues:

“stereotypes play an important part in the configuration of social space because of the importance of distanciation in the behaviour of social groups, that is, distancing from others who are presented negatively, and because of the way in which group images and place images combine to create landscapes of exclusion.”

Landscapes of exclusion are prominently visualised through the notions of race (Cloke 2006) gender (Pain 2000) and disability (Kitchin 1998), and those who do not conform to the mainstream social groups such as travellers (Atkinson and Laurier 1998) and the homeless (Mohan 2002). According to Sibley (1995) exclusions are reinforced by fear of the ‘other’, the construction of boundaries create distance between the ‘alien others’ that emphasise power relations and prevent social mixing. The social polarisation experienced as a result of this is often due to an underlying fear of crime (see previous section). In an effort to promote a sense of security spaces are increasingly being put under surveillance, however, this may enhance feelings of exclusion because certain groups of ‘undesirables’ may be more easily identified and expelled from these ‘purified’ places, youths idling in shopping centres are a common example (Mohan 2002). Sibley (1995) suggests that one way to overcome this issue of exclusion is to police boundaries; however, Sibley does not elaborate how social inclusion can be achieved or offer an alternative perspective of how geographies of inclusion may be explored, leaving the reader to assume the general misunderstanding that social inclusion must be what social exclusion is not.

**Social Interaction and Social Networks**

Social interactions, which form the basis of social networks and arguably all kinds of social relationships, are essential to the development of social sustainability (Bramely et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Demspey et al. 2011; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). Castells’ (1996) widely cited work on the rise of the network society discusses the role of networks in the ‘information
age'; in this type of information society knowledge is considered power and global networks which span across space and time, enabled by new technologies, facilitate the acquisition and distribution of information for competitive advantage in an increasingly globalised economy. Although the social networking terminology is frequently used to refer to the digital age, interest in social networks and attributes offered through social ties are not a recent phenomenon. In the late 19th century Tönnies (1957, [1887]) introduced the concept of ‘gemeinschaft’ and ‘gesellschaft’, respectively translated into community and society; the terms were used to describe different social groups and the types of relational ties between them. Gemeinschaft refers to social relationships that are centred on shared values and beliefs which are commonly thought to be a result of close-knit kinship groups and/or geographic propinquity and usually associated with organic societies. Gesellschaft, on the other hand, connotes social ties that are more impersonal, superficial and individualistic, where the objective of socialising is often for personal gain, characteristics which could arguably be associated with the relationships typical of late capitalist societies. Until the mid-20th century the concept of a social network was used metaphorically, based upon anthropological work, after which the concept was developed as an analytical tool (Mitchell 1969; Knox et al. 2006). Social network analysis (SNA) was a popular method developed by Burt (1982) amongst others, based on mathematics and used to explore social structures within the social sciences. SNA soon became an interdisciplinary tool forming a common language between subjects.

Gesellschaft is reflected in Wittel’s (2001) concept of ‘network sociality’ which is based upon Castell’s (1996) ‘network society’. In this new type of economy social interactions are perceived as commodities (Hess 2004; Wittel 2001) used as opportunities for exchange of information based upon ephemeral encounters between individuals, rather than prolonged relationships where conversation is focused upon a narrative. This idea is most clearly illustrated through the example of a networking event; this activity aims to bring complementary parties together to meet and engage in professional conversation. These types of events are often disguised through social activities, for example dinner or drinks (Wittel 2001), in this scenario people target their socialisation on those who are most likely to offer them the most valuable information or opportunities. Malecki (2002) would describe this activity as the creation of ‘soft networks’. Soft networks are those that utilise social interaction to gain knowledge, in contrast, hard networks are those that rely on technological competencies to get ahead. Prior to the information society, traditional face-to-face interaction between people was the norm and is still favoured in some cases. Goffman’s
(1983) concept of the ‘interaction order’ pays close attention to this phenomenon. Goffman contends that interaction between people at the micro level influences the larger social structures of society; his thesis was the first to pay such close attention to the importance of this type of encounter. Despite the increased number of interactions taking place through communication technologies, the importance of co-presence or face-to-face interaction is still deemed as an important component of maintaining certain aspects of social relationships, particularly for: gaining trust (Urry 2003, 2004), solving problems, providing motivation and in learning (Storper and Venables 2004).

Social networks are central to the notion of social capital (Putnam 1993); within the theory of social capital people are connected in three different ways as previously discussed – bridging, bonding and linking. Bridging social capital is said to be the most valuable because it offers exposure to a wider network of people and in this sense it is similar to Granovetter’s notion of weak ties (1973). Although Granovetter (1973, 1983) appreciates the value of close-knit family relationships, he advocates the benefits of weak ties, stressing that the heterogeneity and quantity of information available through a wide, loosely connected network may offer upward mobility. In addition, Granovetter argues that the more connected one is with people, the more likely they are to be in receipt of reciprocity from others which is beneficial to the expansion of weak ties. Social capital, particularly the definition given by Putnam (1993) is contested; Fukuyama (2001) for example, highlights that the processes of trust, norms, networks and civil society do not constitute what social capital is but are rather manifestations that arise as a result of social capital. The complexity of social capital due to its different elements that are inherently subjective has made social capital a difficult concept to measure (Mohan and Mohan 2002). Putnam (2000) applies social value to participation in community activity, such as those exhibited by members of organisations, societies and clubs and developed a measure of social capital by calculating the number of members of groups. Although this indicates how many people are involved in local community activities it does not provide any meaningful information regarding the characteristics of these relationships and the impact of these groups outside their normal activity; in addition Fukuyama (2001) points out that it would be impossible to create a census of all informal and formal social groups in order to carry out any meaningful comparisons, particularly as so many social gatherings also happen online.

Furthermore, Woolcock and Narayan (2000) argue that Putnam ignores the potential negative consequences of social capital such as exclusion and organised crime, discussed elsewhere in the literature (Fukuyama 2001; Mohan and Mohan 2002; Portes 1998; Putzel
1997; Woolcock and Narayan 2000). Putnam (2001) acknowledges that social capital can indeed be used in detrimental ways, but believes that the notion still offers opportunities for positive outcomes; as such Alder and Kwon (2002) highlight the potential for the term to draw attention to aspects of social life that would otherwise remain invisible.

In the developing world, social networks are often key to the survival of businesses and families; in his research on urban livelihoods in Ghana, Hanson (2005) identified social networks as a key asset in the reduction of vulnerability and economic survival. In the developing world it is often difficult for people to obtain access to formal credit facilities, therefore people have little opportunity other than to rely on close relationships with family and friends for support. Outside of familial relationships associations such as vendor organisations in a street vending context, play a strong role in the creation of support networks facilitating social ties between sellers and wider actors involved in street trade (Mete et al. 2013). Social networks have also been found to be important to migrants in the process of rural–urban migration in the developing context. Migrants with strong ties with other migrants in urban areas, who can provide support during the initial stages of their relocation, were found to be more likely to stay living in urban areas (Korinek et al. 2005). Rural identity can therefore play an important role in the rural–urban migration process and social ties based upon kinship can be considered more important when taken out of their original context (Kuhn 2003). Other factors such as the relationships developed in the work environment were also found to be an important factor influencing whether migrants stay living in the city (Korinek et al. 2005). Social relationships are therefore important in the upward mobility of migrants and to the success of business in the context of developing cities.

**Cultural Heritage**

Heritage, given its entrenched meaning, is a relatively new word in the English language. From a geographical perspective Graham et al. (2000) define heritage as a spatial phenomenon, best conceptualised through the process of representation. Through representation heritage is bound up in the notion of identity which is often strongly linked to a geographical location; cultural heritage therefore becomes intrinsically linked with place, although this is not to say heritage is static. In the social sciences, heritage is interpreted as a social construct imbued with meaning rather than just a material artefact; this however, has not always been the case.
Heritage was first used officially in the International Charter of Venice (1964) to describe the value attached to historic monuments. Prior to the use of ‘heritage’ terms such as ‘cultural property’ and the French ‘*patrimoine*’ were used in earlier literatures to refer to much the same thing (Vecco 2010). The initial guidelines for heritage conservation that were developed focused on tangible heritage which includes monuments, buildings and sites (Ahmad 2006). Smith (2006) argues there is hegemonic heritage discourse that idealises Western cultural values, where precedence is given to retaining elements of the built environment of the past for future generations and in doing so “undermines alternative and subaltern ideas about ‘heritage’” (Smith 2006, p. 11), of which she contends there is no such thing. A discussion by Lowenthal (1985) on historical cultural landscape, which resonates with Smith’s (2006) Western ideologies of heritage, describes clearly how the past continues to exist in the present and how the desire for the preservation and conservation of old buildings, sites and monuments is evidence of an obsession with the way things were. In Africa and Asia, on the other hand, focus is paid to traditional and popular cultural practices, for example, music, dance, languages, food and folklore (Graham 2002) that constitute ‘intangible’ heritage. Vecco (2010, p. 324) has even gone as far as to say “material heritage is not important in many cultures” using the example of Japan where religious monuments are knocked down and rebuilt periodically. Despite the apparent prevalence of the ‘authorised discourse of heritage’ as proposed by Smith (2006) the concept has grown in scope and meaning over the last half century to include immaterial heritage such as environments, social factors and intangible values associated with certain practices or traditions (Ahmad 2006).

The 1972 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, also known as the World Heritage Convention, defined heritage as the “combined works of nature and man” (UNESCO 1972, Art 1, as cited in Rössler 2006). This convention recognises both tangible and intangible heritage in addition to “traditional management systems, customary law and long established customary techniques and knowledge to protect the cultural and natural heritage” (Rössler 2006, p. 334) which contribute to sustainable and local and regional development. According to (Vecco 2010, p. 323) the conservation of heritage:

“can no longer be based on the object’s intrinsic quality. It must be founded on our ability to recognise its aesthetic, historic, scientific, social values etc., or rather it is society, the community that must recognise these values, upon which its own cultural identity can be built.”
The argument here suggests that our understanding of cultural value and heritage has changed over time and grown to include more than just physical artefacts. Loulanski (2006) has conceptualised this transition through three shifts, 1) from monuments to people; 2) from objects to functions; and 3) from preservation per se to purposeful preservation, sustainable use and development proposing a function heritage discourse over what is described as a frozen heritage.

In 2003 UNESCO expanded this acknowledgement of immaterial heritage by introducing the Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and in this document ‘intangible cultural heritage’ was defined as:

“...The practices, representations, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environments, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity” (Article 2:2 cited in Ahmad 2006, p. 298).

There is a World Heritage List of most valuable properties and sites produced by UNESCO, but also a ‘List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding’ (UNESCO 2012), that includes cultural festivals, traditions, crafts and arts amongst others. An example of an Intangible Cultural Heritage is Jemaa el-Fna Square in Marrakesh which is a public meeting and performance space in the centre of the Medina, offering a place for the performance of traditional cultural expressions through religion, art, dance and food. The aim of the UNESCO programme is to prevent the loss of cultural performances, identities and skills in the face of urbanisation, globalisation and modernisation (Nas 2002). Following the 2003 recognition of intangible heritage, in 2005 UNESCO introduced the Convention on the Protection and Promotion for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Rössler 2006), which recognises that cultural diversity is an important aspect of human society that is worthy of celebration and preservation; the convention seeks to allow diversity and cultural expressions to be maintained and flourish with society. The display of traditional cultural expressions, such as those by indigenous populations in the form of dress, food, and dance, living in urban areas has been explored in the academic literature, particularly in the realm of anthropology (Seligmann 2007; Weismantel 2001). However, Cardinal (2006) argues that the voices of aboriginal and indigenous populations are under-represented in the city and
therefore the significant cultural heritages associated with these populations are ignored in sustainability initiatives and developments.

Although UNESCO are the main worldwide body for managing heritage, there are other organisations with charters that closely relate to the aims and objectives of UNESCO, for example The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have their own separate Declaration on Cultural Heritage. Given the existence of different policies, Ahmad (2006) argues for a standardised terminology of heritage that can be adopted worldwide. Graham et al. (2000) however, argue that determining what constitutes heritage is a biased process which is dependent on historical conditions. Therefore, achieving a common terminology that is accepted by all cultures may prove difficult given the subjectivity of the concept (Ahmad 2006; Graham et al. 2000).

Heritage has been developed into an economic commodity (Graham et al. 2000). Discussions of heritage are prevalent in the geographic tourism literature where the past is often viewed through a romantic gaze (Urry 2002). A desire for ‘authentic’ experiences is often fulfilled through the preservation of cultural heritages and traditions. As a result of the popularity of heritage tourism, many destinations have sought to preserve their own local identity through heritage in order to give themselves a competitive advantage in the tourist market (Yeoh 2005). It is a widely accepted argument that heritage sites have the potential to produce real economic and social benefits for the local community in developing countries, particularly when the local community participate in their selection and development (Hampton 2005). According to Rössler (2006) however, it was not until 1998 that local people were officially involved in selecting cultural landscapes as world heritage sites as outlined in the World Heritage Convention guidelines. Although it may be protocol to seek the opinions of those affected, power tensions often still exist in these scenarios (Hampton 2005) and local participation may not offer more than democratic tokenism where economic interest takes precedence. In some cultures upholding certain types of heritage may be deemed a necessity; however, it can sometimes be a liability rather than an asset because although employment can be created from heritage tourism, it may inhibit much needed economic development and investment in some places (Greffe 2004).

**Sense of Place**

Globalisation has challenged our very understanding of how we think about and conceptualise place. Historically, place simply distinguished one geographic area from
another based on its physical economic and cultural characteristics (Massey 1995). Although the term is still used in this way, place is considered a fluid concept which is inscribed with social meaning and constantly reproduced (Hudson and Hudson 2001). It is argued that place is in fact a process and not a thing (Massey 1991) and much like time and space a social construct (Harvey 1993); on its own it is an empty concept with no inherent meaning (Rose 1995). Shamai (1991, p. 355) however, contends that people give places meaning and in return “receive the place’s meaning”. This could be seen as the creation of a sense of belonging, which is a human desire, often shared and created through communities and considered important to the goals of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Brindley 2003; Chan and Lee 2008; Rogers 2005).

Places and people are linked in complex ways (Hudson and Hudson 2001); however, this is not a relationship that can be taken for granted (Massey and Jess 1995). Sense of place is commonly thought of at three separate scales particularly in relation to identity, the local, regional and the national, however, we may also think of place at the scales of the domestic, supranational and global (Rose 1995). The relationship between place and identity is longstanding and has been explored in many different contexts. Tuan (1974) introduced the term ‘topophilia’ meaning ‘love of place’, using it to describe the strong emotional relationships that are formed between people and place. Tuan’s (1974) work draws heavily on the idea of physical belonging. This could be interpreted as an association with ‘settledness’; for Massey (1995) this link is problematic because the notion does not lend itself easily to alternative lifestyles such as travellers and therefore ignores the subjectivity of place that can, in fact, be interpreted to mean different things to different people (Hudson and Hudson 2001). In addition, sense of place may transcend multiple scales and not just restrict itself to one (Rose 1995). Due to the association of peoples’ feelings and thoughts with places, sense of place appears to be most suitable to qualitative inquiry. To the contrary, Shamai (1991) has developed a method that measures the intensity of people’s sense of place and although Shamai (1991) does not attempt to understand the feelings associated with sense of place, it is not clear what producing a quantitative measure of sense of place offers such an emotive subject, independent of supplementary qualitative insight.

Sense of place connotes the idea of belonging and acceptance; however, it is frequently acknowledged that it is underlined by strong power relations that simultaneously welcome some and exclude others (Massey 1991, 1995; Rose 1995). Boundaries are socially constructed (Massey 1991) and it is those who hold most power that have the ability to enforce and reinforce boundaries. According to Massey (1995, p. 69) “boundaries are an
expression of the power structures of society: they are among the many kinds of social relations which construct space and place”. Transgressing boundaries can potentially result in fatal outcomes, particularly under certain circumstances for the excluded ‘other’ (Sibley 1995). Rose (1995, pp. 99–100) argues that “senses of place are not only different but part of unequal social relations”. It is often through the process of ‘othering’ that sense of place is established, echoing the issues of inequality and exclusion that are so prominent in society and that prevent integration and inclusion. The imposing of local norms and customs by powerful groups such as the media or dominant racial groups in a given area, for example, imposes one sector of society’s sense of place on others; this in turn creates and exacerbates spaces of exclusion (Sibley 1995). In addition, the representations of place that infiltrate the everyday lives of people through the media and banal nationalism (Billig 1995) play a large role in reinforcing the ideas of territoriality and identity, creating what has been termed ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson 2006 [1983]). Power structures influence the social construction of place and situate it in the geographical imagination of others, continuing to distinguish between ‘us’ and ‘them’. However, Rose (1995) suggests that as the world continues to become more globalised, it will be increasingly difficult and therefore unlikely that sense of places will continue to be recognised through a process of ‘othering’.

It has been suggested that sense of place is becoming increasingly lost as society has become more mobile; the time it takes for many people to travel from one place to another has reduced and resultantly people spend less physical time in particular locations (Tuan 1974) potentially inhibiting the ability for meaningful relationships to be developed. Interestingly, although sense of place may well have diminished, at least on a conscious level, Harvey (1993, p. 6) comments that capitalism has changed the landscape creating “considerable insecurity within and between places”. As a result, the increasingly volatile world we inhabit has increased our desire for a sense of place (Harvey 1990; Massey 1991); fundamental to this is the need for a feeling of fixity, stability and security. This desire for a sense of place manifests itself through culture and heritage; improved mobility allows local cultures, as discussed in the previous section, to transcend time and space. This arguably strengthens one’s sense of place across both physical and imagined boundaries and food, pertinent to this study, is a key example of a part of local culture that has been shown to create a sense of place and belonging across time and space, particularly due to its role in individual as well as collective social memories (Lupton 1994).
Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of a range of literatures beginning with a discussion on the informal economy, focusing specifically on street vending. Narrowing the scope further, the chapter then looked specifically at the street food vending literature and identified a clear gap in the research to explore the social dimensions of the phenomenon. Drawing upon the sustainability discourse as a lens to focus this study, social sustainability was clearly recognised as an under-researched area of the normative sustainability model. In exploring social sustainability more closely, common themes were identified from previous studies and using models and tools developed in previous research, the key dimensions were collated to inform the design of a conceptual framework to be used to explore the social sustainability of the street food environment. Following this, a brief overview of each of the social sustainability dimensions selected for the framework were discussed to provide a clear interpretation of each theme for the purposes of this research. The next chapter discusses the methodology used in this study and the application of this framework to an empirical study.
Chapter 3: Methodology
Introduction
As discussed in the previous chapter, the research on street food to date has largely focused on socio-economic and environmental health issues. Much of this research has been conducted using quantitative methods supplemented by qualitative material in some cases, and following this trend this research has also adopted a mixed methods approach using a selection of methods: surveys, interviews and ethnographic observations. A mixed method research design was selected to elicit a holistic understanding of the street food environment which encompasses the views of all key actors including street vendors, consumers and stakeholders. The eight key themes of social sustainability identified in the literature review were explored through each of these methods where possible; however, the researcher also allowed for other themes to arise naturally during the research process.

Firstly, this chapter outlines the position of the research followed by an overview of the research design. It then briefly explains the chosen study site (for a detailed discussion see Chapter 4), before justifying and describing the application of each research method; this section also covers the recruitment process, data collection methods and data analysis techniques. The chapter concludes with a discussion which considers the ethical issues of the research.

Positioning the Research
Social sustainability is a contested concept which has been poorly defined (Dempsey et al. 2011; Littig and Griesler 2005; Yiftachel and Hedgcock 1993). The social dimension of social sustainability encompasses various aspirations for society; however, a lack of universal agreement about what these goals are makes it a difficult concept to employ. Regardless of this lack of single definition however, there are some shared values such as the achievement of social equity, democratic participation, good quality of life and social inclusion that underpin all discussions on the subject. Social sustainability is as much conceptual as it is a potential practical outcome of policy change and as with many aspirational visions for society we must recognise social sustainability as a socially constructed concept of values and ideals which are subject to interpretation; what one person, society, or group of people believe to be ‘socially sustainable’ is invariably subjective. In seeking to understand where street food contributes towards the principles of social sustainability, and where it does not, this research sets out to explore a set of themes that are an intrinsic part of everyday life. Using a conceptual framework of social sustainability developed from the literature to explore these multifaceted themes allows the underlying social mechanisms of the street food
environment to be studied independently of outside actors and helps establish its social value in wider society.

This research adopted the epistemological position of critical realism (Bhaskar 1978), which is positioned between the two fundamental strands of philosophy, positivism and interpretivism. Critical realism recognises the benefits of both scientific knowledge as well as social theory (Archer et al. 1998). Realists believe that an external reality exists independent of human consciousness (Denzin and Lincoln 2011; Ritchie and Lewis 2003; Sayer 2010); Bhaskar termed this ‘transcendental realism’ (as cited in Pratt 1995). For realists social life is made up of real structures that produce the world as we perceive it (Bryman 2012).

Bhaskar (1978) proposes that there are three layers of reality: the real, the actual and the empirical. The real is the level at which underlying structures or mechanisms generate events, the actual is the level at which patterns of these events occur and the empirical is the level where these events are observed and perceived by people (Baert 2005, pp. 92–93).

Thus, critical realism is concerned with identifying the underlying structures and mechanisms of social phenomena that make up the patterns of the world we observe (Lincoln and Denzin 2011). Unlike trends in philosophical thought concerned with revealing multiple ways of knowing that have been criticised for trivialising ‘real’ social problems as ‘mere imagination’ (Graham 2005, p. 20), critical realists “aim to identify structures in order to change them, so that inequalities and injustices may be counteracted” (Bryman 2012, p. 710). However, despite critical realists’ belief in their ability to uncover the truth, and however convincing research results may be, they recognise that all knowledge is fallible (Baert 2005; Sayer 2010).

Critical realism recognises social life as an open system made up of complex variables. It aims to “connect abstract (structures) to empirical (events) and to (agents’) experiences of them” (Banai 1995, p. 546); it provides a useful perspective to explore underlying causal mechanisms of social structures that goes beyond simple descriptive analysis (Banai 1995). It is therefore particularly useful in socio-spatial research, such as this, which seeks to explore the multidimensional concept of social sustainability in relation to the social realm of street food. The selling of street food is governed by rules and regulations, and involves negotiation on a daily basis between various agents, such as authorities, customers and suppliers. In order to understand the relationships between various actors and how they may or may not contribute towards social sustainability, the research needed to explore the underlying processes that generate the everyday life of street food.
The idea that there is such a thing as social sustainability is in itself a social construct; it is something that is perceived to be real and desired for, but ultimately it is a concept of society created by the human mind that encompasses numerous values and ideals. Despite this however, “[t]o say that meaningful reality is socially constructed is not to say that it is not real” (Crotty 1998, p. 63). Considering this, the research adopts social constructionism as its ontology in order to recognise that social phenomena can be interpreted and given meaning in different ways by different groups and individuals (Crotty 1998). The key to this study was to explore these different conceptualisations and give voice to the views of street food vendors and consumers that have previously been neglected.

Research Design

The purpose of the research was to gain a broad overview of the social life of street food by exploring whether street food contributes towards principles of social sustainability. In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon a mixed methods approach was employed over two phases of fieldwork. This approach was applied to this study because it was felt that the use of both qualitative and quantitative data would offer the best chance of grappling with the multiple dimensions of social sustainability (Creswell and Clark 2007). The first phase of fieldwork took place between May and June 2014 and consisted largely of observational work, followed by a second phase between September and October 2014 where two questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and further observations took place. Visiting the fieldwork site twice allowed the researcher to become familiar with the study site, establish connections and reflect on the initial observations so that the surveys and interview questions could be developed robustly for dissemination in the second phase. The intention was to explore each theme of social sustainability using the different methods, so that the results could be validated through the process of triangulation (Denzin 1978).

Obtaining the views and experiences of a cross section of street food vendors was crucial for this research to ensure that the opinions of a diverse selection of the vendor population was included in the study; hence an in-depth researcher-led survey was considered the most accurate way of obtaining this data. Consumers, on the other hand, were likely to have only intermittent involvements with street food and therefore the survey was shorter and targeted at a broad demographic. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key stakeholders including policymakers, municipality officers, police, NGOs, planners, tour guides, local business owners and academics. Interviews were deemed the most appropriate method for this group because of the smaller target sample size; in addition the nature of
the subject would make it difficult to offer uniform prescriptive questions to stakeholders because of the diversity of their knowledge and expertise.

The use of mixed methods in this study offered the possibility to provide greater validity to the results in a number of ways: firstly, it allows for triangulation; secondly it facilitated the acquisition of a comprehensive understanding of the social life of street food, in addition to enabling the collection of different types of data required by the range of research questions (Bryman 2012). This chapter continues by discussing each method individually; it comments on the justification, discrete data collection process, practical application and associated data analysis technique. Firstly, however, the reasons for selecting the Hoan Kiem district in Hanoi as the case study will be discussed.

**Selecting the Site**

Hanoi, the capital and second largest city of Vietnam, is recognised as a cultural centre for street food, making it a suitable place to conduct this study. Street vendors make up 11 per cent of informal employment in Hanoi (ILO 2013); however, it is not obvious that any information is available regarding how many of these vendors sell food. Vietnam has a rich and vibrant street food culture that has grown since the Doi Moi policy was introduced in 1986 (see Chapter 4 for further details), allowing private business ownership and free trade (Lincoln 2008). Since then the informal sector has grown exponentially, largely due to an increase of rural to urban migration (Jensen and Peppard 2003). According to Thomas (2003, p. 173) the economic transformations "led to a rapid evolution of consumption patterns, to a highly diverse, street trading, cultural life and also to the possibility of people congregating in groups, at noodle soup shops, in parks and with tea and cigarette sellers on the pavements". Previous studies conducted in Hanoi have explore a variety of themes including consumer choice (Maruyama and Trung 2007), street food vending as an alternative to the growing capitalist economy (Turner and Schoenberger 2012), the role of women (Jensen et al. 2013) and vending as an entrepreneurial activity (Heimstra et al. 2006). However, there are no studies to date which explore the social aspect of street food vending in any great detail, and it is this gap which this study aims to fill.

The downtown area, Hoan Kiem, was chosen as the area of study for this research because not only is it the face of Hanoi, but also the home and workplace of hundreds (if not thousands) of street vendors that are subject to increasing scrutiny as the city continues to modernise and develop. Although Hoan Kiem is a somewhat atypical neighbourhood, its mixed land use of residential, business, tourist sites, schools and hospitals makes it a diverse
and interesting area for study. In addition, Hoan Kiem is the home of the Old Quarter, the original trading area of the city (Labbé 2010) which began as a village that served the citadel; a maze of 36 streets developed from this central point and are still named after the original items that were sold on them, despite many of the products changing (Logan 1995). Along these narrow and busy streets many residential buildings operate businesses from the ground floor (Phuong and Groves 2010), and one of the most popular forms of business is the selling of food, either cooked or uncooked.

Despite its movements towards a capitalist economy, Vietnam has a centralised authoritarian political structure controlled by a socialist government. In the past researchers have experienced difficulties conducting research in Vietnam, particularly using qualitative methods (Scott et al. 2006). More recently however, other academics have reported that it has become easier for foreign researchers to enter Vietnam for these purposes (Turner 2013). Notwithstanding this apparent increased ease of entry, difficulty was experienced in attempts to gain the support of an appropriate host organisation closely associated with the government. Subsequently, alternative arrangements were made with a local university sociology department at short notice.

**Street Food Seller Survey**

The initial observations of street food carried out in Hoan Kiem during the first phase of the research showed that street food sellers are widely dispersed across the district. With the purpose of obtaining and understanding the opinions of street food sellers regarding the social role of street food in everyday life, a survey was conducted with a cross section of sellers. Surveys are an established research method used in other street vendor studies worldwide (Bhowmik 2012; Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Peña 1999); although mobile qualitative ‘go along’ interviews (Kusenbach 2003) were initially considered as an alternative method for this research, a questionnaire survey was thought to be more suitable as the research intended to explore several diverse themes over a relatively short period.

The aim of the research was to find out whether the selling and buying of street food contributes to social sustainability. The multifaceted nature social sustainability meant that the survey endeavoured to explore lots of different themes in a succinct and precise manner. Street vendors are busy people where their time equates to money; when vendors are not selling they are often preparing food to sell, clearing up, buying stock or resting. The survey comprised largely closed questions and a limited number of open questions; this was
considered the most efficient way of collecting data in an effort to avoid overburdening the participant.

**Recruitment**

A typology of five types of vendor was developed as a result of the observations carried out in the first part of the fieldwork; they are summarised in Table 3.1. The vendor typology was used to create a sampling framework for the selection of participants; the aim was to recruit an equal number of each type of vendor to the study from different areas of the Hoan Kiem district. Using a spatial sampling strategy, as employed by other researchers (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Zingel et al. 2011) the district was divided into four and forty food sellers were recruited from each quarter. Central to the district is Hoan Kiem Lake which facilitated the division of land into quarters rather than strips. Each quarter has a distinct design, although the boundaries between them are noticeably blurred. Directly north of the lake is Hanoi’s Old Quarter, to the south east is the French Quarter, the south and south west areas contain many of the foreign consulate buildings and large businesses, although neither are confined to this area, whilst to the west of the lake is the location of a popular backpacker street and large hospital. Even though different distinctions can be made between different parts of Hoan Kiem, all areas in Hanoi’s downtown are characterised by mixed land use; there are schools, markets, residential flats, houses, hotels, shops, restaurants, small businesses and large business all operating side by side. The decision to carry out a survey in all areas of the district, rather than just focusing on one, for example the Old Quarter, meant that a comprehensive sample of food vendors could be recruited to the study and thus contribute to a broader understanding of their experiences. Carrying out the survey over a wider area also meant that vendors were recruited from areas and streets which have a smaller density of vendors in addition to those streets which are recognised as having large conglomerations of street food vendors.

**Table 3.1 Typology of Street Food Vendors in Hanoi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of Street Food Vendors</th>
<th>Uncooked</th>
<th>Cooked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mobile</td>
<td>2. Mobile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Street Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda

The questionnaire was designed and completed in the form of a structured interview and administered by researchers recruited from the local university (See Appendix A). Participants were informed that the survey would last approximately one hour and asked to confirm their verbal consent to taking part. As the survey was conducted then and there, the interviewer assured the vendor that the interview would be paused if they needed to attend to a customer and continued once the transaction had been completed. The survey comprised both open and closed questions; section one collected observable information such as gender, type of premises or equipment the seller was using and what was being sold. A simple distinction between cooked and unprepared food was made regarding the type of food, although sometimes a note was made on the survey indicating the product sold. The second section asked for some basic profiling characteristics of the vendor such as age, place of birth, current living location, how they got to work, how far they travelled and how long they had been living in Hanoi. These standard profiling questions help ease the researcher into the survey and are useful variables for analysing the results.

The third section addressed the sellers’ business details; it began by asking how long they have been selling food in this particular location, what time they sell their food and why. They were also asked whether they had ever sold food in a different location to explore reasons as to why they may have moved. Participants were then asked how many different people or places they buy their goods or ingredients from, how often they restock and how the goods are obtained (delivered or picked up). This question helped to establish who and how often the food sellers interact with other people in the food supply chain. In order to find out if there are any important social relationships with their sellers, participants were also asked how long they had been buying from their main supplier and why they continue to do so. The final question in this section asked the participant to describe their relationship with their supplier as ‘business-like’, ‘friendly’, ‘indifferent’ or ‘other’. This question aimed to explore the strength of these social relationships to the seller.

Section three continued to ask the seller about their selling spaces. The survey asked whether they pay to rent their pitch or premises and if so how much and who to. They were also asked if they pay any other fees to enable them to trade, such as bribes. This was to establish whether vendors are subject to harassment and corruption which disadvantaged the seller and would be considered a negative social aspect of selling street food. The researcher then inquired as to whether taxes were paid on the goods in order to establish the level of informality of the street food business taking part in the interview. This was particularly
relevant for the street kitchens which sell food from fixed premises and look almost formal at first glance; therefore this question was included to confirm the status of each vendor to prevent making any assumptions about informality.

During the observational work in the first phase of the fieldwork, different vendors were observed selling different types of food over the course of the day from the same space. Intrigued by this observation, a question was included on the survey which asked whether vendors share their selling space with any other seller and if they did, the vendors were asked to describe how this arrangement worked. Participants were then asked whether they had any employees and who their employees were; they were given the options of ‘family members’, ‘friends’, ‘someone previously unknown’ and ‘other’. This again was to try and explore the types of social networks present in street food vending. Vendors were also asked how they gained access to their trading site and were provided with the options of, ‘through family’, ‘the government’, through ‘an external landlord’, through ‘another trader’ and ‘other’. This question aimed to elucidate how the vendor came across opportunities and reveal the strength of social networks between different types of people who may have been involved in helping the vendor to establish their business. Alternatively, the mobile and informal vendors were asked whether they trade in the same spaces or follow the same route every day and why. It was intended for this question to help highlight important areas of the city for mobile street vendors. People selling cooked food were asked additional questions about their recipes to establish whether there are any important social aspects to their decision to sell a particular type of food in addition to earning a living.

Section four of the survey explored social interactions and social networks of street food vendors further; it began by asking participants how many other sellers they regularly interact with, followed by the frequency of these interactions. Participants were then asked how important their connections with other sellers were and in what ways they engage with the vendors. They were also provided with the option to describe any other thing that makes the relationships important to them. Sellers were then asked about their interaction with their customers; they were asked who their customers are, how often customers return to them, how many repeat customers they have over different time periods and how they would generally describe their relationships with their customers – ‘friendly’, ‘detached’, ‘business-like’ or ‘other’. Further details were also sought about how the customers interacted with the vendor, for example, whether they made small talk or just bought their food. The questionnaire then explored the relationships between customers and asked how often different types of customer interact with each other and for a description of the types
of interactions which take place. Vendors were also asked what the customers do when purchasing food, for example: ‘chat’, ‘people watch’, ‘play games with each other’, ‘use their phones/computers’ or ‘other’. The options provided were based on the activities observed during the first phase of the fieldwork.

Part four of the survey continued to ask questions regarding vendors’ customers. It aimed to find out how often different types of customers bought from the street food vendors; customers were categorised as: locals, tourists, other business, shopkeepers, other street traders and other. This question aimed to find out which type of customers were regular and thus, which types of people the seller was likely to have built relationships with over time. The seller was also asked how often they have disputes with their customers and other types of people including market regulators and the police. If participants reported any conflict they were asked to describe why they thought these conflicts took place. They were also asked about how any problems with officials were usually resolved and were provided with five options; ‘individual negotiation with payment’, ‘individual negotiation without payment’, ‘through a trader association’, ‘through a market administrator’ or ‘other’. These last two questions tried to elicit any negative social behaviours associated with the selling of street food.

Section five focused on the themes of participation and engagement; first, participants were asked about their knowledge of any street food vendor associations or organisations in Hanoi in order to establish whether any formal or informal groups exist. This question followed up by asking whether they were a member of any such organisation and what the purpose and advantage of membership are. If they were not a member of any association they were asked to explain their decision not to participate. Participants were then asked if they had ever been invited to share their view on the development of policies and plans going on in the city that would affect their trading. If they answered ‘yes’ the participant was asked to explain how they were engaged in these discussions.

The sixth section of the survey presented statements regarding street food in relation to quality of life that were marked on a five-point Likert scale between ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘strongly agree’. The statements asked the seller whether selling street food helps them to meet their basic needs, makes them happy, helps them to contribute to feeding the city’s population, allows them to interact with others and whether it helps them to feel a part of the community. These statements aimed to address both the hard and soft qualities associated with quality of life as previously identified in the literature.
The seventh section of the survey dealt with the themes of safety and security; it asked the participant whether they felt safe whilst selling food on the street and to openly explain what specifically makes them feel either safe or unsafe. In order to explore their actual experiences participants were then asked whether they had ever been a victim of any of the following crimes; ‘harassment, ‘theft’, ‘physical assault’ or ‘other’. Depending on whether they had been subjected to crime they were then asked to recount what happened. Following this they were then asked to comment whether they had witnessed any of the other traders nearby fall victim to any of the previously listed crimes and whether their experiences of crime has influenced where they sell their goods. If they answered ‘yes’, they were asked to provide more details.

Section eight of the survey explored the themes of cultural heritage and sense of place; the sellers were asked to rate the importance of street food to Hanoi’s identity on a Likert scale of importance, and to briefly explain why they gave their score. They were then asked which places in the district were most known for street food to see whether people identified street food with certain spaces in the city. In order to establish how significant the role of street food is, sellers were then asked in another Likert scale to rate the importance of street food in people’s everyday life. Participants were asked to summarise the main challenges facing street food vendors in Hanoi and whether or not they thought people should be allowed to sell food on the street.

The ninth section of the survey addressed the theme of equity and social justice, a vital aspect of social sustainability. Vendors were asked whether they had free or paid access to basic facilities (if required) including clean running water, toilet, gas/electricity and refrigeration, all of which are important to the handling of cooked food in particular. It is a well cited fact that selling food on the street is considered a relatively cheap and easy way of earning an income that requires no formal education (Arámbulo and Almeida 1994). Given this, and the case study context, sellers were then asked whether they thought everyone has the opportunity to sell food in the city if they wanted to and to elaborate on their answer. Vendors were also asked how fairly they thought they were treated by their customers, the authorities, the general public and tourists on a five-point Likert scale from ‘very unfairly’ to ‘very fairly’. The notion of fairness is invariably subjective; in order to clarify how the participant understands the subject of fairness they were asked to explain what fair treatment meant to them. They were then asked whether their job allowed them to meet their basic needs, citing the examples of food, shelter and children’s education as examples of what they might deem as necessities. They were then asked whether there was anything
that would prevent them from carrying out their job, where they were not allowed to sell and whether they thought their occupation was perceived as a legitimate livelihood by others.

The survey concluded with a few open questions allowing the participant to provide any additional information. The first question asked vendors what they perceive to be the main advantages of street food, followed by the disadvantages. They were asked what they thought would happen if they were relocated and what impact this would have on their customers, i.e. where would they go to buy the food instead. Finally, they were asked whether there was any other information regarding social aspects of their job that they wish to discuss that had not already been covered which they think is important.

**Data Collection**

The vendor surveys were conducted during the second phase of data collection by four bilingual Vietnamese research assistants between September and October 2014. After the initial phase of fieldwork it was felt that cultural and language barriers were more difficult to overcome than had first been anticipated given the limited time spent in the field. In order to minimise some of these issues local research assistants were employed to help reduce the negative associations often cited with foreign researchers carrying out fieldwork abroad (Madge 1994; Scheyvens and Leslie 2000).

To ensure that the survey was conducted in a rigorous manner the researcher spent several hours clarifying and explaining the purpose of each question in the survey with the research assistants to ensure that they were confident in conducting the survey and understood what was required of them. After each research assistant had conducted a couple of surveys they met with the researcher to provide feedback. Despite going over the survey thoroughly there were still some misunderstandings about what some questions were asking; after the first week, however, these confusions were resolved and the remaining surveys were conducted without too much trouble.

As described in the recruitment section, each research assistant was designated a quarter of the district and asked to complete 40 surveys. They were each instructed to randomly approach eight of each type of vendor (Table 3.1) across different streets to ensure that the survey attempted to include all types of street vendor. Employing a probabilistic stratified random sampling by means of setting a quota within strata (the predefined types of vendor) meant that a total of 160 surveys would be collected across the whole district.
Data Analysis

The results of the survey were analysed using a statistical software package for social sciences (SPSS). The results were first collated into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet during the data collection process and then later transferred into SPSS where the data was sorted and categorised as being either categorical data, nominal or ordinal or ratio. Initially exploratory analysis was undertaken to reveal the distribution of the data and highlight any unusual results. Descriptive statistics were then pulled from the data to summarise the characteristics of the participants; understanding who exactly participated in the survey helped the researcher to decide which nominal variables to use in the cross tabulation and explore the relationship between the different outcomes. In order to test the significance of the relationships identified between the categorical data, non-parametric tests such as Chi Square were applied to the results where relevant.

Consumer Questionnaire Survey

A structured questionnaire survey was conducted with consumers to obtain their perspectives and experiences of buying and consuming street food. The consumer survey also explored the eight key themes of social sustainability; this meant that the experiences and perceptions of consumers could be compared with those of the vendors and the key stakeholders. The survey was designed during the first phase of research using the observations recorded in field notes to structure the questions. A survey was deemed the most appropriate method for exploring the concept of social sustainability with the consumers because of the multiple themes that needed to be addressed (Creswell and Clark 2007). The structured nature of a survey allows only relevant information to be collected without the need to uncover it, as is sometimes the case in a discursive interview. The survey was piloted at the end of the first phase of research whilst in Hanoi, with a selection of local people. Two surveys were produced, one in Vietnamese and the other in English, in order to include a sample of expats and tourist consumers. Whilst this strategy clearly excludes tourists and expats that come from other countries where English may not be widely spoken (particularly other parts of Asia and the Pacific), the views of this English speaking sub-group are considered valuable in the sense that official tourism strategies are in place which target Western Europeans, North Americans, and Australian and New Zealand nations (Vietnam Tourist Development Strategy 2011). In addition, it is rare for other visitors to the country to be fluent in Vietnamese. A similar approach was taken by Henderson et al. (2012) on their study of hawker centres as tourist attractions in Singapore.
Recruitment and Data Collection

In an attempt to gain a representative cross section of the population in this qualitative study, a non-probabilistic sampling technique was used to recruit participants (Guest et al. 2012). The survey sample quota was set at 120 respondents, based on other studies of street vendors which have achieved similar sample sizes (Henderson 2012; Mateo-Babiano 2012) to allow for some statistical analysis and to account for any response errors resulting in unusable surveys (Parfitt 2005). However, using this method does not allow for the results of the survey to be statistically extended to the population (Guest et al. 2012). People of various demographics were approached and asked to complete the survey; however, many of the older generation refused to take part in the survey because they said they did not eat street food, preferring to eat at home. Despite being told they did not necessarily have to be frequent consumers to take part and that they could skip irrelevant sections, people were reluctant to participate. A number of elderly respondents also spent a long time looking over the survey before deciding not to complete it. Unfortunately, because of the refusal rate amongst the older generation – an estimated 80–90 per cent of people over 50 approached during data collection – the survey was skewed heavily towards younger people. Although this means that the survey is not representative of the general population, it may be considered as representative of the street food consumer population, often reported to be students and people in low-paid jobs (see Chapter 5). The survey was designed in a self-administered format in hard paper copy. A total of 106 people completed the questionnaire; people were approached on the street, in public places such as parks, around Hoan Kiem Lake and at street style tea or coffee shops in the Hoan Kiem district. A direct approach in the form of purposive sampling on the street was considered the most time-efficient method of obtaining responses.

There are a number of advantages of using a self-administered survey, the first being that the absence of an interviewer prevents any biases that may otherwise occur through the delivery of the question; similarly, there is no chance of interviewer variability (Bryman 2012; Neuman 2011) and it involves less time and removes a need for coordination of appointments, meaning more participants can be recruited to the study. The self-completion survey is also convenient for the respondent, as they can consider the questions and think about it without feeling pressured (Neuman 2011). However, there are also number of disadvantages, such as the lack of ability to probe responses, and the potential to receive partial or incomplete data (Bryman 2012; Neuman 2011). In order to minimise these two
issues, a space was provided at the end of the survey allowing the participant an opportunity to elaborate on their answers, and tick boxes were used at the main format of completion.

**Agenda**

The survey design was kept as short as possible to minimise incompletion rates (Bryman 2012); however, in order to address all of the themes and to ensure the design was clear it spanned 6.5 pages. The survey was also accompanied by a cover letter stating the survey’s intent, alongside assuring the participants of their anonymity and providing the researcher’s contact details, including a local phone number, to legitimise the study (Bailey 1982; Bryman 2012). The survey comprised mainly closed and Likert scale questions to make the questions easier to answer and analyse (Bailey 1982; McLafferty 2003). Questions were short, clear and precise and devoid of jargon to prevent over complication that may have resulted in misunderstanding and/or participant fatigue (Bryman 2012). There were only three open questions, which provided the participant with the opportunity to elaborate on the themes addressed in the questionnaire (see appendix B). Where answered in Vietnamese, the open questions could be translated on an ad-hoc basis making it a cost-effective technique. It has been argued that the use of mainly closed questions may result in a loss of information (McLafferty 2003); however, given that the research aims to gather a broad perspective on many issues relating to social sustainability, measuring attitudes and perceptions using a range of scales was felt to be the best method of achieving this.

The survey began by obtaining key characteristics of the informant and asked for the participants’ age, gender, occupation and residential location. For the English survey, the questionnaire asked for home country and their reason for being in Vietnam instead of residential location and occupation. This was so that the results could be analysed against participant characteristics as well as to understand who the consumers of street food are. Following other studies that have used similar formats (Brata 2010; Henderson et al. 2012; Maruyama and Trung 2010; Muyanja 2011), acquiring this information allows the results to be analysed against these different variables. Predefined closed categories were provided for answers to these questions and were based on terminology used by the General Statistics Office of Vietnam.

The remaining questions aimed to address the key themes of social sustainability, equity, engaged governance, social inclusion, sense of place and belonging, social capital and social networks, cultural heritage, quality of life, and safety and security that had been identified in the literature, an approach also adopted by Henderson et al. (2012). The survey asked a
mixture of subjective and objective questions to explore the participant’s perceptions and experiences to see how they compare and helps to validate the results. The second section focused on consumer use to establish what types of street food the participant buys, how often, who from, main reasons for buying from particular vendors, where they consume their food, who with and the frequency of these interactions.

Section three comprised nine Likert scale questions addressing the following themes: equity, social interaction, social inclusion, safety and security, cultural heritage, sense of place, engaged governance and quality of life. A Likert scale of questioning was used for this part of the survey in order to obtain consumer perspectives on a wide range of interrelated themes in a uniform way (Bryman 2012). The Likert scale measures the attitude of the participant regarding the different themes using a five-point scale, one being strongly agree and five strongly disagree, the third point on the scale represents a neutral opinion (Bryman 2012). The use of this style of questioning has been applied in other studies on social sustainability (Chan and Lee 2008; Karuppannan and Sivam 2011). It allowed the importance of each theme of social sustainability to be measured individually and helped to indicate which themes were most pertinent to street food vending. In addition, the use of a scale allowed an overall picture of the social sustainability of street food vending to be measured through calculating an overall score (Bryman 2012) which indicated whether street food was perceived as a positive or negative factor in the context of social sustainability.

Section four of the survey addressed the participants’ experiences of the street food environment. It focused on the themes of crime and security, engaged governance, social interaction and social networks, social inclusion and quality of life. Participants were asked whether they had ever personally experienced or witnessed any of a selection of petty crimes that can be expected in the street. This question was followed by a space which allowed participants to leave details of any other crime they felt relevant. They were then asked if they had ever observed a selection of scenarios where a vendor was being persecuted by the authorities. Addressing the theme of engaged governance, the next question asked whether they had ever been invited to engage in discussions regarding the regulation of street food. If they had been, they were asked to describe what this entailed.

The survey concluded with three additional open-ended questions to allow the participants an opportunity to explore qualitatively their thoughts on whether street food has any social value and to also get them to name the key positives and negatives associations of street
food vending. The survey ended with a space for the participants to write down ‘any other comments’ if they so wished and thanked them for their participation.

**Data Analysis**

As for the previous street food seller survey, the results of the consumer survey were also analysed using SPSS. The results were first transferred from their Excel spreadsheet and transferred to SPSS where they were categorised into the type of data and analysed to reveal the characteristics of the participants. Taking each question in turn the results were analysed to produce descriptive statistics. Again, cross tabulations were applied to the data to explore the relationship between different variables and then tested for their significance where considered appropriate.

**Stakeholder Semi-Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews are a flexible approach to asking questions about specific topics where the researcher uses a schedule to guide the discussion (Bryman 2012). Interviewees were asked questions around the themes of social sustainability and were provided with the opportunity to answer questions freely in as much or as little detail as they wished. One of the main benefits of semi-structured interviews is that the researcher is able to probe in order to make further inquiries into the participants’ responses where appropriate (Guest et al. 2012). Interviews are also beneficial because they can provide further qualitative data to supplement that collected by more structured methods, such as the surveys. The flexibility and discursive nature of the semi-structured interview also allowed new themes to naturally arise from the conversation that were not part of the predefined themes of social sustainability. Interviews took place in the second phase of the research, six out of the total 22 were conducted in Vietnamese with the aid of a research assistant acting as a translator and nine were conducted independently by the researcher, the remaining seven were conducted in English with the research assistant present. All interviewee names have been anonymised in the subsequent analysis chapters.

**Recruitment**

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 23 key informants involved with street food or who had a vested interest in the development of the Hoan Kiem district. Participants included policy makers, municipality officers, a police officer, NGOs, planners, tour guides, local business owners and academics. A number of the participants were recruited through a gatekeeper who was a contact of the professor at the host organisation. The gatekeeper was an invaluable part of the recruitment process as she kindly put me in contact with several
people working in various different municipality departments. However, the gatekeeper was unable to communicate in English which at times made the recruitment process difficult; arrangements with interviewees were negotiated through a research assistant who I relied heavily upon to inform me about the participants’ details and meeting arrangements.

In order to prevent bias in the results, participants were also recruited independently of the gatekeeper; this was achieved through networking with local people and sending emails to relevant organisations and NGOs. Although this cold calling method of recruitment was not always successful, responses were often received, even if it was to say that they did not think they could help. The stakeholders contacted for interview were selected on the basis that they would potentially have specialist knowledge about the street food trade and be able to offer an alternative perspective to the vendors and the consumers. Stakeholder interviews are an established method of data collection in geographic research, and using this method helped to ensure that a holistic understanding of different views was gained. The interviews were carried out in the second phase of the research; they aimed to elicit as much information from the participants about the street food environment as possible through exploring the themes most relevant to their occupation that would help answer the objectives of the study. The researcher intended to recruit further participants through snowball sampling and asked the participant at the end of each interview whether they could recommend anyone else to talk to; however, none of the participants were able to make any suggestions, except for a small community of culinary experts who recommended one another.

**Agenda**

The interview began by the researcher introducing herself, confirming with the participant the purpose of research and asking permission to record the conversation. Prior to the interview the researcher drafted a list of approximately ten questions addressing the relevant themes of social sustainability to ask the participant based on their role. The researcher eased the participants into the interviews by asking general open questions about the participants’ role and whether they had any direct involvement with street food. The course of the rest of the interview was determined from this discussion at the start, and the researcher used the interview guide to help steer the interview where necessary. Where a participant showed particular knowledge or enthusiasm for a certain theme relating to the social sustainability framework, the researcher explored this theme more thoroughly with the participant by probing with further open questions on the subject. Broadly speaking, the questions asked during the interview tried to elicit the participants’ perspective on the social
significance of street food vending in the city and each of the themes raised were explored discursively.

The literature on research previously conducted in Vietnam reports that authorities are often wary of outsiders coming to ask questions about them (Scott et al. 2006). In an effort to reduce any potential air of distrust the researcher took great care in the wording of the questions and sought advice with her local research assistant to make sure that the types of questions being asked were suitable and not likely to be misunderstood.

**Data Collection**

Interviews took place at a location chosen by the participant, most often this was the interviewees’ office, which was preferable as noise was at a minimum and privacy was maximised. Under other circumstances or where an office space was not available, interviews were conducted in a local coffee shop or at the participants’ home. Where the researcher was invited to the interviewees’ home she was always accompanied by the research assistant or friend for safety reasons (see section on research ethics for further discussion). Where possible interviews took place in English and were conducted independently by the researcher. In an event where the interviewee was not confident using English, an interpreter accompanied the researcher and provided direct translation throughout the interview. On average the interviews lasted 40 minutes and were recorded on a voice recorder; in the three cases where permission to record the interview was refused, extensive notes were made during and straight after the interview. Interview recordings were also transcribed verbatim as soon as possible after the interview and annotated with notes regarding feelings or thoughts that may have been recorded by the researcher during the conversation. This also helped to start the analytical process, as through transcribing the researcher begins the act of interpretation (Secor 2010).

**Data Analysis**

Once the interviews had been transcribed they were analysed using a framework analysis which was aided by computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), in this case NVivo, to manage the data and streamline the coding process. Firstly, the data was open coded; this process involved ascribing each line in turn with an appropriate code. Emic and etic codes were both used at this stage of coding the data; the decision as to whether emic or etic codes were used depended upon whether the participant had used a word or phrase that was understandable; if they had talked about a subject without using a term which could be used as a code, then a code devised by the researcher would be applied. The text was
then revisited and the codes were grouped into categories based on the social sustainability framework using the themes identified in the literature: social equity and justice, quality of life, governance and participation, social networks, social inclusion, crime and security, cultural heritage and sense of place. Where the open codes did not fit under any of the pre-established themes a new code was allowed to emerge; this is known as analytic induction (Bryman 2012). Throughout the process the researcher made ‘memos’ alongside the data with any notes on ideas that would later help to formulate a discussion of the analysis. Although the process is somewhat repetitive it enables the researcher to get close to the data and gradually build and develop better understanding in order to ascribe meaning to the data.

Observations: Watching and Wandering

Participant observation is the premise of ethnographic research (Herbert 2000). According to Hammersley and Atkinson (1994, p. 249) “in a sense all social research is a form of participant observation, because we cannot study the social world without being a part of it”. Although this study cannot be considered ethnographic in the traditional sense – as the research was conducted in two relatively short but intensive phases of fieldwork, rather than over an extended period (Swanson 2013) – the exercise of observation undertaken was very much embedded in values ascribed to understanding the everyday lives of the street food vendors and their consumers. This was achieved through observing what it is that food vendors and consumer do, as well as considering what it is they say that they do (Herbert 2000).

In this study my position as a researcher fluctuated between that of ‘complete participant’ and ‘participant as observer’ (Burgess 2002), although there were times where the dichotomy between these two positions was not so clear cut. The ‘complete participant’ is the position in which the identity of the researcher is unknown; this role was adopted during the initial phase where I was orientating myself in the field, participating in the street food environment as part of the consumer population. As time passed more of a ‘participant as observer’ position was adopted, where I began to discuss my role as a researcher and the purpose of my observations informally with other consumers and some street food vendors. Observations based on ethnographic methods aim to reveal how social worlds are structured, whilst recognising that social life is inherently complex and messy (O’Reilly 2012). The use of observations to study the practice of everyday life was therefore also highly complementary to the epistemological perspective adopted in this research.
Observation has been a powerful tool in the field of planning, used widely to study the behaviour of people in public spaces (Gehl 1996, 2006; Goffman 1963; Jacobs 1961). Whyte (1980) conducted a study on street life in New York; in his discussion on food in the city he writes, “at every plaza or set of steps with a lively social life, you will almost invariably find a food vendor at the corner and a knot of people around him – eating, schmoozing, or just standing” (p. 52). In short, the findings of Whyte’s observations found that the presence of food in the street attracted people to this space and in turn these people attracted more people; it was only through experimental observation that this finding was achieved. Despite its potential insightfulness into everyday life, observation work has been described as “time-consuming and meticulous”, but nonetheless useful for obtaining a regular picture of street trading (Bromley and Mackie 2009b). Recently, participant observation has been used successfully in other research on street vending (Karim et al. 2012; Mateo-Babiano 2012; Newman and Burnett 2013) and there is evidence that observations have been used in previous studies of social sustainability, often to support qualitative interviews (Scott et al. 2000). Despite this there is still limited published research within the field of geography that uses this qualitative method (Swanson 2013). During this study the researcher was in the field for an initial period of six weeks followed by a further period of nine weeks; during the first phase exploratory observations were undertaken in order to familiarise the researcher with the area, and to gain a broad overview and understanding of the street food environment. This approach has been used in other research on street food vending where little or no pre-existing data exists on the number and types of street food vendors (Lucan et al. 2011, 2014; Rheinländer et al. 2008), as in the case of Hanoi. In the second phase of research more structured observations focusing on particular aspects of street food trading were conducted; the following sections outline each of these approaches and are followed by an account of how this information was analysed.

**Phase 1: Exploratory Observations**

Participant observations were used to gain an overview of street food vending in Hanoi; based on previous work by Bromely and Mackie (2009a), initial observations took note of who vends, what was being sold and where. Distinctions were made between the types of different vendors, mobile, fixed and whether the food being sold was cooked or uncooked. The researcher typically conducted observations from 8 am through to the end of lunchtime (2 pm) and then from approximately 5 pm to 8 pm keeping account of the movements of street food vendors during the day, and paying close attention to the busiest times, i.e. breakfast, lunch and dinner, to observe the vendor–consumer relationships. The reason
observations were carried out over the period between breakfast and lunch was to see what
the vendors do when there are fewer customers. The research also took note of the
movement of the consumers to see whether they stopped and stayed in the area to eat, as
the study by Whyte (1980) would predict.

Observations were recorded as field diary notes and transcribed with reflections at the end
of each day. According to Gehl (2013, p. 32) keeping a dairy when conducting observations
that are not explicitly ‘purpose-driven’ is a useful technique where nuances and relevant
information can be recorded to supplement more quantitative data.

Phase 2: Observations

During the second phase the researcher carried out observations as both a participant and
as a non-participant. Because of the other commitments, organising and attending
interviews, conducting the surveys and supervising the research assistants, it was difficult to
carry out observations in a structured manner. The observations were carried out whenever
the researcher happened to be in the Hoan Kiem district, whilst eating lunch or dinner and
on purposeful visits when there was time. On several occasions the researcher sat for a
couple of hours at a time in different locations to purposefully watch a particular area,
counting the number of mobile vendors and interactions that happened. Notes were quickly
made by hand into a notebook so that the researcher did not miss anything.

Approach

Structured observation involves determining a set criteria or observations schedule to use
during the observations (Bryman 2012). At each selected site in the first phase of research
the number of street food vendors was recorded, noting down the number of mobile, fixed,
cooked food and non-cooked food sellers. As this research is utilising the dimensions of social
sustainability identified in the literature as a guide to understanding the social life of street
food, a schedule was prepared that addressed the relevant and observable themes. The
selected themes for observation based on this were primarily related to the second research
objective which was to examine people’s behaviour in the street food environment. Social
capital and social networks and safety and security were the selected themes for observation
as unlike sense of place, they can be observed more easily because of their tangibility. In
addition, observing just two themes makes the observations more focused and manageable.
As regards to observing social capital and networks, observations paid close attention to the
social interactions between people, and specific attention was paid to the levels of
recognition and friendliness or otherwise amongst people. In terms of exploring safety and
security the researcher kept a look out for suspicious or criminal activity during periods of observation and recorded any occurrences.

Structured observations in the second phase were conducted from one vantage point that allowed the researcher a good view of the street and typically took place over a period of two hours. Observations were recorded in the form of field notes on site. An agenda composed of the main themes of social sustainability was laid out and the researcher made notes relevant to that theme under each of the headings, noting the current location and time. Observations were reflected on at the end of each day and the notes helped to inform the researcher’s field diary, which kept a more narrative and reflexive account of the occurrences that had happened each day.

**Data Analysis**

Whilst in the field the researcher made field notes and observations by hand. These were later transcribed onto the computer so that they could be analysed qualitatively using NVIVO software. This process, although laborious, allowed the researcher to re-familiarise herself with the text and make additional notes and record thoughts whilst transcribing, before putting it through the thematic coding process. The text was coded line by line and these codes were then grouped into themes using the vocabulary of social sustainability where relevant, but also allowed for new themes to be created from the coding categories.

**Research Ethics**

There are invariably ethical concerns when conducting research in any setting and particularly in the developing world where there are additional historical political and cultural forces which shape our understanding of the research subject and their understandings of us (Madge 1994). The research was conducted with the utmost care and integrity and was always conducted in a manner that was appropriate and respectful to the research subject and did not intend to do any harm to the research participants (Hay 2003). According to Madge (1994) however ‘simply doing no harm’ is not enough to justify ethical research, and the author argues that a more active role should be taken to make sure information gained is use sensitively to avoid disempowerment. Butz and Besio (2009) suggest that instead of referring to researchers as causing less harm, we should reframe this to focus on building trust with our participants; however, due to the, often, temporary visits of researchers to their study site, as was the case for this project, often one never feels as though they are able to repay their participants enough (Heller et al. 2011).
At all times I was open and honest with participants about my position as a research student explaining (in the event of being asked for professional advice or advocacy) that my position of power as independent researcher was limited. I explained to participants that I have permission and support from a local university (University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University) to conduct the research. All interview and survey participants were asked to provide verbal consent to partake in the research; they were also clearly informed that their involvement was voluntary and that their identities would be kept anonymous and confidential. In addition, participants were made aware of their freedom to withdraw from the study at any time.

Permission to audio record the discussions was requested from all interview participants. It was explained that the audio recording would be transcribed to help with the analysis of data and be kept confidential. Where the participant did not speak English or preferred to talk using their first language, the local research assistant asked the interview questions in Vietnamese and interpreted the responses as the interview progressed. The research assistants were assigned by the local university professor who was employed by the host organisation; I therefore had no choice over which assistants conducted the surveys and had to trust the professor’s judgement to ensure that the researchers were of a suitable quality. As other researchers have commented, choosing the ‘wrong’ research assistant or interpreter can potentially be detrimental to the research process (Scott et al. 2006). Upon meeting the four assigned research assistants I ensured that they were fully briefed in the importance of the ethical procedures above, during their training period.

During observations of general street life the researcher did not seek consent from individuals as this would have been far too difficult to implement. The purpose of such observations was to gain an overall feeling for the place and not to comment on specific individuals. “Participant observation involves playing out a multiplicity of changing roles during the course of the research. These roles, which are sometimes complementary, sometimes clashing, and which are contingent to our positionality, will influence the data given/gained and our subsequent interpretations” (Madge 1994, p. 118), given this, the researcher kept a field diary to document any ethical concerns that arose during the fieldwork and recorded any changes in procedures or methods that were altered. The method of journal keeping has been found to be a useful process, particularly for early career researchers, to reflect on their experiences and as a way of identifying any concerns (Heller et al. 2011). As Turner (2013, p. 4) confirms “[b]eing ethical in practice needs to go hand-in-hand with the reflexive, self-critical methods that guide our moral decisions and encourage
us as researchers to explore the ethical dimensions of fieldwork as they arise”. The diary method allowed the researcher to identify the key ethical concerns in situ and work to alleviate them as best as possible.
Chapter 4: Background
Introduction

This chapter outlines the context for this study, firstly it provides a political and economic historical overview of Vietnam and the city and region of Hanoi. It then introduces Hoan Kiem, the central district of Hanoi which is the specific geographical focus of the study before discussing the role of street vending and use of public space in Hanoi.

Vietnam

Vietnam is currently a one-party communist state which has endured a complex history of war, imperialism, colonial rule, soviet allegiance and poverty. The most recent major conflict, referred to by Vietnamese as the ‘American War’, but is known more widely as the ‘Vietnam War’, took place between 1945 and 1973. During this time the country was divided into north and south, with the Americans supporting the anti-communist movement in the south. After the war ended the communist party regained control of South Vietnam and the country became unified once again in 1975. The current population of Vietnam is estimated at 90 million (World Bank 2015), its two largest cities are Ho Chi Minh City in the south of the country and the capital, Hanoi, situated in the north. Ho Chi Minh City is the site of most economic commerce, Hanoi, founded in 1010, on the other hand is the historic centre of politics and culture except for the period between 1802 and 1945 when Hue became the Imperialist Capital during the Nguyen Dynasty. Hanoi was given status as the capital of French Indochina from 1902 - 1954.

In 1986 the state introduced Doi Moi, an economic transformation policy commonly translated and understood as ‘Renovation’ (Beresford 2008). This renovation policy opened Vietnam to a market-based economy; this meant dissolving ties with the Soviet Union and building relationships with Western countries (Horen 2005). Although the outcomes of this policy were not witnessed until the early 1990s, it resulted in a rise in the number of small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), both state-owned and foreign investments. The shift away from a centrally planned to a market-based economy stimulated opportunities for people to pursue their own business ventures, creating an increase in the amount of micro-enterprises and entrepreneurial activity such as private shops and offices (Horen 2005). Another of these activities also included the unstructured developments of food markets leading to the development of the ‘pavement economy’ (Waibel 2004), also typical of other cities in Southeast Asia and developing cities worldwide.

The urban informal sector represents a large proportion of total employment in both of Vietnam’s major cities, amounting to 42 per cent in Hanoi and 32 per cent in Ho Chi Minh
City (Demenet et al. 2010). A large part of this informal economy is composed of street food vendors, however statistics regarding the percentage of the overall informal economy in the trade of food remain unknown.

During the 1990s and 2000s Vietnam experienced a remarkable decrease in poverty which has been accredited to Doi Moi, and during the first ten years of the millennium the country had an average annual GDP growth rate of 6.61 per cent (Söderström and Geertman 2013). The economic reformation was seen as particularly beneficial to the agricultural sector helping to improve the lives of millions of Vietnamese by allowing them to diversify their agricultural practices (Maruyama and Trung 2010). However, exposure to the international marketplace also resulted in a number of negative consequences such as enlarged inequalities between urban and rural areas, increased unemployment, pollution and crime (Waibel 2004) amongst other social deviances (Turner 2009).

Between 1997 and 1999 Asia experienced an economic crisis, which may partly explain the growth of the informal sector in Vietnam (Cling at al. 2011; Demenet et al. 2010), which was also witnessed in other neighbouring countries such as Thailand (Maneepong and Walsh 2013; Yasmeen 2001). The explosion of the informal workforce and its inherent flexibility has been considered beneficial in times of such crisis (Demenet et al. 2010), moreover, its value in “absorbing the ‘shocks’ associated with the transition from a centrally planned economy to a market-orientated one” has been recognised more widely (Cuong et al. 2007, p. 328).

**Hanoi City and Region**

Hanoi is the capital and second largest city of Vietnam situated in the north of the country. In 2008 the state expanded the city boundaries of Hanoi more than doubling its size and increasing the population from approximately 3.5 million to 6.23 million (Turner and Schoenberger 2012, p. 1029). The expansion was made to accommodate new urban developments which are being built on the outskirts of the region on the peri-urban interface (Labbé and Bourdreaux 2011). These new urban areas, such Royal City in Thanh Xuân and Ciputra in Tay Ho, feature high-rise apartment towers, offices and other commercial spaces such as large American style shopping malls. Some of the districts further away from central Hanoi which have yet to be developed are still characterised as peri-urban, and it is in these locations where much of the food is grown and transported to daily wholesale markets across the city region. These outer districts are also the hometowns and villages of many migrant street vendors who have moved to the city temporarily for work (Jensen et al. 2013).
Often, migrant street vendors return to their hometowns during harvesting season to help with agricultural work.

**Hoan Kiem, Central District**

Hoan Kiem is the central district of Hanoi, approximately 5 km² in area. In the centre of the district is Hoan Kiem Lake which is an iconic landmark of the city and a key gathering place for citizens. In the morning people can be seen exercising next to the lake, running or performing Tai Chi and in the evening many young people are attracted to the benches surrounding the water’s edge where they socialise with friends. During the day tourists are found taking photographs of the lake and its famous pagoda, while despite the well-known ban, informal street vendors sell lemonade when the authorities are not looking. To the north of the lake is the Old Quarter which is made up of 36 old streets which date back to the 15th century (Waibel 2004). The south west of the lake is characterised by wide boulevards and tree-lined streets; it is the area known as the French Colonial Quarter where the French built many grand buildings such as the Opera house and large villas, many of which have been converted into offices for private businesses, international designer shops and expensive hotels. The east of the lake is also largely used for commercial purposes, mainly offices, shops and hotels. To the west of the lake sits St Joseph’s Cathedral, a large hospital, schools, small service sector businesses (garage, beauty salons) and one of many ‘backpacker’ streets with lots of shops, hostels, hotels and bars, similar to the nearby Old Quarter. South of the lake towards Hai Ba Trung District the streets become wider and straighter with each building having more space surrounding it. In this area is the museum, a number of larger hotels, restaurants, schools, international NGO offices and some foreign embassies.

The Old Quarter is characteristic of ancient Hanoi; its streets are tight and narrow with many alleys running in between the tall buildings known as ‘tube’ or ‘tunnel’ houses (Logan 1995). It is in these alleys that many of the informal street markets selling uncooked fresh food take place. Despite the crowded and busy nature of these alleys with sellers displaying their goods on the pavement, people on their motorbikes (the most common form of transport in Vietnam) are not deterred from entering. Motorbikes weave in and out of people to take shortcuts from one side of the Old Quarter to the other, or to simply drive directly to their vendor to buy goods. In the past each of the 36 streets in the Old Quarter was named after the particular type of product which was crafted or sold on it. Some of the names remain today, such as Silk Street (Hang Gai) and Silver Street (Hang Bac). The original 36 streets of the Old Quarter were occupied by craftsmen who came from villages on the Red River Delta;
the occupants of each street organised themselves into guilds and each street had their own meeting house, pagodas and temples (Waibel 2004) living cooperatively and creating a village community. The main purpose of the guild was to serve the King in the citadel. Some of the original street patterns remain, although the area has undergone a number of transformations over the years, with many of the houses having been rebuilt and taking on new purposes, especially since the introduction of Doi Moi. In addition as a result of the changes in Land Law in 1993 where residents were given the right to change use, rent, transfer, inherit and use land as collateral (Han and Vu 2008) a number of residents have moved out or transformed their homes into shops, hotels and restaurants to take advantage of sharp increases in land value in the Hoan Kiem district (Turner 2009).

Although the architecture and landscape of the Old Quarter has shifted and morphed as the city has developed, it remains the site of significant historical heritage, as well as a site of traditional crafts and commerce where one particular type of product is still sold in many of the streets. For these reasons it is also a key tourist attraction, one of the main draws of which is the street food, with the likes of ‘Chicken Street’, and in recent years Hanoi has become somewhat of a culinary tourist destination.

**Street Vending and Public Space in Hanoi**

Since economic liberalisation and the relaxation of the use of public space (Kürten 2008) the informal economy in Hanoi has boomed, creating vibrant streetscapes full of street vendors selling goods alongside other commercial practices conducted on the streets which have come to characterise Hanoi. In 2008, however, the municipality of Hanoi banned street vendors from selling goods on 63 streets and 48 public spaces across Hanoi (Eidse et al. 2016), 16 of which are within the Hoan Kiem district1. This has placed increasing pressures upon the livelihood of informal workers, particularly the migrant street vendors whom are specifically targeted by the authorities over the vendors who sell from fixed spaces (Eidse et al. 2016) increasing their vulnerability. This is because the fixed sellers are often from Hanoi and either sell outside their own home or rent the space from the homeowner and have built good relationships with the authorities in the area overtime, often paying them regular fees to trade as well (Eidse et al. 2016). A number of studies on Hanoi’s street vendors have been conducted previously with a focus on street vending and the informal economy generally (Lincoln 2008), vendor resistance (Eidse and Turner 2014; Turner and Schoenberger 2012),

---

1 For entire list visit - http://m.thuvienphapluat.vn/archive/detail/84303
the mobility of vendors (Eidse et al. 2016), the lives of migrant vendors (Jensen et al. 2013) and consumer purchasing practices (Wertheim-Heck et al. 2014b).

The next chapter begins the discussions of the empirical findings of this research starting with the theme of social justice. This first empirical chapter builds upon this background chapter by providing an overview of street food vending livelihoods in Hanoi.
Chapter 5: Social Justice
Introduction

Social justice and equity underpin the foundation of the social pillar of sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Cuthill 2010; Dempsey et al. 2011; Littig and Greissler 2005; Scott et al. 2000; Yiftachel and Hedgcock 1993). This chapter addresses the first research objective which was to explore issues of social justice in relation to street food. Initially, social justice was taken as a discrete concept within the social sustainability framework, however, during the data collection it became apparent that social justice is instead an accumulation of several other dimensions of social sustainability, most notably quality of life and well-being, participation and safety and security. These three themes are used to frame the main body of this chapter and each is explored in turn; throughout the discussions the findings from the data are explored and the wider implications towards social justice are considered. Additionally, the subject of food hygiene and food safety arose from the analysis as key issues which the generic social sustainability literatures inevitably failed to identify as important. In this study these food-related concerns were deemed an important part of social justice debates and are discussed in a fourth section using the lens of food justice.

Firstly, in order to set this chapter in context an overview of street food vendor livelihoods are explored. This section sets the scene for the rest of the chapter by discussing the legitimacy and perception of street food vending as a livelihood strategy in Hanoi; it looks at the opportunities and barriers to becoming a street food vendor and attempts to separate out the differences which might be experienced by the different types of street food vendors (for a typology see Chapter Four). This is important because the right to earn a living is recognised under several international conventions and is central to the understanding of social justice (Meneses-Reyes and Caballero-Juárez 2013). It is therefore important to understand the position of the street food vendor in Hanoi’s informal economy before considering issues of quality of life, well-being, participation and food justice.

Secondly, the chapter addresses the notions of quality of life and well-being. Key indicators of quality of life include living standards and basic needs. According to Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs, at the most fundamental level people need adequate food, water, shelter, air, sex and clothing to physically survive. Beyond this, humans have other needs concerning safety, social, emotional/esteem and self-actualisation. Accordingly, for both vendors and consumers, this section considers whether street food helps people meet their basic needs in terms of providing adequate income and food. It also attempts to address the higher level of needs, such as emotional needs, by exploring whether selling and eating street food can contribute to happiness. Assessment of happiness, as opposed to normative
measures of quality of life, adds an additional level to our understanding of social justice issues.

Thirdly, the chapter discusses the idea of participation by establishing the role of organisations and associations in relation to street food and the informal economy in Hanoi; it examines whether such organisations exist, in what format and the barriers to their creation. It also looks at vendors’ and consumers’ previous involvement in decision-making processes with regard to street food activity. Drawing on recent civil society literatures relevant to Vietnam, this section also explores the debate questioning whether public consultation regarding city developments should be increased and more participatory in nature.

In the fourth section the themes of crime, safety and security are discussed. The research attempts to understand both vendors’ and consumers’ experiences and perceptions of crime in the street food environment. In the research three key areas surfaced as particularly poignant areas for discussion: sense of security and crime, public disorder and environmental problems.

Finally, drawing upon the concepts of food justice, this chapter explores the concerns of food safety and food hygiene in regard to street food in Hanoi. Issues concerning food quality and safety arose iteratively in the data analysis process. Given the prominence of these matters a discussion on the challenges facing the food system in Hanoi is warranted, as issues of food quality, traceability and access are also issues of social justice. Following the seminal work of Sen (1981) the literature on food justice argues that food security is only achieved “when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO 2006, p. 76 cited in Morgan 2015). This definition emphasises the importance of access to culturally appropriate food which offers healthy options, rather than simply the mere supply of food. This research explores food justice in the street food context from this perspective.

Within each of the discussions in this chapter, attempts have been made to unravel the differences between the experiences and opinions of different types of street food vendors to explore how they are impacted by and respond to each situation. To begin with, an up-to-date overview of the street vending situation in Hanoi is presented to set the scene in the wide context of social justice issues and provide additional detail to the study.
Street Food Vendor Livelihoods in Hanoi

Vietnam began a transition to a market-based economy in the late 1980s as a result of economic transformations. Consequently, the development of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and micro businesses, whether formal or informal, have become very important to the economic growth of Vietnamese cities. Street vendors constitute a significant proportion of all micro-businesses and SMEs in Vietnam’s largest cities, and in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City, street vendors make up 11 per cent of the urban workforce (ILO 2013). In Hanoi the informal economy is estimated to contribute to approximately 16.5 per cent of the city’s GDP alone, and this is likely to be an underestimation given that not all such work is likely to be accounted for in official statistics (Demenet et al. 2010, p. 8). In this research for example, 87 per cent of street vendors interviewed reported not paying taxes and are therefore unlikely to be accounted for in official statistics; this finding was supported by many of the stakeholders during interviews. Furthermore, only a small minority of street food vendors reported paying any money to rent their selling space (Table 5.1), supporting the idea that street food vending is very much a part of the undocumented informal economy in Hanoi.

Table 5.1 Percentage of vendors who pay to rent their pitch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal stationary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total 53)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total 40)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total 67)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the data which was collected regarding the cost of fees for renting their pitch or space, the average rent paid by vendors was approximately £107 per month (the average was based on information provided by just 36 vendors (22 per cent) and excluded an anomaly where the street kitchen vendor apparently reported paying £183,000), and ranged from approximately £9.42 per month to £314.12 per month. Additionally, 9 per cent of total respondents reported paying fees to local homeowners or landlords whereby the vendor sells directly outside a property; these fees enable them to trade on the pavement outside the home or shop owners’ property without complaint and the payment often includes access to clean water and sometimes electricity. Some vendors also reported paying additional fees directly to the local authorities for cleaning and security services. The amount of payments made by street food vendors appear to be inconsistent, even amongst the same
categories of vendors. Given this finding, during one of the interviews NGO representatives were asked if there were any documents to keep track of payments. This question was met with laughter and then a simple reply of: “no, of course not, this is one of the problems”. This suggests that there is a potential for unfair treatment of the vendors by the authorities and local property owners who, without appropriate documentation or a form of record keeping, can exploit the vendors for their own gain. On the one hand street food vending creates a wealth of livelihood opportunities for people in developing cities, including Hanoi, on the other hand however, the lack of formal record keeping and rules exposes vendors and makes them vulnerable to exploitation (Asiedu and Agyei-Mensah 2008; Bhowmik 2010; Pena 1999; Anjaria 2006) which may not contribute towards the principles of social sustainability.

The right to work was declared as such in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR 1948). When people have few other options available to them for work, many people in developing countries choose to utilise the street as their place of work (Meneses-Reyes and Caballero-Juarez 2013; Roever 2014). However, increasing numbers of people also decide on this option, particularly to sell food, because it has the potential to offer higher returns (Arámbulo and Almeida 1994; Simopoulos and Bhat 2000) or because they have an opportunity to take advantage of their situation. In Hanoi for example, many of the street kitchens and stationary vendors operate from the bottom floor of their home, in what are sometimes referred to as ‘shop houses’. This was the situation for Thi’s grandmother who previously worked as a street food seller:

“Like my grandma’s experience as I told you [before], she has her whole house; she does not have to pay the rent every month. And sometimes she used me to serve her customers... and sometimes some of us who spoke English could translate and help her to collect money [from tourists]. And my grandma for example had regular, stable income and even high income from selling of street food. Otherwise [in contrast] new people who come from the province have to move from this place to another to have a good and regular income. I mean those who sell banana on the street, or pineapple on the street, some of them have to serve from the pole and the income is just enough for, well, they come from the province so they have to pay for the house and everything. And often, I think normally with poles they offer you [the customer] a better price than those in the fixed place” (Thi, NGO Project Coordinator).

There appears to be potentially large disparities between standards of working and living conditions for the different types of street food vendors found in Hanoi. In the case of Thi’s grandmother, her business success was largely attributed to the fact that she had no rent to pay. In contrast, migrant vendors who come from surrounding villages and often operate as
mobile vendors have additional overheads for accommodation and storage; they also often sell their goods at a cheaper price than their stationary counterparts, meaning that they are likely to make less profit. Inequality is experienced by street food vendors worldwide; this is true even in the most developed countries such as the United States where, for example, new ‘gourmet’ street food vendors, often belonging to the white middle classes, have been shown to be in receipt of preferential treatment by policymakers over established neighbourhood street food vendors who are often a part of the poorer local immigrant communities (Martin 2014). The following part of this section moves on to discuss whether street food presents an equitable opportunity for employment, how it is regulated by the state and how street vending as an occupation is perceived by consumers and the vendors themselves.

In order to establish whether street food vending was an occupation available to everyone, vendors were asked through an open question whether anyone was allowed to sell food on the street. The results show a mixed response (see Figure 5.1); 31 per cent of respondents said ‘yes’ anyone can sell food on the street and 46 per cent of vendors said ‘no’. The results also show some differences of opinion as to whether some form of licence, certification or approval from the local authority are needed. As a result of this information further exploration was carried out to establish whether there are any formal regulations (Nguyen et al. 2013). It is suggested in the literature that if a vendor is working out of a shop, such as a street kitchen, they should have permission and certification from the authority, however, in reality this is not always the case. There was a consensus amongst participants that mobile vendors on the other hand do not need a license, despite their contested presence on the streets in Hoan Kiem, particularly around the Old Quarter.
Figure 5.1 Vendor opinions on whether anyone can sell food on the street

According to the vice-president of one of the wards within the Hoan Kiem district, street food vending is managed at the ward level (usually just encompassing four to five streets):

“To be honest, government management activities at the wards level include general management of all aspects of social life. As the vice president in charge of social-cultural activities of my ward, my responsibility regarding street food, firstly, is to ensure that the food is safe for residents of my ward as well as people coming here from other places such as tourists” (Ms Chau, Ward Vice President).

Although there are regulations in place which prohibit street vending on certain streets within the Hoan Kiem district (for full list see Nguyen et al. 2013), I often witnessed vendors clearly in breach of these rules in the presence of authorities who did not appear to take any action. The management of street food at the ward level may lead to a lack of consistency across the district as different ward authorities may enforce rules more or less than others. A lack of uniform understanding is unlikely to result in a coherent practical application of the official regulations and may potentially lead to unjust practices (Fainstein 2010). This also coincides with some of my own observations where there seemed to be no obvious regular enforcement of rules; at times I witnessed authorities removing a vendor’s wares from the street or taking away the plastic tables and stools from the street kitchens, whilst at other times the authorities would pass by without taking any notice of the informal activity taking place. This may result in some of the confusion regarding the regulations amongst vendors and authorities. This was something also picked up on by one interviewee in his own observations:
“It happens everywhere. You know there are lots of small districts or precincts within the city, so each one of those has a different set of rules, depending on who’s in charge. You know, it’s a corrupt system, it’s a bureaucratic corrupt system. There’s payments which go on, which are kind of regulated because of the market, and so you know it’s determined by those authorities and the regular practice there” (John, Street Market Tour Guide).

In his statement John recognises that the inconsistency is not only down to the management of vendors at the individual ward level, but also due to widespread corruption, an issue which is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

In order to try and establish the perceived legitimacy of selling street food, the vendors themselves were asked whether they believe people should be allowed to sell food on the street; 85 per cent of people agreed that they should, however, interestingly 15 per cent disagreed, despite this being their current occupation. A cross tabulation shows that stationary vendors and vendors with street kitchens were more likely to agree with this statement, 90 per cent and 88 per cent respectively, however, 20 per cent of mobile vendors disagree. It is unclear from the data available why they might disagree with the practice although, one interpretation might be that they see street food as being a temporary solution and although they sell food in a certain form, they would perhaps wish to see street food more formalised. Alternatively, those who do not believe people should be allowed to sell food in the street may have interpreted the question differently from its intent and disagreed because they feel that encouraging the sale of street food as a livelihood opportunity for more people might create additional unwanted competition. When consumers were asked an alternative question of whether street food should be removed from public space, 80 per cent either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement (with just 6 per cent agreeing). This finding suggests that consumers are generally in support of street food vendors and in doing so legitimise their presence in the city’s public space; this is further supported by the fact that over half of consumers (56.3 per cent) also felt that street food is an important part of everyday life for people in Hanoi. Furthermore, several interviewees recognised that the removal of street vendors would be detrimental to the livelihoods of many vulnerable people:

“… the Chairman of the National Assembly has suggested that because our country is still poor, we should sympathise with people who don’t have jobs and have to become street vendors so for the time being, we should just let them do it” (Ms Tien, Representative of Hanoi People’s Committee).
“Many times I have talked to the local authority and they tell me that we know that we have to remove them but if we remove them it will cause a big mess in society because many people will lose their jobs and the demand of the citizens will not be met, or something like this. They don’t have any official regulation to remove, and when there are special occasions like weekend or national holidays they just stop them from doing so freely like this” (Thi, NGO Project Coordinator).

The tolerance given to street food vendors illustrated in the above remarks seems to reflect an understanding of the difficulties that are likely to be experienced by many street food vendors if they were to be completely removed from the city. The comments also recognise the wider role street food vendors play in fulfilling the needs of local citizens; to remove street vendors from the city entirely would currently be too problematic, particularly given that Hanoi is still developing itself as a city. However, the comments made by both Ms Tien and Ms Thi suggest that street vending is a temporary solution until more desirable options are available; it is also only a preferable option when it suits the local government and not when there are special events taking place in the city which result in the temporary removal of vendors. Despite having clear support from consumers and contributing significantly to the urban economy, the street vendors’ place in the city is continuously challenged by the unpredictable actions of the authorities, undermining street food vendors’ legitimacy. The daily uncertainty experienced by vendors is no doubt likely to impact their quality of life and well-being and it is these issues which this chapter turns to discuss next.

Quality of Life and Well-being

Quality of life is considered one of the most important components of social sustainability (Alexsson et al. 2013; Chan and Lee 2008; Littig and Greissler 2000; Jacobs 1999; Poleses and Stren 2000; Scott et al. 2000) and it is both individual and social. It is widely recognised that in order for a society to be socially sustainable minimum standards of living need to be met, where people are able to meet their basic needs and maintain good psychological health. First, this section explores the quality of life of street food vendors and consumers by considering the concept of basic needs. Secondly, using the idea of ‘happiness’ as a soft measure of quality of life, this section moves towards discussing the more subjective aspect of quality of life to understand whether street food contributes to the general well-being of vendors and consumers. This part of the chapter attempts to add an additional layer of understanding to the street food environment and vendor livelihoods in relation to quality of life.

To assess quality of life, vendors were directly asked whether selling street food helps them meet their basic needs. Using Maslow’s (1943) theory of motivation as a foundation, basic
needs here are those which are considered ‘lower level’ in the hierarchy of needs on the first and secondary levels and refer to things such as food, water, shelter, air, sex and clothing, safety, employment, stability and social security. On the third level are ‘love’ needs which refer to a sense of belongingness and the importance of relationships with family and friends. Basic needs are arguably a subjective concept and can vary from person to person and between places, particularly given different rates of development. The essence of this question was to understand whether vendors felt that their basic needs were being met, rather than to define exactly what these might be. Collectively, 75 per cent of the vendors surveyed either agree or strongly agree that street vending does help them meet their basic needs, however 15 per cent of respondents disagree or strongly disagree. Upon closer inspection of the results Figure 5.2 shows that 83 per cent of street food vendors operating from fixed premises feel selling street food helps meet their basic needs in contrast to just 67 per cent of mobile vendors. Despite the majority of respondents reporting positively, a small proportion do not, which suggests inequalities between different types of vendors, as touched upon earlier. Fixed vendors are likely to earn more money than their mobile counterparts and their comparatively secure position sets them up for a more regular and stable income, no doubt allowing them to meet their basic needs more easily. Mobile vendors on the other hand are generally more vulnerable as they do not have a secure place of work and often sell their goods at lower prices. A hierarchy of street vending locations amongst different types of vendors has been reported by other researchers in different parts of the world and mobile vendors being the most vulnerable are often at the bottom of this chain, particularly if they are migrants or belong to a minority group (Bromley and Mackie 2009a).
In exploring this issue further in the interviews with stakeholders it was found that migrant vendors were considered to have the poorest quality of life. As in many developing cities across the world that have implemented economic development policies focused on urbanisation, increased expansion of the city has meant that there is less agricultural land available for work, forcing rural residents to seek alternative incomes in urban areas (Gugler 1992). Migrant vendors make up the majority (78 per cent) of the itinerant street food vendors in this research, which is consistent with the study conducted by Jensen et al. (2013). Migrant vendors tend to make little money and live in poor conditions, as described by one interviewee who works with informal workers across Hanoi:

“...[they have] some typical characteristic like unstable income, relatively poor. Can they earn next month what they earn this month? No. Do they know what they can earn today? Tomorrow? No. The income is unstable and also fluctuates up and down.... But [whether this is] enough income or not, we cannot say. But for the majority of them it’s very very low income, that’s why they...you imagine they can share a room, 10 people on the bed. We cannot say that is a good condition. They minimise the price for food, for healthcare. They can go to the hospital only when very serious...” (Ms Ngoc, International NGO Programme Coordinator).

When a person travels to another area to live or work in Vietnam they sacrifice their rights to access subsidised social security and healthcare, making them more vulnerable than those who might do the same or similar job but live in the area in which they were born:

“They have to register at their family residence in their hometown, so if they stay in their hometown they [can] fully enjoy their rights as a citizen, but when they go to another place they can enjoy them hardly. For example, to go to the healthcare centre or hospital, even if they have health insurance
card they have to pay big part of that [for their treatment]. And the doctor can only cover for them 30 per cent, but if they are in their home town they can cover, the government can cover…. 70/80/90 per cent” (Ms Ngoc, International NGO Programme Coordinator).

Another issue for migrant vendors is that their informal status leaves them vulnerable to harassment and they are often treated unfairly and targeted by authorities as pointed out by several stakeholders:

“…. they get harassed by the police of course. Street vending is very visible, so they have to pay like a bribe and also a kind of payment that is a kind of tax, it may go to the government pocket or it may go to the individual pocket… they pay, but they are not recognised” (Ms Ngoc, International NGO Programme Coordinator).

“Sometimes these guys [authorities] also get a bit heavy-handed and they tend to pick on the weaker ones like the fruit vendors or things like that. Confiscate their bicycles or knock down their food stands and get a little rough and I don’t like that aspect” (John, Street Market Tour Guide).

As documented in further detail later in this chapter, street food is considered an accessible source of food for the majority of the population; it also popular because of its affordability, as described by Ms Tien, a Representative of Hanoi People’s Committee: “street food stalls are often small-scale and mostly cater for the needs of common people [people with average and low income]”. Furthermore, Hue (a local street food tour guide) described how the average meal from a street kitchen or food stall costs around £1.00, however, many places will provide a simple bowl of noodles for approximately £0.15 if they are asked. This availability of cheap food illustrates that even for the poorest there are some options available, arguably helping to fulfil some nutritional needs but certainly not all. When consumers were asked in which ways street food helps fulfil their basic needs, 38 per cent felt that street food helps meet their nutritional needs and 32 per cent felt that street food gave them an opportunity to choose what food they eat. This indicates that whilst food is available it does not necessarily meet their dietary needs; in terms of findings this is not necessarily an unusual discovery as food quality and access to ‘healthy food’ is an issue which has been, and continues to be, explored worldwide, but particularly so in the developed world (Walker et al. 2010; Wrigley 2002). This potentially challenges the idea that street food can truly be a socially just food system, at least at the consumption end, because it does not appear to be helping consumers meet their nutritional requirements (this theme is discussed further in the food justice section of this chapter).
Moving on from a focus on quality of life framed through basic needs, this section explores the notion of well-being, underpinned by psychological needs that sit higher up Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs. During my observations of street food vendors in the Hoan Kiem district I not only saw street vendors looking extremely busy serving customers, carrying heavy loads balanced on both ends of a bowing yoke pole and confrontations with police involving the confiscation of goods, I also frequently witnessed vendors laughing, smiling, chatting and eating together as they stopped for rest, prepared food, washed dishes or simply waited for customers (see Figures 5.3 and 5.4):

“A stationary vendor sat selling bread from a box calls over an itinerant vendor selling bananas from a bicycle. They chat for a few minutes smiling and laughing, they seem comfortable with each other. Another mobile vendor selling fruit briefly stops and joins in the conversation and then moves on…” (Field Diary Extract, 08/10/2014).

Figure 5.3 Mobile vendors stop to chat in the shade
The familiarity and apparent happiness shared amongst the vendors struck me as a seemingly positive element of the street food environment that is often overshadowed by the pressing challenges associated with street food vending as a livelihood. Given these observations it was important to establish from the vendors themselves whether their occupation plays any part in making them ‘happy’. Happiness may be criticised as just an ephemeral feeling or subject, however, there is a broad universal understanding of what happiness is (Cloutier and Pfeiffer 2015) which makes it useful as a simple ideological concept to explore well-being. In order to embrace this shift in focus and apply it to a developing world context where much research is still focused on basic needs, vendors were asked whether selling street food makes them happy. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, 61 per cent of people either agree or strongly agree that it does. When consumers were asked a similar question, whether buying and eating street food made them happy, only 45 per cent of those surveyed agreed, and 36 per cent held a neutral opinion (compared to 32 per cent of vendors). In conversation with the stakeholders street food was recognised as a cultural tool that can induce a ‘good feeling’ which in turn promotes a feeling of happiness or enjoyment, however ephemeral:
“The advantage of street food is the good feeling after enjoying each delicious street food dish. Each dish manifests a cultural characteristic of Vietnamese people” (Ms Chau, Ward Vice President).

These findings clearly show that street food has a positive impact on the happiness of many people, but more so for the vendors themselves. Although it is not possible to directly measure the level of street food vendor happiness, this finding provides an interesting insight into vendors’ well-being which resonates with other research such as that of Bromley and Mackie (2009b), who found that despite some of the difficult and challenging conditions facing young street traders, a high number of street children (80 per cent) reported that they enjoyed their work.

In examining these results further, a Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was applied to explore the relationship between the two variables ‘selling street food helps me meet my basic needs’ and ‘selling street food makes me happy’: the result shows a strong positive relationship between the two variables ($r_s = .534, p < .001$). Further analysis in Figure 5.5 shows that 52.2 per cent of vendors who took part in the survey agreed that selling street food helps meet their basic needs and also makes them happy; only one vendor reported that selling street food did not make her happy although it did help meet her basic needs. In contrast, just 6 per cent of the total number of vendors disagreed with the statement ‘selling street food allows me to meet my basic needs’ and also disagreed with the statement ‘selling street food makes me happy’. The analysis indicates a positive correlation between those who feel their basic needs are being met and whether or not they feel selling street food makes them happy. Using Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to interpret these results supports the idea that only when basic needs are satisfied can higher needs which may contribute to a person’s happiness, such as ideas associated with the importance of social relationships and self-esteem, be considered by individuals.
Quality of life and well-being are increasingly being recognised as essential elements of achieving healthy, sustainable places which are underpinned by notions of social sustainability. This section has explored the role of street food in influencing quality of life for both vendors and consumers. Firstly, the section discussed whether street food helps people meet their basic needs using Maslow’s theory of motivation as a tool to centre the discussion. The results show that in this sample street food vendors largely felt that selling street food helps them meet their basic needs (75 per cent); however differences between the extent to which street food helps meet basic needs was found to vary between different types of vendors with those who sell from fixed spaces feeling more strongly that their needs are being met than those who are mobile and widely recognised as living more precariously or being more vulnerable socially and economically (Steel 2012).

The second part of the section explored the influence of street food on well-being, specifically focusing on the concept of ‘happiness’ as a soft indicator of well-being. It was found that those who agreed or strongly agreed that selling street food helps meet their basic needs also reported that selling street food made them ‘happy’. This relationship between basic needs and happiness tells us, as we would expect, that when people’s basic needs, such as air, shelter, food and drink are met, they can consider ‘higher needs’ such as those related to ‘belongingness’, ‘esteem’ and eventually achieving ‘self-actualisation’.
Participation in society is not mentioned in Maslow’s theory of motivation as a discrete concept, however it could be interpreted as a form of ‘higher needs’ for some people under the belongingness and esteem levels that raise the importance of relationships with others, self-esteem, confidence and respect. Participation is fundamentally understood to be about giving voice to people, recognising and valuing their opinions, particularly when it comes to decision-making on issues that directly affect them. It is this subject which is discussed in the following section.

**Participation**

Fainstein (2010) argues for more just processes within policymaking to prevent unfair practices being inflicted on less powerful communities. Participation offers one such solution, and is considered a vital dimension of social sustainability (Bramely et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Cuthill 2010; McKenzie 2004; Littig and Greissler 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013; Vallance et al. 2011) and one which underpins the idea of a just society (Fainstein 2010). This section addresses participation and the notion of civil society, rather than the closely related term ‘engaged governance’, given the political context in which this research was conducted, to account for participation which takes place outside of politics. Civil society is “understood as the realm of private voluntary association, from neighbourhood committees to interest groups to philanthropic enterprises of all sorts” (Foley and Edwards 1996, p. 38). In the context of research in Vietnam, civil society networks have previously been defined “as the joining together of organisations and individuals to influence power around a shared conception of the common good” (Wells-Dang 2010, p. 98). In Vietnam the population is governed by an authoritarian state, and this raises a question as to whether civil society is an appropriate term to be used in this context; as discussed in Gray (1999) civil society organisations in Hanoi, unlike in truly democratic societies, do not appear to be entirely disentangled from the state. In Vietnam the public are engaged in decision-making processes through people’s committees and unions, however these committees are elected and closely aligned to the central government which operates through a vertical system (Parenteau and Nguyen 2005). Historically there has been limited scope for grassroots civil movements, although in recent years some success stories have been reported: local civil networks have successfully campaigned against major developments in a local park and for their right to public space (Coe 2015; Parenteau and Nguyen 2005; Wells-Dang 2010). However, much of this success has been a result of some important actors involved within the civil society networks being in close proximity and holding some influence with the government. Although participation and civil society are
contentious issues to discuss in such contexts, Wells-Dang (2010, p. 96) argues “while open spaces for political expression may indeed be fewer or differently structured in authoritarian regimes, this does not preclude their existence”. This chapter then seeks to explore opportunities and barriers to street food vendors becoming members of appropriate organisations. It also tries to establish the level of engagement in decision-making processes in the past and whether residents of the case study area think more participation is needed from street food vendors in decision-making processes that affect them. It also looks at the role some non-governmental organisations have in creating and promoting the voice of informal workers such as street food vendors.

Across the world people working in the informal economy have formed associations or organisations in order to collaborate and defend their rights through a collective voice and action (Brown 2006). These forms of association for vendors have, at times, proven to be effective in their collective resistance against removal and relocation policies implemented by governments across the developing world (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Brown et al. 2010; Cross 1998; Mackie et al. 2014; Milgram 2011; Steel 2012). In India, for example, there are over 350 street vendor associations across the country which belong to the umbrella organisation National Alliance of Street Vendors of India (NASVI) (Bhowmik 2010). This has led to a widespread acceptance of street vending across several states in India and heightened their visibility to policymakers and urban planners (Bhowmik 2010). Unlike India and many Latin America countries where street vendors are strongly represented by such organisations and have a strong political voice (Mackie et al. 2014), Vietnam is not a democratic nation and the lack of political freedom of expression stifles the development of similar associations and assemblies. During the survey vendors were asked whether they were aware of any street vendor organisations, however formal or informal they might be. Just 18 respondents (11 per cent) said that they were aware, meaning that 89 per cent were not aware of any. In terms of belonging to such organisations however, only three respondents said they were a member, leaving 98 per cent who were not part of any such organisation. This is not surprising given Vietnam’s political context and low levels of association membership has also been found in other parts of the world, such as Zimbabwe (Musoni 2010). Although only three people were identified as belonging to an organisation, reasons for membership coincided with general roles and benefits identified with trader associations in other parts of the world (Brown 2006, p. 184); when asked why they were a member of such a group, one vendor replied: “to protect the benefits of the members and to discuss strategies to develop the cuisine culture”. Another vendor said: “we contribute
ideas to help the street food develop more stably”. Respondents also identified the main advantages of the group as providing protection, being able to contribute ideas, to share knowledge about any government policy changes and its implications. These findings suggest that similar concerns are shared by Vietnamese street food vendors and those in other parts of the world.

In contrast to other countries which appear to have high levels of participation in street vendor associations such as in Peru (Bromley 1998; Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Roever 2016), Ghana (King 2006), and increasingly in the developed world such as the USA (Devlin 2014), the low level of participation in Hanoi is likely to be due to a combination of the small number of street vendor associations there, together with a lack of awareness of such associations, partly as a result of Vietnam’s authoritarian rule which limits public participation (Parenteau and Nguyen 2005). In this research, the overwhelming majority of street food vendors did not belong to any informal or formal trader organisation but also appeared to express a strong disinterest in such activities. The main explanations given by vendors for not belonging to an association of some kind are summarised in Table 5.2 below. A similar finding was observed by Brata (2010) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Brata found that 82 per cent of all vendors surveyed did not belong to an association; this was recognised as being due to the fact that either there were no organisations to join in the area or because the vendor reported no interest in joining. Interestingly, in Yogyakarta, Brata (2010) also observed that many street vendors were migrants from outside of the city with no kin or relatives working in the same area and proposes that this may have contributed to the lack of association formation. However, the same cannot be said for vendors selling in Hanoi as 87.5 per cent of respondents reported to be living in the city, although only 40 per cent were born there. The lack of membership may be more accurately derived from the vendors’ seeming dislike to be grouped or feel accountable to others; Vietnam’s relatively new position in a market economy means that people can now create and build their own livelihoods, whereas between 1954 and 1986 northern Vietnam operated a centrally planned economy under communist rule. This may have resulted in a degree of scepticism of groups and associations and a preference for individual pursuits, particularly if there is not widespread knowledge of their existence and or benefits. Having said this, it would appear the sheer lack of street vendor associations is the overriding factor in the low levels of participation in Hanoi.
Table 5.2 Vendors’ Most Cited Reasons for not Joining an Organised Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not wanting to be part of an organised association (Total Answers 146)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know about any organisations</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not care for such organisations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to operate independently</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not like the idea</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not want to incur any additional costs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, due to their need to make earning a daily living a priority, vendors have little time to contemplate joining such collective groups:

“I think to an extent they have not been aware about how they can benefit by being a part of an association or organisation. They are more used to working independently, earning a daily wage, so even having to spend time on social works is another matter for them to think of. Because they don’t have the welfare, they don’t enjoy the welfare. Their livelihood very much depends on their daily work, so the economic needs are always the first thing they think of. Also, among the migrants, the migrant informal workers have a lower education than the formal sector. So this is also another limitation for the informal worker” (Ms Ngoc, NGO Programme Manager).

There are, however, some organisations such as the Association for Vietnamese Cities, Oxfam and Light (a local health and welfare organisation) who are trying to help and promote the rights of informal and migrant workers and make them aware of the benefits of being organised, including those who work as street food vendors, by supporting them in developing their businesses and educating them about voice:

“First we focus on the migrants and the informal worker, in particular the women so these people are able to collectively and effectively voice and defend their rights....[We] focus a lot on social protection rights so that they can secure their livelihoods and basic needs and that continues to welfare, to inclusive critical improvements. That is our aim. We want to see them organised and with power so that they are able to raise a collective voice” (Ms Ngoc, NGO Programme Manager).

“Our project will contribute to the local governance by supporting public service delivery for household businesses, which means we try to improve the public service toward the household business development. We support them in competition, to find market output, to support them in developing by themselves, accessing capital and support them in getting and expanding
their networks. Because street vendors, sometimes they need the network as well” (Thi, NGO Project Coordinator).

However, the changes promoted by such organisations are not just about giving a voice to the vendors and organising them, as this does not hold much power in an authoritarian state. A shift in perceptions on a wider scale is also needed alongside further collaboration between other civil society organisations in order to raise the recognition of informal worker rights as described by Ms Ngoc:

“But it is not only organising, organising here means nothing! ...The other change we want to see is more civil society organisations like LIGHT, and other partners and other organisations. They can support to organise the migrant worker, they can. And together with those organisations and with grassroots organisation they can move better, forwards. Toward the government, toward the private sector... first [we need] the recognition of the migrant worker because they have no voice, and no one recognises them. They are ignored. So how to make the migrant worker visible in the society and their role in economic development? That is important. Because that is the first step that can help them claim their rights” (Ms Ngoc, NGO Programme Manager).

Of the street food vendors who were surveyed in this research 12.5 per cent had previously given, whether through invitation or initiative, their opinion about changes that would affect their livelihood. Some of the vendors reported making recommendations themselves, whereas others said that they had taken part in government surveys or been invited to a public consultation carried out by government representatives. Sometimes suggestions were sought ahead of any planned changes, whereas at other times these meetings or surveys were organised for feedback on changes which had already been implemented. According to one of the stakeholders who was interviewed as a representative of the planning department:

“According to the law, if the government has plans to redevelop an urban area or a street they must ask the members of the community in order to gain their ideas, before making the decision. The street food sellers are one part of the community, thus, they will have the right and the liability to give their points of view about any plans which may affect their business. For example, for any redevelopment plans in the Old Quarter, they would need to collect the contribution of people there” (Ms Linh, Department of Planning).

Although the sample of vendors surveyed is by no means statistically representative, the low number of vendors reporting their involvement in previous consultations suggests that many people are not always being included in the process. Ms Thuy, describes how in practice, engagement with local residents should take place:
“In our country’s general context, for example in the urban planning activity, from the general planning of the whole city to the detailed planning of each district, it is all required to seek public opinion, including the opinions of local residents and organisations based in those areas. However, in reality, there is no direct opinion from local residents except for some specific projects which involve public discussion. For the Hoan Kiem area, they need a specific project which means that it should include information on which kind of renovation and how to implement it, who the investor is and which method to use. With a well-defined project like that, the Government certainly have to ask for ideas and suggestions from the local residents” (Ms Thuy, Institute of Urban Economics).

The research also sought to find out whether participation in decision-making processes was something that should be more inclusive of street vendors. When consumers were asked whether they thought street food vendors should be involved in decision-making processes only 59 per cent of consumers believed that they should (see Figure 5.6). Although this is a majority, there is still a significant number who disagree. As consumers, only 5 per cent had been invited to participate in discussions regarding the regulation or future of street food and only one person explained their answer stating that they had previously been asked about their knowledge of food hygiene.

**Figure 5.6 Street food vendors should be engaged in decision-making processes regarding the selling of street food**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Respondents (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral Answer</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in Hanoi is clearly limited for several reasons, given participation is considered a key element of social sustainability within a society, it would be unreasonable to claim that street food vendors are being engaged with decision-making processes; based on the evidence from this research there is a lack of engagement across all types vendors and
consumers. The research showed that efforts are being made by local and international non-governmental organisation to push the civil society agenda, however, resistance from the state and street food vendors themselves has been witnessed, with the latter appearing to value their relative autonomy and pursuit of individual income over the proven benefits of collective action. However, this might also be due to a lack of awareness rather than ignorance, supporting the need for further education in this area and certainly further research.

**Safety and Security**

Safety and security is understood to be important to the achievement of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008, Dave 2011; Dempsey et al. 2011). Crime is often measured in two ways, firstly through the reporting of actual experiences and secondly through people’s perception of crime. Exploring crime from both angles creates a fuller picture of the safety and security of an environment and more accurately reflects any issues which need to be addressed. Each type of participant reported different levels of safety, which leads to the question as to whether the guarantee of safety is entirely necessary for social sustainability or alternatively, how safe is safe enough? However, there were three clear notions which were highlighted as causes for concern: sense of security and crime, public disorder, and environmental problems. These three themes have been used to frame this section.

Vendors are the principal users and creators of the street food environment. When asked whether they felt safe whilst selling food on the street 84 per cent of vendors said that they did. The same participants were then asked to openly describe what it was that made them feel specifically safe or unsafe and the top six cited reasons are summarised in Table 5.3. Almost one-third (30 per cent) of respondents said that they felt safe because of the provision of good security or because of the police presence in the area; a further 9 per cent attributed their feeling of safety to a good government; and another 9 per cent said that friendly customers added to their sense of safety.
Table 5.3 Top Six Cited Reasons for Feeling Safe by Vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Per cent (%)</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good Security/Police Presence</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good Government</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Friendly Customers</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presence of other people</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Has not experienced a negative situation before</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Trust in other People</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of other people – whether sellers, customers, passers-by or the general crowded nature of the street food environment – also added to the sense of safety for 8 per cent of vendors. This supports the notion of ‘eyes on the street’ as proposed by Jane Jacobs (1961), which creates a form of natural surveillance (Newman 1972). The fact that there are other people using the street, watching their environment (even unconsciously) creates a busy, rather than an empty environment which provides vendors with a level of security and comfort in addition to the security offered by the authorities. Other vendors attributed their sense of safety to not having experienced any negative situations in this setting before. Some vendors also cited friendliness and familiarity with others and neighbours which leads to them feeling safe or comfortable selling food in the street, perhaps appealing to their sense of place (see Chapter 7). The descriptors provided by the vendors illustrate that it is other people, including the authorities, which contribute to their sense of security on the street. Not unsurprisingly the vendors selling from street kitchens reported feeling safer than the other types of vendor, 93 per cent of those surveyed (see Table 5.4), whereas 15 per cent of informal stationary vendors and 16.4 per cent of mobile vendors do not feel safe whilst vending. This suggests that the level of permanency may influence how safe and secure vendors feel; it could be said that those with informal arrangements are likely to feel more vulnerable than those with fixed selling spaces.
Table 5.4 Vendors’ Feelings of Safety whilst Selling Food on the Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Informal Stationary Vendor (%)</th>
<th>Informal Mobile Vendor (%)</th>
<th>Street Kitchen (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45 (84.9)</td>
<td>56 (83.6)</td>
<td>37 (92.5)</td>
<td>138 (86.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8 (15.1 %)</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>3 (7.5)</td>
<td>22 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 70 per cent of the vendors interviewed at street kitchens employ members of staff or enlist help from family members, and are therefore unlikely to work alone; this may also explain why they felt more secure than the informal vendors. Sellers at street kitchens also operate from fixed premises – usually out of the bottom floor of their own home – or rent from someone else. Through the conversations in the interviews it became clear that these types of vendors are likely to have established relationships with the owner and/or neighbours and be familiar with the local authorities who regulate the areas (see Chapter 6 on social relations). During observations, when the police approached to inspect a street it was clear to see that some of the vendors had established relationships with them; these vendors would be particularly unfazed by the sudden police presence and announcements being made via the police van loudspeaker, whereas others would quickly start to remove their goods from the roadside into nearby buildings.

When vendors were asked whether they had been a victim of any crime it was reported that 71 per cent had not, 6.9 per cent had been victims of harassment and 4 per cent had experienced theft, as illustrated in Figure 5.7 below. Some respondents provided examples of other experiences of crime, and incidents most commonly cited were customers refusing to pay after their meal, being paid with counterfeit money and some drunken customers behaving disorderly, especially at night. When explored more closely (see Table 5.5), it was found that informal vendors are more likely to experience theft of goods, but the street kitchen vendors surveyed were subject to the most harassment. However, the figures for all incidents are very small and overall the street food environment was deemed safe by the majority of vendors who took part in the survey.
Table 5.5 Street Food Vendors’ Experiences of Crime (by vendor type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever been a victim of any of these crimes?</th>
<th>Informal Stationary Vendor</th>
<th>Informal Mobile Vendor</th>
<th>Street Kitchen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Goods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Crime Experienced</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumers on the other hand reported different feelings of safety and security in the street food environment. When asked to rate whether the street food environment was a safe place to be, 44 per cent of consumer respondents either ‘strongly disagreed’ or ‘disagreed’. Only 27 per cent either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that it was a safe place, and the remaining respondents (30 per cent) held a neutral opinion. A later question asked the consumer whether they had witnessed any of a select number of crimes: 70 per cent of consumers said they had witnessed a theft, 19 per cent had witnessed someone being...
mugged, 16 per cent had witnessed the dealing of illegal goods and an additional 7 per cent of respondents said they had also witnessed acid attacks in the street food environment (Figure 5.8).

**Figure 5.8 Crimes witnessed by consumers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugging</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing of Illegal Goods</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid Attacks</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a clear discrepancy between the vendors’ experiences of crime and the consumers witnessing of crime in street food settings. This indicates a distinct separation of perceived sense of security between that of the vendors, who generally felt safe and comfortable in their role (84 per cent) and the customers, where only 27 per cent reported that they felt safe in this environment.

A person’s sense of security is influenced by a number of spatial, social and situational factors or previous experience (Pain 2000). One of the major influences affecting a person’s sense of security or conversely their sense of fear, is their perception of crime (Smith 1987). Interviewees spoke with some hesitation about the subject of crime, whilst they recognise that crime happens many emphasised the point that it occurs no more often than in any other city in the world, or in fact less so and gave a consensus that they felt it was relatively safe.

The differences of opinions between the three groups engaged in this research is interesting; on the whole vendors felt safe, consumers felt unsafe and the stakeholders interviewed appeared to hold a neutral opinion. The consumers’ perception of crime and safety might be more enhanced because they spend less time in the environment than street food vendors. Vendors who work in the street for prolonged periods of time may be more accustomed to the everyday goings on and petty crime to the extent that they may not register it happening.
and therefore under-report it, potentially undermining the scale of the problem. The stakeholders on the other hand had a vested interest in assuring the researcher, as a foreigner, that their city is safe and whilst crime does take place it is not any worse than anywhere else in the world. This point is clearly illustrated by Quy:

“Yes but like anywhere in the world, you have to be aware of your surroundings and your belongings. I don’t know of anyone who’s been robbed while they’ve been eating in Vietnam” (Quy, Local Street Food Blogger and Tour guide).

Rather than emphasising, however, that the environment is safe, the choice of phrasing by Quy places a degree of responsibility onto the consumer. ‘You have to be aware of your surroundings and your belongings’ – this statement proposes that the consumer is accountable for the crime. This acceptance that crime happens and that the prevention ultimately occurs at the individual level indicates that there is larger underlying problem which needs to be addressed. Falling victim to theft myself whilst conducting research, albeit not sat eating, but wandering around the Old Quarter, I was surprised to hear from one of the local ward managers that she viewed crime as a rare occurrence:

“However, in my ward, as a person working for the local ward’s authority for nearly 15 years in different positions, I have rarely see any law violations or security issues related to street food because this is the Old Quarter, a very special place in this district so the local authority has applied strict security control and sound management” (Ms Chau, Ward Manager).

On the particular evening my bag was sliced open whilst I navigated my way through a large crowd. I later learnt that I was not the only victim – at least two other people I encountered also had this happen to them on that same night. Although it was not a typical evening, as the city was particularly busy due to the 60th Anniversary of Hanoi’s liberation, subsequent informal conversations with locals told me that this was not unusual behaviour, in fact my research assistant had her electric bike stolen the same week and on a number of occasions I heard about expats being assaulted and then robbed. Contrary to the reoccurring unfortunate circumstances I and others found ourselves in, John, a long-term expat and local food expert explained:

“This is probably one of the safest countries to be on the street I’ve ever been in to tell you the truth. You know, there is always a chance of pickpocketing or the very occasional purse snatching or something like that, but it’s very rare, especially in Hanoi” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

It is worth considering however that people are more likely to discuss and share their experiences of crime than they are to talk about the multiple occasions they have walked
freely around the streets and markets without experiencing any kind of negative consequence which impeded on their sense of safety and security. Most of the crime people talked about, with the exception of my research assistant’s bike being stolen, was targeted at tourists, rather than locals:

“Tourists they have to pay attention. Walking around the old quarter for the night market, it is very crowded, and you do not know who will crush you, and when they crush you it is easy for them to pickpocket for cell phone or for camera. Or your wallet or something, so for everything you have to pay attention” (Hue, Local Street Food Tour Guide).

Street food vendors on the other hand do not appear to be at risk; in the survey few of the respondents felt that they were in danger of being stolen from and therefore did not fear crime. Vendors felt that they do not have anything worth stealing and because of this reason potential criminals would not bother to steal from them:

“I am so poor, not even a bad guy would want to steal my money or bike” (Male Bicycle Vendor, 42 years old).

Ms Thuy’s statement below goes on to support the findings that vendors do not experience much crime themselves because of their poor status:

“In fact, I don’t see problems happened to street food vendors. I have only heard about robberies at jewellery shops for example. In fact, most of street vendors are poor. They don’t have a lot of money to become the target of criminals” (Thuy, Institute if Construction and Urban Economics).

Contrary to the above belief that vendors are at low risk of being stolen from, the following field extract illustrates an example where I did in fact witness pretty crime:

“As I wander along through the streets this afternoon not 10 metres behind a roving bicycle vendor with a bamboo tray of rambutans attached over the back wheel, I saw a man helping himself to a handful fruit before disappearing in the other direction. The vendor did not notice his fruit being stolen as his back was turned to his goods as he pushed the bicycle by the handle bars facing forwards” (Field Diary Extract 15/09/2015).

The data collected in the research suggests that street food vendors do not often fall the victim of crime; however, street vendors have been known to be involved in petty crime themselves, for example, trade in illicit items or acting as a cover-up for illegal activities, as witnessed by 16 per cent of consumers (see Figure 5.8). In order to establish whether there was any criminal activity being covered up by street food vendors in Hanoi, participants were asked broadly about their knowledge of any illicit activities which take place in the street food environment. However, given again, my position as a foreign outside researcher it was
unlikely that interview participants would speak of anything too untoward or want to portray the Vietnamese people in a negative light. Participants mostly spoke about how gambling activities, which are illegal in Vietnam, can supplement a street food vendor’s income:

“There is minor crime at some refreshment stalls on the street pavement. The owners of these stalls often act as an illegal lottery and gambling host. Actually I don’t know their gambling rules but these places are very popular to gamblers. In fact, each refreshment stall like this does not consume over a kilogram of dried herb tea, no more than a kilogram of roasted peanuts, except for some places where they also sell coffee. So without that illegal lottery and gambling activity the owners of these refreshment stalls would earn so little. Therefore, these illegal activities are very popular among them. I don’t know much about other criminal activities related to street food vendors but I think that this is the most outstanding problem” (Ms Tien, Hanoi People’s Committee Representative).

Ms Tien went on to describe how gambling is a “big problem” and is the root cause of some social problems in the Old Quarter; she says that most of the people who visit an alleyway near Quan Chuong Gate, which is an area full of refreshment stalls, do not visit it for that purpose, but to gamble. Gambling was not a criminal activity which people identified in the survey as affecting their sense of security, the fact that it is confined to particular vendors or locations means that it can easily be avoided. However general public disorder which may transpire as a result of activities associated with gambling, such as drinking alcohol, may impact on the wider environment:

“Well, um you know many street food vendors, they also sell alcohol. There is no rule yet I don't think, or they are just starting the rule, like new regulations, that you cannot buy alcohol unless you are a certain age. Or they are discussing about it at least. So at the moment it’s still free to go out and drink whatever you want. And a lot of places, again street food, like hot pot for example, is a great place for socialising because you share with a lot of people and so sometimes it can cause, like when people are drunk it can cause problems” (Hong, Journalist).

The lack of regulation over alcohol, often consumed alongside street food (or in fact the opposite way around) as discussed by Hong, has the potential to cause problems. Public disorder, in particular caused by drunken customers, also came up in conversations with vendors during the surveys. In response to questions on crime, some of the vendors who specified ‘other’ explained that sometimes drunk customers will cause fights with each other, creating general disorder or may harass vendors.

In addition to drunken customers, conflict between different types of vendors was another issue which threatened the safety and security of the area:
“The third problem is security issues. Since street vendors come from so many places, it is very difficult to manage them. For example, there are public fights and arguments among street vendors. There are also thieves and robberies” (Ms Tien, Hanoi People’s Committee Representative).

This is a familiar problem which has been reported in studies of street vendors elsewhere in the world, for example in Cusco, Peru, where tensions rose between vendors of different economic status due to increased competition (Bromley and Mackie 2009a). Those who could not afford a place to sell in the new markets were forced to sell illegally on the streets. It is these kinds of street food vendors who are frequently ostracised all over the world, particularly by governments because they are perceived to be detrimental to the city’s orderliness and stability and therefore seen as potentially troublesome; Ms Lien shares the concerns of the authorities:

“They don’t allow street vendors to wander around the streets’ pavement because they worry these street vendors would affect the city’s law and order” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist – Cuisine).

During my time spent in the field I observed that street vendors are not the sole cause of disruption to the city’s law and order; the excessive use of motorcycles compounds the chaos and congestion in the streets. In Vietnam motorcycles are the main form of transport, as their small build means that they can easily traverse pavements and squeeze down tight alleyways which are often also lined with street food vendors. This inevitably causes traffic problems which are another form of public disorder that people expressed concern about in discussions regarding safety and security:

“In general, the fact that people sell all types of products on the streets has led to traffic problems, affecting the public order, the city’s clean and beautiful image and social security”(Ms Tien, Hanoi People’s Committee Representative).

Interestingly, it was common for interviewees to blame traffic problems on the presence of vendors, rather than on the unruly driving practices and the use of vehicles themselves, as phrased by Ms Tien in the above quote. It would appear that the convenience of the motorbike overrides the convenience of food availability, although often the two complement each other; customers will drive right up to a vendor’s stall and without even getting off their bike, buy their food – usually unprepared uncooked foods such as fruit or meat – and drive off. Traffic also has the consequence of causing environmental pollution which was another theme associated with the safety and security of the area:

“Generally it’s a safe environment, there are some street food locations where the traffic is heavy around there so it’s dusty and a bit dirty, maybe a
little polluted, that sort of thing. And that's probably my least favourite part about street food and sometimes the noise factor from that as well. Um, but other than that I think the safety is generally pretty good” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

Ms Tien draws attention away from the traffic and highlights the environmental pollution caused by the street food vendors themselves:

“The second problem is environmental pollution. I mean the general environment including the ecology, the clean and tidy space of the city. Street vendors have made the streets so dirty. For example, some people bring coal stove and wood stove to cook right on the pavement and their dirty plates are all around the food stalls. So it is not only a food safety issue, it also affects the aesthetic image of the city” (Ms Tien, Hanoi People’s Committee Representative).

Not only do vendors cook on the pavement and cause a mess, but through the observations I saw that it was common for customers, especially at cooked food stalls, to throw their rubbish onto the pavement and into the road (see Figure 5.9), a problem also emphasised by Ms Linh:

“Sometimes street foods can be the reason for the polluted environment because the bad behaviours of sellers and the buyers, they throw rubbish on the road and in the lakes...” (Ms Linh, Institute For Urban and Rural Planning).

The combination of factors which contribute to the overall safety and security are wide-ranging. Crime is direct and often physical which people usually experience on an individual level and can result in a sense of fear. The effects of environmental pollution, such as traffic fumes or littering, on the other hand are more indirect and are more likely to affect people generally rather than individually. Public disorder is a problem that occurs at both the general and individual levels; a person may be directly affected by the actions of a drunken customer or they may just be at risk of harm, jeopardising their safety and security, by being in a place where the public order is disrupted. The social sustainability literature suggested that crime and security would be key to social sustainability within the street food environment and these issues take a particular form, firstly in terms of creating public disorder and secondly causing environmental problems.
In addition to the themes discussed, questions about safety and security also brought up a dialogue about food safety and food hygiene which was not a focus of this study as it is addressed elsewhere in the literature (Mergenthaler et al. 2009; Wertheim-Heck et al. 2014a, 2014b). However, because of the prominence of these issues in the Vietnamese media, and because of the growing concerns about food safety, it was a topic of conversation which could not be ignored whilst talking about street food.
Food Justice

The right to adequate food is a basic human right (UDHR 1948) and is therefore a fundamental issue of social justice. According to Tim Lang (1996), pioneer of the food justice movement “what matters is not just ‘what’ is eaten, but ‘how’ it is produced and distributed” (cited in Levkoe 2006, p. 89). There is clearly an abundance of food in Hanoi amongst the myriad of street markets and food stalls, however, what is not so obvious is its quality which could potentially undermine any socially sustainable attributes identified with the street food environment. Food hygiene and safety were not subjects which this research set out to explore as, inevitably, they do not appear under the general social sustainability literatures; however, their prominence in discussions throughout the research suggests further insight is needed.

The urban food system is a vital part of community health and welfare in cities and a core component of a city’s economy (Pothukuchi and Kaufman 1999). The food hygiene and safety issues associated with this urban food system are indeed not unique to Hanoi, particularly where mobile street vendors are common (see Figure 5.10), nor is this the first time such issues have been addressed in this context (Lachat et al. 2011; Lincoln 2014; Morgan and Murdoch 2000; Moustier et al. 2005; Wertheim-Heck et al. 2014b). The notion of food access which concerns access to healthy and affordable food for all (Walker et al. 2010) is used in this section as an avenue to explore the key issues which were identified in the research: food accessibility, quality, traceability, hygiene and safety. This section also explores the challenges facing Hanoi by taking into consideration some of the cultural nuances that are specific to Vietnam which may prevent the transition to more hygienic practices.
In the survey consumers were asked whether they thought street food was an accessible source of food for everyone, a total of 73 per cent agreed or strongly agreed with this statement (Table 5.6). This suggests that the majority of consumers in this research believe street food to offer opportunities for all citizens to consume food in this way.

Table 5.6 Consumer Opinion on whether Street food is an Accessible Source of Food for Everyone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Street Food is an accessible source of food for everyone” (111 respondents)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unclear from this data why some people believed street food not to be accessible, however Dr Bao, a representative of the Vietnamese National Institute of Nutrition, suggested that street food was inaccessible to certain groups such as the very young and very old and for those with health concerns such as diabetes or cardiovascular diseases which are a growing public health concern in Vietnam. Observations showed that cooked street food sold by vendors offers no nutritional information about the quality or quantity of different ingredients used in each dish, which means people consuming the food cannot be 100 per cent sure what they are eating or how thoroughly the food has been cleaned or prepared. The limited regulation and monitoring of the sector suggests that there is not a
standardised system in place to guarantee food safety, as has been implemented in other countries such as Singapore whereby stalls are graded with letters (Henderson et al. 2012). Dr Bao also expressed frustration in his role; he said that he has spoken to the minister a number of times on the issues of nutrition and food safety but the conversations have never resulted in any outcomes. Dr Bao describes how difficult it is to control the street vendors, when he tells me:

“How can we control it? We don’t know where they buy the food, we don’t know about the cost or the price of the food. We don’t know about the quality of the food they buy and cooked for us... when they cook how many things they put in it? We don’t know. Here, in my house, you drink some coffee you know that this is good coffee and this is good sugar. But on the street, if they put something into sweeten the food we don’t know about it. So it’s very difficult to control. If they put some sticky rice wrapped in banana leaf and paper, you know the paper, it will have been used before... and after eating, if you have any problems, diarrhoea for example, how can we find the people who sell the food for us?” (Dr Bao, National Institute of Nutrition).

Dr Bao is clearly very passionate about the problems faced by consumers, as he argues that if there is “no health, then there is no work; if there is no health, then there will be nothing to do” and yet he says that this is a small issue for Vietnam compared to other health concerns such as vaccinations; in comparison, nobody cares about food hygiene or food safety, “it’s not important for the government”.

Further concern was expressed by Eugene, who works for an international food and agricultural NGO. He shares similar concerns to Dr Bao with regard to food safety, hygiene and traceability but in relation to the uncooked foods:

“The government are not monitoring or taking samples from the street vendors and analysing them in the laboratory, so there is no way that you can determine exactly how much pesticide residue is contained in the vegetables. But I am sure it is quite high because there is no traceability; the source is usually questionable, doubtful. But I hope that these vendors are also practising cleanliness in the business, in that they wash thoroughly; I hope they do that, but normally they don’t. I think there is still risk for that” (Eugene, NGO Regional Manager).

Issues of food quality were echoed by some of the other interviewees:

“The problem is food quality control. Nobody can control food quality. Currently, in Vietnam, food producers are using so many preservatives in order to keep their food fresh for a longer time and growth stimulators in the process of growing plants and raising cattle. These chemical ingredients will affect people’s health and are the roots of many diseases” (Ms Thuy, Institute of Urban Economics).
There is an additional concern about the impacts of environmental pollution and unhygienic practices on the quality of the food being sold:

“For the hawker I am concerned a little bit about the hygiene, because when they are walking around the street they do not cover their food with anything. So when they are walking around the street it will get a lot of dust on it” (Hue, Street Food Tour Guide).

“First of all for food hygiene is not clean at all. So it causes health problems and also some streets become quite dirty and chaotic. So the vehicles and people come and park and when eating on the street people are throwing their trash right there [in the road]” (Ms Hong, Journalist).

“If you see how they make the food, it's not hygienic. OK it tastes good, but you cannot eat it all the time, it causes problems with your stomach, I know” (Mr Binh, Ex-employee of Department of Culture).

Upon my first few days carrying out fieldwork I met with a Vietnamese street food blogger and tour guide, and on seeking advice for where to eat I was told to avoid street food stalls or kitchens labelled ‘Com Binh Dan’; this translates roughly as ‘commoners rice’ which is a popular choice for low-skilled workers at lunch as it one of the cheapest options available. At a Com Binh Dan the customer orders a plate of rice and then selects items from a display of different meats and vegetables laid out in a buffet (Figure 5.11).

Figure 5.11 Com Binh Dan Street Kitchen, Hanoi
The clear health concern with this type of arrangement is that the food is often left exposed for hours in the heat with little or no cover. The data shows a clear lack of confidence in the quality of the entire food system, not just with its production but all the way through to handling and storage by the street vendors. However, according to one of the ward managers within the Hoan Kiem district, regular inspections are carried out on both cooked and uncooked food. However, the conviction in her answer with regard to the standards of these tests seems questionable:

“In fact, we carry out food quality inspection regularly. Functional agencies in our ward are in charge of this activity. For example, first, we have a veterinarian agency taking and analysing samples of live cattle and poultry for disease control. Second, we have health officers to check for the level of food safety by taking and analysing food samples...all the members in our general steering committees which include the disease control steering committee, basic health care steering committee have the responsibility to monitor and control food safety inspection activities... In our inspection process, firstly, we check the street food sellers’ health... these people must take regular health check to get a certificate of good health. In the past, they had to participate in a food safety training programme to get a certificate. Now, they have to learn and answer a questionnaire on food safety to ensure they have good knowledge and understanding of food safety issues” (Ms Chau, Ward Vice President).

Ms Chau confirmed that the food inspection process is stricter for hotels and restaurants, whereas for street food vendors it is more difficult to implement, although in theory the regulations do exist:

“Currently, each local authority has to participate in a training programme on this issue. Although the authority of each ward still carry out inspections regularly, it is hard to cover all street food businesses. The food quality and hygiene depends on each street kitchen’s size. You know, houses here are very small so to ensure food quality and hygiene, each street kitchen or food shop needs to be very careful in their cooking process and keep their kitchen clean. We carry out inspection activities frequently but we cannot say that 100 per cent of these street vendors follow the rules all the time. For example, for some street food sellers, maybe 90 per cent of the time their food quality and hygiene are met. However, sometimes we are not so sure. A street food dish might be very delicious today but tomorrow it is not that good and then on the third day, when we come back, it is better. In other words, the food quality is not very stable. That’s the disadvantages of street food” (Ms Chau, Ward Vice President).

Food hygiene and quality were not explicitly examined as part of the social sustainability framework developed from the literature, however, it emerged as a vitally important issue related to food justice in exploring the wider context of social justice. Street food offers an
alternative food system which is not available, but perhaps desired, in many places across the world.

This section has attempted to highlight some of the food hygiene and quality issues raised by the participants by critically examining the apparent abundance of street food in Hanoi and questioning the quality of food available. Although much of the food in Hanoi is fresh, it is the invisible presence of pesticides, bacteria, incorrect food handling practices and a lack of regulation which challenges whether this food is a truly suitable source of food and more importantly, whether it gives all citizens fair opportunities to buy food which is clean, appropriate and healthy. Simply not being sure, or not really knowing what is in the food or how it has been grown and the inability to find out, is arguably a violation of rights. The potential for food to jeopardise an individual’s health without any repercussions for the seller or an ability to warn other customers is also a concern. In order for street food in Hanoi to be considered just there are obviously many improvements to be made in this area. However, as is the case in many developing cities a number of barriers exist making it difficult to implement effective solutions.

Chapter Conclusion
In this chapter, social justice in relation to street food has been explored through four key themes: quality of life and well-being, participation, safety and security and food justice. In the literature social justice is identified as a fundamental aspect of social sustainability. In this research it became apparent that in some ways street food may contribute to social justice in that it provides decent livelihoods to people who may otherwise struggle to find an adequate source of income. Furthermore, consumers are also provided access to an affordable selection of food. On the other hand, street food is may not contribute to principles of social justice in all aspects as many street food vendors, particularly itinerant migrant food vendors, still face harsh living conditions and are the most vulnerable to police harassment. The research also identified potential issues with the quality and hygiene of the food which do not suggest this is a healthy food system that is indicative of social sustainability.

The first section of this chapter explored the legitimacy of street food. The research findings showed that street food vending is generally accepted by much of the population, even the stakeholders who recognise that despite the challenges, it is important to allow people to sell food on the street, rather than contest it, at least for the moment, because of the benefits it provides to poorer citizens.
In terms of the quality of life offered by street food, a key finding of this research was that many vendors reported enjoying their work, claiming that it made them happy. This finding resonates with research conducted in other parts of the world (Bromley and Mackie 2009b) and challenges the perception that street food is an undesirable occupation that is limited to those who have no other option, rather than it being a livelihood made through choice (Maneepong and Walsh 2013; Yasmeen 2001).

The section on participation showed some evidence that street food vendors and consumers are being engaged in decision-making processes put forward by the government; however, participation appears to be extremely minimal, particularly in comparison with other parts of the world such as Latin America (Bromley 1998; Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Roever 2016). The research also showed limited demand for increased participation from all parties, particularly the state and vendors themselves. However, efforts are being made by non-governmental organisations and local civil society networks to promote the benefits of associations in order to create a stronger collective voice amongst informal workers, including street vendors. There is therefore much work needed to be done to improve participation rates in Hanoi, particularly in relation to the street food vending population who appear to value their autonomy over collective engagement.

With regard to the safety and security of the street food environment some issues were highlighted regarding crime, particularly by the consumers. However, overall experiences of delinquent behaviour were relatively low in comparison to their perceptions. Vendors reported feeling safe in the street food environment and this was attributed to good levels of public security. Environmental pollution and public disorder were two additional problems identified within the safety and security of the street food environment that challenge the idea that street food is socially sustainable from a safety and security perspective. More needs to be done to tackle inappropriate disposal of litter by providing adequate facilities and promoting environmentally friendly behaviours.

Food justice arose in the research as an issue outside of the original social sustainability framework. Food safety and hygiene became a prominent discussion point in the research; there are clearly many unresolved and ongoing issues in this area which jeopardise the potential sustainability of the street food system in Hanoi. Although street food is visibly abundant and accessible to most, some of the food is produced and sold under poor hygiene conditions and with no clear standardised food standards system to monitor these activities. In addition, raising consumer anxieties regarding the overuse of pesticides leads people to
question food quality. Food safety and hygiene issues are not unique to Hanoi, but common across many developing cities (Rheinländer et al. 2008; Von Holy and Makhoane 2006). The research does show that attempts are being made to improve and regulate the sector to try and curtail some of the problems, however, there are concerns over the thoroughness and regularity of the current monitoring and more work needs to be done to ensure cooperation between the authorities, vendors and consumers to achieve a more sustainable street food system.

Although the presence of street food in Hanoi is contested to a degree, the removal of street food vendors from the area has not been threatened as harshly as in other countries across the world (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Middleton 2003; Musoni 2010). Street vendors appear to be tolerated by the local government and allowed to exist because of the livelihood opportunities the street food sector offers and customer demand. Street vendors contribute to the local economy in many ways (as discussed further in Chapters 6 and 7); however, it cannot be said to be entirely socially just because of the many issues that have been raised in the above discussion. In order to improve the socially just nature of the street food environment, firstly participation of street vendors in decision-making should be improved to ensure their rights are defended. Secondly, food hygiene issues need to be addressed potentially through the introduction of a more standardised food safety monitoring system; however, this should not be at the expense of the vendor. In addition, further research is warranted on the issues of food quality, particularly regarding food traceability and access to good safe food in Hanoi’s street food system, as few research studies appear to be available on this topic and this would further benefit the food justice literature by adding a perspective from a developing world context.
Chapter 6: Social Relations
Introduction

The practice of consuming and selling street food is a social activity which facilitates interaction between people in public space, whether this is through a simple exchange of money for goods or an in-depth conversation. Research conducted by Whyte (1980) showed that placing a food cart in a public space attracts people, which in turn attracts more people. Similarly, Valentine (2006) argues that food plays an important role in producing the street as a social environment. In Hanoi some forms of street food, particularly from the sellers running street kitchens or services offered by stationary vendors, not only provide people with food to eat but also a space to socialise. Drawing on the idea that food consumption plays an inherently social role in everyday life (Bell and Valentine 1997; Warde and Martens 2000) this chapter seeks to explore the social relationships between the street food sellers, consumers and stakeholders.

First, this chapter will focus on street food as a place of social inclusion and explore the experiences of different social groups. The promotion of social inclusion is deemed essential in combating poverty and improving well-being (Oxoby 2009) and is understood to be a social process whereby the building or enhancing of social bonds is facilitated by providing access to social activity (amongst other services) for all citizens. Second, the temporal and fluid nature of the street food environment will be discussed in relation to social inclusion to illustrate how the environment is used and experienced at different times of the day. It will introduce Oldenburg’s (1991) concept of third places as social levellers in an attempt to understand and explain how the street food environment is used by various people and groups.

The third section will explore the qualitative interactions between the various actors involved with street food in more detail; it will look at the relationships between vendors, consumers, authorities and suppliers. In doing so it will examine some of the social networks embedded within this food system using the notion of social capital in an attempt to understand the strength and importance of these relationships in everyday life. This section will also consider the power dynamics amongst the different actors and how they negotiate their use of public space, and what this means in the creation of socially sustainable places.

Finally, this chapter will attempt to link street food to wider society by exploring its role beyond the city. It will do this by discussing the rural–urban linkages which are facilitated by street food to demonstrate its wider impact on society. Rural–urban linkages form a major aspect of sustainable food debates, however, the focus of this piece of research is to explore
the social relationships and networks these interlinkages bring to this urban food system. Finally, the chapter provides some concluding remarks on the sociality of the street food environment in the city and its implications for social sustainability.

Social Inclusion

Across the globe, street food has been identified as a type of food for the poor or working classes (Bhowmik 2005; Tinker 1987; Valentine 1998); however, in Vietnam street food is an important part of the cultural heritage (as will be discussed in Chapter 7), making it an appealing choice for the majority of social groups, not just the poor. Given the abundance of street food in Hanoi, the research sought to explore whether street food in the Hoan Kiem district offers an inclusive environment for the sale and consumption of food. Exploring the different types of consumers present in the street food environment was one approach used in this study to explore social inclusion. The information collected in the surveys shows that street vendors serve a range of customers from managers and senior officials to the unemployed, with the highest number of customers being students, unskilled and mid-level professionals (Figure 6.1).

Figure 6.1 Types of street food customer in Hanoi

Although the evidence shows street food is largely a food for the younger generation, the working and middle classes, it is not exclusive to these groups. During my observations I saw all types of people – young, old, local, foreign, rich and poor – buying and consuming food on the street. In her work on the marketplaces (albeit it in a Western context) Watson (2009) proposes the notion of ‘rubbing along’ to describe varying degrees of social encounters in the public realm that help to address differences between different groups. This also feeds
into the idea of the strength of weak ties (Granovetter 1973); Granovetter has argued that small-scale interactions play a functional role in bridging micro behaviours to larger social structures. Watson (2009) argues “that a minimal level of encounter in the form of inhabiting the same space as those who are different from oneself, such as markets can embody, has the potential to play a part in challenging racist discourses and stereotypes of unknown others” (p. 1582). As such, street foodscapes in Hanoi also appear to be a place of diversity, though perhaps less diverse generally than the London street markets described by Watson (2006, 2009), and therefore brief encounters with ‘others’ may help promote a culture of inclusivity. John, an interviewee who works in Hanoi’s Old Quarter, tells a story that illustrates the extent to which street food is consumed by all types of people, including those who appear to be very rich:

“A few months ago I saw a great thing; I wish I had taken a photo. I was driving somewhere in town and there was a Rolls Royce parked, you know, up on the curb, the driver standing kind of at attention outside waiting for the owner. And then I glanced to the right, obviously the owner, who was Vietnamese, was sitting on the stool at this stall, drinking tea that cost him 2/3000 Dong (£0.06-9) with all these locals. And you could see that he was the wealthy guy, you know, this is a billion dollar plus car here in Vietnam and yet he was equal with everybody at that moment, and there is no hesitation to do that. You know, even in a place like this, there are all levels of economic situations going on. You go to the Bia Hoi [local beer street stalls] and some of those people drinking and eating are construction workers and labourers, shop workers etcetera. Others are big party officials, police men, military, business owners, they’re all there and there all paying the same price and there’s no real distinction at that point. So I think it’s very much an equalising factor” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

Here, John talks about the street food environment as being ‘socially equalising’; this resonates with Oldenburg’s (1989) notion of social levellers which he refers to in his discussion of third places. He describes a leveller as “an inclusive place... [which] is accessible to the general public and does not set formal criterial of membership and exclusion” (1989, p. 24). These types of public places allow people of different backgrounds and social status to meet and socialise in a neutral environment, helping to promote a culture of acceptance and break down social segregation (Seeland et al. 2009). This is exactly what John describes above and was echoed by other stakeholders:

“Across the road here, at the Pho shop, if you come at 7.30 or 8 in the morning, there will be five or six huge Land Rovers, or luxury cars lined up that are constantly moving through and then you’ve the motorbikes... So you certainly get a mix of people going in, whether they’re interacting when they’re there... I mean Vietnam is quite um a class-conscious society, so yeah, so I’m not sure of what actual interaction will be there. But it’s certainly
not, street food is certainly not limited to just the lower classes” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).

“But I can tell you that in Vietnam that sometimes they [wealthy people] do go to the street food vendor because they enjoy the taste of the food, sometimes they like this. I have so many friends who are businessman and they will tell you, even if it’s ten times more expensive in the restaurant... they tell me that in the restaurant they cannot serve food with the true taste like that of the street food vendor. So they serve all kinds of people but preferably this [working] class depending on what kind of street food it is” (Thi, Project Coordinator at local NGO).

Thi’s comment suggests a reason explaining why street food is popular with all social groups; Vietnamese street food is related to an authentic taste which cannot be found elsewhere (see Chapter 7), which makes it popular with people from all walks of life. Williams (2002, p. 1898) has argued that the privileged may take part in consumption within the informal market economy for reasons of “fun” and “sociality” rather than through “economic necessity”. I would add to this argument by suggesting that street food, particularly in the developing city context, facilitates an opportunity for the well off to engage with a collective cultural experience of everyday life that is appreciated by all Vietnamese regardless of social status. However, when consumers were asked whether they had engaged positively with people outside their own social group in the street food environment only 45.7 per cent reported that they had, which is perhaps reflected in Julie’s comment above. It should not be assumed from this data that the remaining 54.3 per cent of respondents had negative experiences, it may just be that their experiences are indifferent. This is supported by the fact that only 1.9 per cent (2 people) of consumers surveyed reported ever having an argument with another customer and only 20 per cent reported negative experiences in the street food environment more generally.

Street food in Hanoi is consumed by a wide range of people, although, to what extent these different types of customer interact is difficult to measure; it is therefore important not to mistake superficial social encounters with more meaningful interactions (Sibley 1995). In order to explore the extent of interaction further, vendors were asked how often different types of customers interact with each other; 15 per cent said that different types of customers interact with one another ‘always’ and 24 per cent said that this happens ‘sometimes’. However, 60 per cent said that this happened either ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ suggesting that from the perspective of the vendors, customers do not generally engage with others outside their own social groups. In order to see whether different types of street food made a difference to the levels of social interaction, a cross tabulation was performed (see
The results show that 44 per cent of people buying cooked street food interact with others outside of their own social group at least ‘sometimes’, compared to just 32 per cent of people purchasing uncooked food. However, this question was posed to vendors and relies on accurate reporting of their observations. Having said this, my observations support the fact that consumers buying cooked food are more likely to stop and eat their food on the pavement and sit on small plastic stools and therefore open themselves up to more opportunities for social engagement (see Figure 6.2).

In contrast, people buying uncooked food are more likely to be ‘on the go’ and therefore less likely to stop and interact with other customers; this type of food is also often bought from mobile vendors or static pavement sellers where there is less space to stop, decreasing the chance for social interaction, as demonstrated in my own observations:

“It is half past five and the traffic around Hoan Kiem is crazy busy, walking back to my hotel which is on a road that operates as an informal street market selling fresh produce. As I navigate my way through the crowd I struggle to dodge the motorbikes as people pull right up alongside the street food vendors selling fresh meat. They shout their orders out loudly over the noise of the revving engines, waving their money in the air” (Field diary extract – 14/05/2014)

Under these circumstances, after purchasing their goods whilst remaining on their motorcycles, customers drive straight off with their goods hanging from their handle bars (see Figure 6.3). However, despite the apparent differences between the nature of transactions, with cooked food seemingly offering more opportunities for engagement
outside one’s own social group, the analysis shows that the differences between the frequency of interaction and type of food sold was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 5.094$, df = 3, $p = 0.165$).

**Table 6.1 Type of Street Food Sold vs. Interaction Outside Own Social Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of interaction with other consumers outside own social group whilst buying different types of street food (%)</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncooked/unprepared food</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooked food</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 159 respondents

When vendors were asked their opinion on the extent to which customers do or do not interact with each other, the main explanation given for no interaction was that people do not like to talk to strangers. Others described how customers are simply courteous to each other, particularly if they are both regulars, by saying “hello” or exchange some conversation about what is happening in the street, the news or about the quality of the food. This implies a notion of civility amongst consumers whereby courtesies become a part of face-to-face interaction in everyday life (Fyfe et al. 2006).
Building on the notion of Oldenburg’s third place further, “nothing more clearly indicates a third place that the talk there is good; that it is lively, scintillating, colourful and engaging” (1989, p. 26). Street food is sold on most streets in Hanoi’s Hoan Kiem district, which is favoured for its characteristically small, narrow streets (Oranratmanee and Sachakul 2014) which help to stimulate the lively atmosphere. This becomes particularly evident at night with the addition of Bai Hoi (local beer stalls), which become quite crowded throughout the evening with a diverse mix of people eating and drinking in the same spaces (see Figure 6.4).

Figure 6.4 Night-time Bai Hoi, Hoan Kiem

Street food consumption appeared a particularly popular activity for the younger generation, most evenings and late afternoons I witnessed groups of young people ‘hanging out’ with others in their own age group. In Vietnam many young people still live within the family home and most houses are built in a tall and narrow style, especially in the Old Quarter, meaning that there is not usually enough space to socialise with lots of friends inside the home (Drummond 2000). As street food in Hanoi is affordable, easy to access and abundant, it provides the ideal space for young people, whether students or workers, to socialise with their friends. This was emphasised in conversations with some of the interviewees:

“For the new generation, like me, we are young and we love to spend time with our friends and hangout, so eating outside is a good solution to saving our time. Because after eating we don’t need to wash up and we don’t need to spend our time on cooking food. And, after eating in one place we will take out a motorbike to another place for a drink and whilst we have a drink
we can sit on the corner of the street people watching and enjoy some snacks” (Hue, Street Food Tour Guide).

“I think street food is for young people, couples, groups, like 60 per cent of the time. Because first of all they don't have space and secondly, they don’t have the experience to cook at home. They don't have space because the house like this [uses hands to show a narrow shape] in the Old Quarter, always small. You cannot invite friends, it is not typical behaviour and the family will not [be] happy with this. They say: ‘why you invite this guy? There is not room’... In Vietnam when you invite somebody to your house it’s really important, you have to check... But when you spend time with your friends on the street, sharing money, it’s more comfortable... Some people they cannot cook, so they love street food” (Mr Binh, ex-employee of Ministry of Culture and Sport).

Oldenburg (1991) describes such spaces as ‘third places’, areas which offer a “place of refuge other than the home or workplace where people can regularly visit and commune with friends, neighbours, co-workers, and even strangers” (cited in Mehta and Bosson 2009, p. 2), and thus provide opportunities for different types of people to meet one another. Viewed from this perspective the street, lined with vendors selling various types of food and drink could be considered a type of third place. Street food vendors occupy a neutral space and provide the facilities for citizens to engage in informal social interaction in public. Research by Valentine (2006, p. 199) also suggests that eating on the street “is often the only private space they [teenagers] can carve out for themselves away from the regulatory gaze of family”; the observations and informal conversation made during the research also indicate that this is true for young people living in Hanoi and this observation is supported by recent research conducted by Geertman et al. (2015). Lahh, a local resident and young person educated and working in the hospitality industry, makes a distinction between the different tastes of the generations:

“Young people like this environment, and the old people, maybe they want to go to some place that is more like fine dining, or restaurant, or use a delivery service which offers more quality, things like that. You know the old people, they don’t like crowded environments” (Lahn, a local resident working in hospitality industry).

The findings suggest a strong preference for cooked street food by young people which may suggest a lack of inter-generational inclusion amongst consumers. Having said this, the draw of eating on the street is something which seems to be embedded within Vietnamese society; for example, Bao, who works for a public health institute, is not a fan of eating cooked food sold by street food vendors, however, he told me that he often takes meals cooked by his wife out on to the street so that he can eat and socialise with his friends and neighbours.
This suggests that the street is an open environment whereby those who do not wish to consume street food can still take part in the social activity it provides, building further upon the idea that street food is not an exclusive practice but also blurring and complicating what is commonly understood to be ‘street food’. Observations made throughout the fieldwork also support the idea that people simply enjoy being on the street; I witnessed a lot of people, particularly older men, sat on small stools around the streets at all times of the day drinking lemon tea, beer and occasionally coffee whilst they people watched or chatted with others.

There was also evidence that street food is inclusive in other ways, for example, a few of the vendors also commented on how local people will sometimes help tourists at street food restaurants by showing them how to order or eat their food – this was something I experienced first-hand. A friendly local took the opportunity to come and sit with me and a friend one evening during the early stages of the fieldwork to show us how we should approach eating the food we had ordered. On other occasions locals would shake a homemade unmarked bottle of sauce in my direction suggesting that I add it to my meal, or make gestures towards me to show that I needed to mix up my noodles more, for example with the dish Bun Nam Bo. These behaviours demonstrate that local people are proud of their food and want to ensure that visitors to their country are experiencing it properly and will therefore engage, despite the language barriers, with ‘outsiders’. Although at times this made me feel somewhat naïve, it was a pleasant experience to interact with local people through simple body language, despite not being able to say much more than a ‘Cam’ on’ (thank you). This also illustrates that tourists and foreigners are welcome in this environment; at no point during the fieldwork, did I hear from a non-Vietnamese person living or visiting Hanoi that they did not feel welcome. The only form of discrimination that is common, and therefore expected by most people to a degree, was tourists sometimes getting overcharged or charged a premium by vendors taking advantage of their lack of knowledge and/or inexperience dealing with the large denominations of the Vietnamese currency (for further discussion on this issue see Chapter 7).

There was a general understanding amongst participants that street food is for ‘everyone’, although people have mixed feelings about the ability of street food to necessarily be inclusive of everyone all of the time. For example, there is a preference for street food by those who are younger and poor(er) than the older and very rich, and, as my first interviewee, Bao, a representative of a public health institute, pointed out, it does not accommodate for those with strict dietary requirements, particularly because there is a lack
of appropriate information regarding ingredients coupled by the fact that even if you ask the vendor “you can never be sure”. However, in a wider sense, street food does not discriminate against any social groups:

“It's a great equaliser here, because you know, anything from the little tea shops on the sidewalk to the bia hoi’s, all of those things, they’re very um you know, socially equalising, you’re all sitting on tiny stools, you’re all paying the same price, there is no class system that’s apparent in those kinds of situations” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

Hue encapsulates this idea referencing the temporal differences that might influence the inclusivity of street food:

“In the rush hour, the high time, all people the same. Rich people or poor people, if, I [speaking from the perspective of the seller] do not have a space, all of you will stand, hold a spring roll and eat! For my tourists it is the same” (Hue, Street Food Tour Guide).

The fact that the street food sellers treat everyone equally, at least when it comes to local Vietnamese customers, shows that the environment is one of acceptance, where everyone is welcome regardless of social status. In fact, Hue goes on to describe that if a person tries to abuse their wealth for social gain it is often met with disapproval from the street food seller:

“But some [people] who come and who are very rich or whatever will [try to] use money to have everything. It is not like this... I take my tourist to the coffee shop, it has been running for 17 years and it has some manner and etiquette when you go there, like you have to follow the people. So you cannot go there and say ‘Hey! I want to have this and I want to have this...’ and just throw the money at them. They will ask to you go out” (Hue, Street Food Tour Guide).

This almost allows the vendor to assert a level of control and power over those who may be deemed superior in another context which makes the environment more socially level, than what might be the case in a more commercialised, private establishment.

In terms of the street food business as a workplace environment, of those who had employees 45 per cent employed family members, and 7 per cent friends. Of the 30 per cent who also selected ‘other’ many mentioned that they employ a mixture of family members or people who were previously unknown to them (17.9 per cent). This suggests that the composition of people selling street food may be quite homogenous. Although in another context this could be problematic, the recruitment of family members to informal businesses such as street vending is not uncommon in the developing world. It also points towards the
value of bonding social capital which describes the strong relationships between family and close friends (Woolcock and Narayan 2000). Within the small sample it would appear that street kitchens are most likely to employ someone previously unknown to work with them. This is likely to be because more people are needed to run a street kitchen; the mean average number of employees amongst street kitchens surveyed was two and the modal average was three people and the range spanned from one to six people. Kinship networks are still prominent in Vietnam which might explain why those who are involved in street food businesses are largely recruited from within the family or close networks (Turner and Nguyen 2005). According to Turner and Nguyen (2005, p. 1704) the Vietnamese saying: ‘A drop of blood is worth more than a pond of water’ (mot giot mau dao hon ao nuoc la) illustrates that trust is formed only amongst a relatively narrow circle of family and close friends; they also note that there is still a considerable mistrust of outsiders. The limited scope of employment outside of kinship groups, however, may be limiting in terms of economic development of the small-scale and micro businesses such as those run by street food vendors. Turner and Nguyen (2005) found little evidence of bridging and linking social capital amongst young entrepreneurs in the city and there seems little evidence to suggest things have changed.

Although street food appears to foster a sense of social inclusion amongst consumers, it must be noted that one particular type of street food vendor is excluded more so than others from the city. Migrant street vendors who come to Hanoi often work as mobile vendors, and their presence is contested because of their mobility; they move around the city taking up space with their wares and disrupting the flow of traffic. Some migrant vendors, as discussed in the cultural heritage chapter, are criticised for giving ‘regular’ vendors a bad reputation through their selling tactics used with tourists. The contest between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ vendors is described by one of the interviewees:

“There is always a kind of distinction between Hanoi inhabitants, the people, and migrants, rural migrants. There is always a ‘we’ and ‘them’, so I think it's very very hard for them, sometimes it’s terrible. In fact, if you go to the city and you see a lot of traffic, a lot of people and suddenly you may see some woman like that saying [waves arm around making a pointing gesture] ‘she, she, she, they take our place’, it's not good” (Ms Yen, Local Academic).

The challenge here appears to be one between rural and urban, which can be attributed to the competition for space in an increasingly overcrowded city. The migrant vendors, unlike some of their urban counterparts, are considered ‘out of place’ because of where they come from, increasing their already precarious position. The concept of ‘out of place’ has been used previously to describe street vendors in Indonesia whereby their presence has been
argued to disrupt the urban environment with regard to urban design and planning (Yamto 2008). In this context however ‘out of place’ has taken on an additional level of meaning whereby the migrant vendors are perceived as not belonging by some local street food vendors.

The research findings illustrate that street food is desired by all types of people from different socio-economic backgrounds, from the very rich to the very poor, but is most often consumed by students and people of the lower working class. If we are to consider the inclusivity of a specific city environment it must be one which provides equal opportunities and be equitable and accessible to all citizens. This does not necessarily mean that everyone must be seen using the space at precisely the same time and in the same ways but that it should be accessible to all and at the very minimum accepting of diversity. The evidence gathered in this research demonstrates that street food in the Hoan Kiem district of Hanoi offers plentiful opportunities for diverse groups of people to socialise in public space. Although they may not always necessarily socialise with each other, street food provides an opportunity for different groups of people to use the street, for the same or different purposes simultaneously. In turn, the openness and wide appeal of street food to a range of people, may promote tolerance, if not recognition and respect (Sandercock 1998) and further integration amongst different social groups. This is particularly important in a developing city where population density is high and living conditions may be cramped, meaning that people have little choice but to use what available public space there is for affordable social activities.

Social Interaction and Social Networks

Social interaction is one of the key dimensions of social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Dempsey et al. 2011; Rogers 2005 Sharifi and Murayama 2013) and a fundamental aspect of the street food environment. Intensity of interactions can deviate from eating with another person, simply purchasing food from a vendor or incorporating it as a regular aspect of one’s social life. The previous section focused on who is using the space; this section builds on this through exploring the frequency and types of social interaction between the different actors in the street food environment and examining how these interactions take place. The researcher’s observations are also used to comment more generally upon social interactions taking place in the city.

Social interaction was explored through observing and questioning the nature and intensity of relationships between different people involved with street food (Knox and Pinch 2010).
As the previous section discussed, street food offers a place in which members from all social and economic backgrounds may socialise. This section begins by discussing the spatial elements of street food, how different people use the street for consuming street food and the frequency at which they do so. The subsequent sections go on to explore the relationships between vendors and the various other actors involved with street food, other vendors, consumers, authorities and suppliers and aim to draw out to what extent these relationships are important to the street food environment and whether they contribute to social sustainability.

**Street Food as a Social Activity: Overview**

Food offered by street vendors and street kitchens clearly attracts people to the street, and as observed in my initial impressions it appears to be a very social activity:

“As I walked around the city I noticed people sitting around at various street kitchens, usually in groups. It’s rare to see people sat eating alone, this seems to be most common outside the main mealtime hours, or at very quiet stalls” (Field Diary Extract, 10/05/14).

In order to establish more about the nature of street food consumption, respondents were asked about their frequency of street food consumption with different types of people. The results of the consumer survey show that 76 per cent always eat street food with another person, furthermore 61 per cent of people claimed to eat street food with other people at least several times per week, whether with friends, family or strangers (see Figure 6.5).

**Figure 6.5 Frequency of consumer consumption with different groups**
The results of this question indicate that the practice of eating street food is very much an occasional social activity, as is common in many other places in the world (Acho-Chi 2002; Wardrop 2006). The results show that 18 per cent of respondents eat street food alone on a daily basis; however, the nature of eating on the street at communal tables means that people often end-up eating, or feel like they are eating, with other people (see Figure 6.6). Julie, describes her own experiences:

“One thing that I really like about street restaurants is that you never actually eat alone. You can go on your own and as soon as you sit down, often you are sitting on a communal table so you are joining other people, or you are sitting so close that you feel like you’re on their table…” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).

Figure 6.6 Shared dining space

Julie goes on to describe how people also acknowledge one another with the phrase ‘Xin mờ’ (‘please’) before starting to eat, creating an additional level of interaction among consumers:

“The people sitting right next to you will get their bowl or whatever...and before they start to eat they will look at you and say “Xin mờ, Xin mờ, Xin mờ” [interviewee motions her head as if nodding around the table] to each other, so you’re interacting with these people, you don’t need to say anything more than that if you don’t want to. But before people eat, they will acknowledge everybody else around them, so I think that is quite typical of Vietnam, you never do things on your own” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).
This simple act of recognition between customers exemplifies an important social behaviour that is a part of food culture in Vietnam. The acknowledgement facilitates a level of social interaction which helps to create a feeling of inclusion for the lone diner. Cattell et al. (2008, pp. 552–3) report similar findings in their research on everyday public spaces; they found that “simple gestures such as nods and smiles were often reassuring”. These types of routine and potentially regular encounters often helped to maintain loose ties between strangers in public spaces, such as the street, and could possibly provide the first step towards establishing friendships (Cattell et al. 2008; Geertman 2011). In support of this idea, this research identifies that 49.5 per cent of consumers reported making friends with another customer and 38.1 per cent had met a new business acquaintance.

Observations of any street food site clearly show that social interactions are taking place all the time, whether it is a mobile vendor approaching people on the street only to get turned away or large groups of teenagers taking up the pavement during their break time. In order to find out how social interactions are perceived, consumers were directly asked whether they feel street food provides opportunities for positive social interaction; 74 per cent of respondents agree or strongly agree that it does (Figure 6.7). This suggests that general overall impressions of the street food environment by the customers is one of positive social association behaviours.

**Figure 6.7 Street food provides opportunities for positive social interaction**

It also suggests that street food may generate positive social interactions amongst the daily lives of consumers which might not otherwise be experienced if they were consuming food outside the public realm, such as in the private space of the home. Eating out is a prime
example of a social activity; however, the concept of ‘eating out’ is usually associated with special occasions (Warde and Martens 2000), and by contrast street food in Hanoi was considered quite an ordinary aspect of everyday life by most of the local Vietnamese people interviewed.

Spatially, street corners are known as key places of social interaction (Whyte 1993) and it is therefore no surprise that some of the busiest areas for people sitting, talking and eating street food was observed on corners and at crossroads, as reflected in my observations:

“Walked around the Old Quarter at lunch time, 11:30–12:30. Some stalls were very busy, especially with men at bai hoi (beer) corners and more generally at kitchens situated on street corners i.e. Bat Dan crossroads where the street kitchen, cooking equipment and plastic seating, spill out onto the pavement and roadside” (Field Diary Extract, 4/06/14).

Street corners offer a wider area of pavement for sellers to position plastic stools and sometimes tables for their patrons. This wide berth allows for more people to be accommodated as opposed to regular sidewalk space which competes with shop produce, pedestrians and often motorcycle parking (Figure 6.8). According to Mehta and Bosson (2010, p. 782) the provision of seating, preferably portable, has been recognised as “one of the most important characteristics in retaining people in public spaces and possibly supporting social behaviour”. The ability to eat and drink has also been found to be an important factor encouraging people to increase time spent socialising in the street (Mehta and Bosson 2010). This would imply that street food, specifically thinking about the services offered by stationary vendors and street kitchens which sell cooked food, offer ideal opportunities for social interaction.
The following sections explore the relationships between the different actors in the street food system. Firstly the research explores the relationships between street food vendors, and then moves on to discuss the relationships between vendors and consumers, vendors and the authorities, vendors and their suppliers and finally vendors and their employees. The final section of this chapter will look at the role of street food in the wider environment before pulling together some of these findings, provide some conclusions about the nature of social interaction and the role of social networks in Hanoi’s street food environment and what this means in relation to social sustainability.

**Relationships Between Vendors**

In the Hoan Kiem district it is an unusual sight to see a vendor occupying a street alone, unless of course the vendor is an independent itinerant seller wandering through. Stationary vendors and street kitchens in contrast are usually situated alongside other street food vendors often selling similar, or in fact the same, type of goods. This may be a result of the traditional market system that developed in Hanoi where each street was associated with a particular craft or product (see Chapter 2). Yên Thái Street is a good example of this where approximately 15 to 20 vendors were observed selling uncooked goods such as fruits and vegetables, and nearby Nguyễn Văn Tố where stationary vendors were observed selling mostly fresh meat and fish. Other streets such as ngõ Đống Xuân, an alley situated near Đống Xuân market, has a variety of vendors lined side by side selling cooked food and offers a communal seating area in the side of an adjacent building. It is therefore customary to see
vendors engaging and talking to one another whilst they are working, particularly outside of mealtime rush hours when they are less busy. Of the vendors who were surveyed, 51 per cent of respondents said that they interact with over six other sellers in a day. With regard to the frequency of these interactions, 59 per cent said that they were interacting with other vendors more than once per day, and 24 per cent at least once a day. These findings tend to support the general observations made during the fieldwork. In the interest of finding out more about these relationships, vendors were asked how significant these connections were to them: 58 per cent said that these connections were either ‘quite important’ or ‘very important’, suggesting that vendors’ relationships with other vendors may perform a significant social role in their everyday lives. With a view to find out further information about relationships between vendors, participants were asked about the ways in which they engage with one another; a summary of these results can be found in Figure 6.9.

Figure 6.9 Types of social engagement between vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of cases (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We make small talk</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We gossip</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We talk about business</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watch their goods</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help them with selling</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We talk about our personal lives</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I eat a meal with them</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help them with cooking/preparation</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look after their children</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pick up their stock for them</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main type of engagement between vendors was making ‘small talk’, and this was true in 73.6 per cent of cases. Small talk, or perhaps what might also be considered as ‘chit-chat’, although may seem trivial can actually be an important element of building casual relationships with others and a starting point for forging stronger relationships over time (Cattell et al. 2008). Of the types of street food vendors, mobile vendors were most likely to make small talk with one another (80.6 per cent) compared to 60 per cent of vendors running street kitchens (see Table 6.2); these vendors were more likely to discuss their personal lives with other vendors which might be due to their fixed position on the street, allowing them
to engage in longer conversations, in contrast to the mobile vendors whose more precarious position means that they are always on the move, only stopping for brief periods of rest.

**Table 6.2 Most Popular Forms of Social Engagement between Types of Vendor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Small Talk</th>
<th>Gossip</th>
<th>Discuss Business</th>
<th>Watch Goods</th>
<th>Help with Selling</th>
<th>Discuss Personal Lives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal (stationary)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street kitchen</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gossip on the other hand has negative connotations and could potentially have negative consequences for the subject of the gossip, potentially impacting their livelihood, as described by Ms Yen below. The data shows that the type of vendors most likely to gossip are those working in street kitchens, however, there was not much difference between the three groups. Gossip is something which migrant female street vendors are apparently particularly sensitive to, according to one of the stakeholder interviewees; young female migrant vendors have to be careful about how they conduct themselves whilst working away from home because if their actions are perceived to be immoral by their peer group, stories about them may travel back to the village:

“But sometimes their social networks can cause them some problems also, because if your behaviour in the city has not been very good, someone will take stories back to the village and create rumours, and this can be very dangerous. Especially for women, for young ladies. For older women it’s OK. It’s just a kind of gender pressure, can be very hard” (Ms Yen, Local Academic).

Although day-to-day the social relationships between the vendors may appear to be quite robust, as will be discussed in more detail shortly, the day-to-day behaviours of migrant street food vendors reflect wider social issues that can damage their identity or reputation and which may subsequently have knock on effects to their social relationships and kinship networks in the countryside or villages where they come from.

A further 38.9 per cent of the vendors surveyed also said that they talk about business with other vendors; this was particularly true for the street kitchens (47.5% of cases). This again
may be because they have more time to devote to conversations about business in their
downtime, such as outside of busy meal time periods and because of their fixed nature,
meaning that they are not trying to evade the police. In addition, given the mutual interests
of their occupation it is perhaps not surprising that many of the vendors more generally talk
about business together; they may for example, compare prices for goods bought at
wholesale that morning or talk about the success of trade during the day.

One of the most interesting social behaviours amongst vendors revealed through this
question is that in a third of cases sellers report watching over another’s goods; this is
suggestive of high levels of trust between some vendors. This is a significant revelation
because the value ascribed to a vendor’s wares is likely to be high; many street food vendors
carry with them or display a day’s worth of stock (Jensen et al. 2013) which they have bought
for the cheapest prices from the overnight wholesale market. If their goods were to be stolen
or confiscated by the police it is likely to have a considerable impact on their livelihood; it
would therefore appear paramount that the vendor hold high levels of trust in the person
looking after the stock in their absence. The most likely vendors to watch one another’s
goods are the informal stationary group, 52.8 per cent of whom sell uncooked goods,
normally in large amounts (as described below). The potential for high levels of trust
characterised by this activity also suggests a relationship may have been formed over a long
period of time. In exploring the results in more detail those who had been selling in their
location between 11 to 15 years (47.6 per cent) reported watching another vendor’s goods,
and given the high trust nature of this activity it would not be unreasonable to assume that
these relationships are reciprocal. Another reason for this activity to happen most frequently
between informal stationary vendors is likely to be because although not permanently fixed,
their goods are less easy to transport than mobile vendors, but more easy to steal than
equipment and produce used at street kitchens. This type of social interaction was also
recorded in my observations:

“The mobile vendor I have been observing has just hopped on her bicycle
with a bag of baguettes taken from a large polystyrene box at her side;
she looks as though she is about to deliver them somewhere. She left
after she had finished eating her food, perhaps as a result of one of the
phone calls she received earlier. Whilst she goes off, vendors sat close by
watch over her goods. The vendor returns empty-handed about eight
minutes later” (Field Diary Extract, 20/5/14).

At other times I saw mobile vendors resting or taking a nap in the shade leaving their goods
in sight of another vendor or local shopkeeper, again indicating the nature of social
relationships amongst the various actors in the city. Further to watching another’s goods, 30 per cent of vendors surveyed reported helping another vendor with selling; again this was most common amongst stationary vendors, suggesting that there is another dimension to their relationship. Although slightly less than other forms of social interaction already discussed, almost a third of vendors also said that they talk about their personal lives with other vendors. Given the busy nature of selling and/or cooking street food this is an important discovery which points towards a strong bond between street food vendors; this finding was most prevalent for those vendors who work at street kitchens, as in this situation vendors spend a lot of time in one place preparing, cooking and cleaning up which allows them time for engaging in conversation with other vendors which may, overtime, naturally lead them to talk about their personal lives. Combined with the other behaviours exhibited by the street food vendors it could be considered that exchange of personal information in addition to trust and cooperation demonstrate high levels of social capital (Putnam 2000).

The evidence of social capital found in the social interactions discussed above are further supported by additional qualitative data provided by the vendors in exploring how else their relationships with other vendors might be considered important to them. A number of vendors stated that they are the neighbours of some of the other vendors and even more significantly, some of the vendors rent houses together. In the sample studied in this survey 60 per cent of sellers were originally from outside Hanoi, with a few of the vendors revealing that they migrated in groups to Hanoi with others from the same village. At present only 12 per cent of those who were surveyed commuted from outside the city. These findings are consistent with the work conducted by Jensen et al. (2013) on female migrant street vendors in Hanoi. The shared situation that many of the vendors find themselves in was another reason that their relationships with other vendors was important to them; a number of vendors spoke about how the sellers can protect, help and support one another in times of difficulty. These similar situations shared between vendors create an understanding of reciprocity, which indicates a level of bonding social capital (Woolcock and Narayan 2000) which is key to ‘getting ahead’; furthermore Friedmann (1996) suggests that these types of social relations help to shape and enable self-empowerment. This finding from the surveys was supported by some of the stakeholder interviews, such as from Yen, a local academic, who has worked with street vendors herself:

“In many many cases [the networks] are very strong and very important for them because if someone has some kind of problem with the police and they lose everything, another basket lady will lend them money and it works very well for them” (Ms Yen, Local Academic).
In addition to financial and practical support which is deemed most important amongst informal support networks related to the informal economies in other countries (Crossa 2009; Lyons and Snoxell 2005; Pena 1999) migrant vendors also offer one another a level of emotional support:

“[They] just kind of offer an emotional support, it's very very important... after work in the evening, in the night, they can tell stories, share things about how to raise children, how to do housework, how can I say, talk about social or familial occupation back in the village. They share emotional things. But I think rationally speaking, the most important thing in terms of support between them, each other, is just kind of lending money when there is some kind of accident with police” (Ms Yen, Local Academic).

The ability for the vendors to be able to relate to one another adds another level to their relationships; it may also suggest a notion of a shared identity amongst the vendors, allowing them to develop friendships with each other. Having a support network, informal or otherwise, is likely to help influence and improve well-being amongst vendors (Crossa 2009). These relationships are particularly important for mobile vendors, many of whom are migrant workers who move temporarily or seasonally to the city for work and who are less likely to have social ties readily established in the city outside of their own kinship or village networks. Efforts to strengthen and widen these networks more formally are being made by external organisations, however, there is a sense of disinterest among the vendors:

“[They] are willing to have organisations, but [the feeling towards them are] not so strong. But they do have informal organisations, like a group of friends in the village – they have a network, they have their own network. The network might not be very strong, but they have [one]. And the effort of [name of NGO officer] for example tries to link those networks, tries to make it stronger and to bring them together” (Ms Ngoc, NGO Programme Coordinator).

This is perhaps related to the prominence of kinship networks in Vietnam referred to in the previous section on social inclusion.

Vendors were also asked how they obtained access to their trading site, 27 per cent said that they gained the right to use their space through family, and 28 per cent through other traders. Again, this illustrates the strong role that family plays in establishing businesses in the informal street vending sector (Lyons and Snoxell 2005; Turner and Schoenberger 2012). However, an almost equal number of vendors found their site through another vendor, suggesting that the networks which exist between vendors can help facilitate rather than hinder the progression of their peers; this is characteristic of bridging social capital which helps vendors ‘get ahead’ by broadening their networks and opportunities beyond their
existing connections (Woolcock and Narayan 2000). Other vendors reported establishing their sites independently by using their initiative to simply ask the building owner for permission to use the pavement in front of their shop; often this was negotiated to include certain terms, such as selling only at specific times of day and ensuring the removal of waste. These kinds of social relations are again indicative of bridging social capital (Woolcock and Narayan 2000), where the vendors reach beyond their own social network to enhance their employment prospects.

A proportion of the vendors do not remain in just one place for selling because they are mobile, going from place to place to sell their goods. These vendors are generally considered the most vulnerable, because they do not have a place to stop and they are always on the move making them tired; however, the mobility of vendors has also been considered a form of resistance in Hanoi as they are able to move from place to place quickly and escape the police (Eidse et al. 2016). Mobile vendors also reported informing each other of the police presence so that they can make a quick getaway; this provides evidence of an informal support network which suggests a level of reciprocity among vendors which helps to build trust and strengthen the networks. It also corresponds to the earlier comments made about how relationships were important to the vendors, particularly the mobile vendors who operate illegally in some areas and are at higher risk of being prosecuted by the authorities.

During the first phase of the fieldwork I observed that at particular locations street food vendors would change at different points throughout the day, this prompted me to ask whether the vendors shared their space with anyone else and how this was organised. This type of arrangement was also found in Kathmandu (Shrestha 2006) where informal traders take turns to sell at different times of the day to suit other commitments such as domestic tasks, education or other work. In this research 17 per cent of the sellers surveyed said that they shared their space with another business or trader. In some instances, the sellers share their space at the same time and in other cases the vendors sell at different times of the day, for example one vendor described how she sells vegetables from 5 am until 12 pm, at which point a meat vendor uses the spot, the vegetable vendor then returns at 3 pm and the meat vendor vacates. This demonstrates a level of cooperation between vendors which is characteristic of social capital (Putnam 1995).

Vendors clearly interact with each other in many different kinds of ways which ranges from the most fleeting forms of interaction to more in-depth personal relationships which may involve looking after another vendor’s goods to living with one another. These latter types
of behaviour indicate a significant level of trust between vendors, which is itself a strong characteristic of social capital (Putnam 1995). However, in line with other research in Hanoi (Turner and Nguyen 2005), the breadth of social networks still appears to be limited with much focus remaining on kinship and village connections. Having said this however, there is some evidence to suggest the development of bridging social capital being used by some of the street food vendors in attempts to improve their livelihood strategies.

Vendors and Customers

Relationships between vendors and their customers are a key element to the success of their business and building strong relationships in the form of social capital and expanding social networks takes time (Bourdieu 1985). Given this it is not surprising that 81.1 per cent of vendors trade in the same places or follow the same trading route every day. Vendors do this because they have regular customers in these areas enabling them to maintain a regular client base and because they may have established relationships with the residents of the street who allow them to sell in front of their homes or businesses. A similar finding was reported by Whyte (1993, p. 31) from his study on street people in New York, in which he states “the ones [food vendors] with the best clientele are the ones who are always in the same spot”. Consistency and familiarity are important to people’s rhythms and routines in their everyday lives and help to shape the urban experience (Amin and Thrift 2002; Edensor 2011), and these factors may influence street food vendors’ decisions to sell from the same places. Of the mobile vendors surveyed, 66 per cent said that they trade in the same places or follow the same route every day; having flexibility to move around the city was considered advantageous by some of the vendors as it allows them opportunities to travel to busier locations in the city at different times of day.

In exploring relationships between sellers and their customers, it was found that in almost 42 per cent of cases the vendors and their customers engage in small talk and more specifically, in 18 per cent of cases the vendors and consumers talk about the food (see Table 6.3). Vendors perceived their relationships with customers to be ‘friendly’ in nature in 65 per cent of cases, rarely were interactions considered detached (8.2 per cent of cases). Recent research by Wertheim-Heck et al. (2014b) also observed frequent conversations taking place between street food vendors and consumers across the variety of different types of market places in Hanoi. As with the relationships between vendors discussed previously, small talk also helps build casual relationships between customers and sellers. A specific focus on talking about the food suggests that there are perhaps a proportion of vendors and customers who engage in meaningful conversation about a shared interest; customers may
wish to know where the food has come from or seek advice on how to prepare it, equally the vendor may want to share their knowledge with the customer or boast about how the produce is home-grown, for example:

“Normally, we would prefer to buy from somebody that we know, because first we don't have to bargain. Every time with a new person, or if in a new place, it's always a challenge because you often have to bargain for fruits or vegetables. And another thing is we often choose someone who sells good quality, you know some people are very honest they will say that sometimes they have it fresh from their garden, or their neighbours garden and they will tell you. That's how, for example, my mum or older generations will go about that, they are very careful about that. And they will always buy from one specific women for example” (Hong, Local Journalist).

Here, the account by Hong shows that relationships between the customer and the vendor are sustained through a degree of familiarity and trust. Establishing a relationship with the vendor means that the customer can repeatedly purchase goods at a fair price which they have established during a previous barter. Maintaining this relationship through repeat custom also opens the buyer up to opportunities to buy better quality goods, such as those which are home-grown. The revelation of the availability of higher quality goods to the purchaser also helps to found trust in the relationship and enhance the transactions that take place, making it more likely for the customer to continue to buy from the same seller.

However, in 40 per cent of cases the customers simply buy their food and do not engage in conversation with the vendor; this might be explained by a number of things such as the customer being ‘on the go’, for example on the way home from work (see section on social inclusion). In exploring these interactions further, it was found that transactions with mobile vendors were less likely to provoke casual conversation, again this might be due to their mobility and limited opportunities to stop in one location for longer than necessary. Small talk on the other hand was more likely to take place with vendors at street kitchens (50 per cent) and informal stationary vendors (43.4 per cent) where the customer and vendor have time and space to stop; this is particularly relevant for street kitchens where seating on the pavement is usually provided.
Table 6.3 Types of Interaction Between Vendors and Consumers when Purchasing Street Food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>They just buy their food</th>
<th>We make small talk</th>
<th>We talk about the food</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Stationary</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Kitchen</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to further explore the relationships between the sellers and their consumers, vendors were asked about their repeat custom to try and quantify some of the above inferences. The survey results show that 43 per cent of customers return to the seller ‘often’ and 18 per cent ‘always’. Only 2 per cent of vendors surveyed said that they had customers which never return to them. The cumulative bar chart in Figure 6.10 shows that the largest number of repeat daily customer is between 2 to 15 people for all types of food vendor. The informal stationary vendors mostly sell fresh produce (52.8 per cent of total surveyed), as customers still buy fresh produce on a frequent basis, sometimes even daily because of lack of refrigeration facilities or a cultural preference for ‘fresh food’ (Figuié and Moustier 2009; Maruyama and Trung 2007), it is perhaps not unsurprising that they have a high proportion of daily customers. In terms of street kitchens 23 per cent reported to attract 25 or more of the same daily customers; this might be explained by the fact that street kitchens offer cooked meals that cater for the local workforce who probably frequent the same places either before, during or after work. Mobile vendors, on the other hand, are less likely to work at the same location making it harder for them to accumulate and guarantee large numbers of daily customers. However, during the fieldwork many mobile vendors were observed purposefully stopping at shops, businesses and street kitchens to sell their food, sometimes this was a result of the shop keeper calling out to them but on other occasions appeared to be much more direct, as if their visit had already been arranged. This may suggest that some of the mobile vendors potentially deliver goods to the customer’s door on a daily basis – like a “moving market” as described by one of the interviewees.
In contrast to these findings however, from the perspective of the customer only 28.9 per cent of those interviewed reported to ‘always’ or ‘almost always’ return to the same vendor; 35.6 per cent on the other hand actually said they ‘never’ or ‘almost never’ return to purchase from the same vendor. This might be explained by a desire for the customer finding the best value goods, which was echoed in the opinion of some of the stakeholders interviewed:

“For me, and for most people, we are quite selfish. We all the time want something which is cheapest, fresh. Like the tastiest and the best with a reasonable price. So if today I buy from one lady and I see that her vegetable is very fresh I will buy from her, and of course I will bargain to have a good deal. But tomorrow, if see that lady, I know her already but I will make sure that if her vegetable is not good I will choose the other people. Because on the traditional market, or everywhere it is a lot of the same product but better quality, so why don't I choose” (Hue, Street Food Tour Guide).

The conflicting perceptions of loyalty between consumers and vendors warrant further exploration, however, the data available from this survey does not allow for a further robust analysis of the different variables. This is further complicated by the fact that 42.9 per cent of customers surveyed said that they had made friends with a street food vendor, suggesting that some vendors and customers have formed strong bonds that transcend mere business transactions.

**Vendors and Authorities**

Conflicts and disputes are common between street vendors and local authorities worldwide (Cross 2000; Donovan 2008; Hunt 2009; Walsh and Maneepong 2012) and usually occur as a
result of contestations over space. Mobile and informal street traders are more likely to be targeted by authorities because their mobility can cause problems with traffic flow and transgress into areas where vending is prohibited (Cross 2000; Bhowmik 2005; Eidse et al. 2016). Mobile vendors and informal static vendors are often migrants who have come to the cities to earn money temporarily and they may have fewer established relationships with other traders or stakeholders, compared to their more permanent counterparts, making them more vulnerable to consequences of prosecution. During the ethnographic observations evidence of confrontation and disputes were witnessed between vendors and authorities, such as the event recorded in my observation diary:

“As I walked toward the bus stop I saw three mobile vendors with bicycles loaded with fruit stopped at the side of the road chatting, in the distance I could see a police van coming down the road, a few seconds later the ladies had hopped on their bikes and as I looked round to see how far they’d got, they were already far out of sight. A number of stationary informal vendors however, were delayed in their sighting and reaction to the approaching van, as the police officer stepped out of the van he shouted at the lady, assumingly to remove her things (a table) from the pavement and signage hanging from the nearby wall and tree, as this was what she was already trying to do. On this occasion the police did not appear to take any of the goods and I saw no exchange of money.” (Field Diary Extract – 30/09/2014)

As a result of these observations, vendors were asked about their relationships with the authorities during the questionnaire interview. The findings show that 22 per cent of the vendors were likely to experience some kind of confrontational conflict with an authoritative figure, such as a market regulator or the police on a daily basis; a further summary of confrontations with other actors are summarised in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4 Frequency of Conflicts Between Street Food Vendors and Other Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you have disputes/conflicts with the following people?</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several Times per Week</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Less than Once per Week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
<td>158 (96.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local People</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>15 (9.4%)</td>
<td>140 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
<td>21 (13.1%)</td>
<td>133 (83.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Street Traders</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4 (2.5%)</td>
<td>25 (15.6%)</td>
<td>128 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>17 (10.6%)</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (4.4%)</td>
<td>18 (11.3%)</td>
<td>110 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Regulators</td>
<td>18 (11.3%)</td>
<td>4 (2.5%)</td>
<td>9 (5.6%)</td>
<td>23 (14.4%)</td>
<td>106 (66.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>57 (35.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 102 of 160 did not respond to the ‘Other’ category.

The authoritative figures stand out as key initiators of disputes, which may reflect the wider power relations at work in the city. The police have an official authority to remove street vendors and their goods from the streets where vending is banned or contested. During rounds of police surveillance, it was interesting to observe how some of the vendors panicked and immediately began moving their goods from the pavements and into the doorways of adjacent shops or houses. There were other vendors, however, who would not flinch; some even appeared to engage in friendly conversation with officers. As a resident of Hoan Kiem, John describes his own observations, which correspond closely with my own:

“You see these little trucks that go around with the megaphones, the main police sit in the front and the officers in blue are sort of assistants of the police that enforce things, or do the dirty work in the back. They round the corner announcing ‘move the motorbikes, get the chairs off the street’ and everybody is scrambling to comply with what they know they're supposed to be doing. They may have encroached upon certain space, but a few don't move. They're absolutely not concerned and so it tells you that they either have a better relationship with that authority than the others, or they have relationship with a higher authority that allows them that privilege. And you know it's different from neighbourhood to neighbourhood” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

The above observations illustrate a dynamic power relationship between the vendors and the authorities; some vendors clearly have more ‘rights’ to the street than others, and as
John suggests it is likely that the vendors who remain unthreatened by the police presence have some kind of superior relationship with an authoritative figure. Alternatively, as alluded to earlier in the thesis (see Chapter 5) the vendor may have established a payment system with the officers in order to protect themselves. Ultimately however, in this situation the police hold both power and authority over the street and those who occupy it.

Whenever I was out in the field with a local resident and there happened to be a police van or tuktuk driving through calling out to vendors to clear the sidewalks, I would informally ask my companion about what they knew of the relationships between the street vendors and the police. I was told on several occasions that the police would make the vendor pay some kind of bribe, otherwise they would have to move on or have their goods confiscated. As one acquaintance rightly pointed out, the people cooking the street food can hardly tell their customers to get up and move out of the way, so they are forced to pay the police bribes, otherwise they would lose their customers. This puts vendors in an economically precarious position and suggests that there is a negative and exploitative relationship between some of the authorities and the vendors; it also suggests that fixed vendors selling from permanent spots are not immune to corrupt practice by the authorities. Street kitchens and similar establishments such as coffee houses, it was observed, are most vulnerable to police action when their facilities such as plastic tables and stools encroach the pavement. However, the way in which the police chose to take action appeared to be extremely inconsistent.

As the vendors in Hanoi are not unionised in any official capacity (see Chapter 5, section on participation), they remain a fragmented part of the cities’ social structure, with virtually no power to resist the authorities who operate, in contrast, as an institutionalised collective supported by the state. Despite their relatively weak position when they do experience confrontation with the authorities, street food vendors in Hanoi do practice more general subtle forms of resistance to avoid confrontation with the authorities as described in more detail by Turner and Schoenberger (2012) and Eidse and Turner (2014). In addition, Eidse et al. (2016) find the mobility of street vendors to be a key mechanism of resistance for street vendors in Hanoi, allowing them to maintain their livelihoods.

Some previous studies report violent or heavy-handed action by authorities to remove street vendors, however, this was not something observed during the fieldwork; the presence of the authorities on the street seemed to be more about intimidation than anything else:

“Police around a lot today. They walk with batons clenched in their fists (coloured like lighthouses) but don’t seem to do much other than walk around. Mostly people don’t flinch. The police travel around in groups on
Clearly the inconsistency of treatment of street food vendors and the elusive tactics used by some of the mobile vendors to subvert the laws of vending are not very cohesive to a socially sustainable environment. Whilst some vendors are constantly on the run to avoid disputes or sanctions from the authorities, others with superior social relations are immune to the rules. This emphasises the significance of the social networks and social capital to the success of street food vendors.

Vendors and Suppliers

To explore social interaction from the perspective of the street food vendor, participants were asked about the frequency of interaction with their suppliers to try and measure how often they engage with them. The results of the survey show that 46.5 per cent of vendors buy their produce from one supplier or market place and 20 per cent bought from just two different suppliers. Of the types of places they buy from, 39 per cent of street food vendors bought goods from the wholesale market and 23 per cent from a large public market. According to the vendors interviewed, 63 per cent said that they stock up on goods once a day and a further 12 per cent said that they stock up more than once a day. Furthermore, over three-quarters of the vendors (76 per cent) pick up their goods directly from their suppliers, meaning that a significant proportion of the vendors go to the markets on a daily basis and engage in face-to-face interaction with the suppliers. In other studies, loyalty has been reported to play a significant role in market trading routines (Feagan and Morris 2009; Sinnereich 2007); of those surveyed 60 per cent of vendors have been buying from the same supplier for over four years (see Table 6.5), and this would suggest that many of the vendors may be quite familiar with their supplier, particularly if they are interacting with them once a day.

Despite the growth of technological communications, face-to-face interaction is still considered an important part of building social capital; it is particularly important for developing trust between people (Mohan and Mohan 2002), and especially so in the sales and purchasing of food (Renting et al. 2003). Furthermore, in their study Nasar and Julian (1995) found that face-to-face interaction also helps to create a ‘sense of community’. The importance of face-to-face communication is also resonated in Julie’s comments (detailed below) about the strategies used to build social networks:

“Oh it’s everything in Vietnam, social networks, it’s how things work really. You can’t make a phone call and have something happen over the phone,
you've gotta go and sit and have tea and develop a relationship to do business with somebody” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).

Social networks are an important element of a person’s social capital and this is emphasised as important to achieving social sustainability (Dempsey et al. 2011; Littig and Greissler 2005). It would seem that businesses relationships, such as those between vendors and their suppliers are fostered and built on face-to-face social interactions in the street food environment.

When the vendors were asked about the reasons they continue to buy from a particular supplier 35.6 per cent said they did so because of the cheap price, the second most popular reason was because the supplier was considered reliable (26.9 per cent) and thirdly because of the quality of the goods (28.8 per cent). An emphasis on price highlights the nature of street food vending as a livelihood strategy for many of the vendors where the objective is focused on maximising profit. Some vendors who chose ‘cheap price’ as their primary answer also mentioned additional reasons for their continued custom in the ‘other’ category, mostly ‘reliability’ and ‘good quality’. A secondary emphasis on ‘reliability’ shows that vendors are more likely to continue to purchase from people who are dependable and offer a consistent service; this may be related to the idea of the trustworthiness which may have been formed over repeat transactions over a given length of time. According to Fukuyama (2001, p. 16) “individuals who interact with each other repeatedly over time, develop a stake in a reputation for honesty and reliability”. Table 6.5 shows that of the vendors who had been selling in the same location for over 11 years, the majority had bought their stock from the same supplier in excess of 10 years suggesting that relationships had been maintained for long periods of time. A further interest in ‘food quality’ stresses the importance of some of the food justice issues discussed elsewhere in this thesis (see Chapter 5).

Table 6.5 Number of Years Street Vendors have used Main Supplier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years vending in this location</th>
<th>Years buying from supplier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 10 years</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years and over</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on responses from 151 participants
The types of social interactions which take place between the various actors within the street food environment on a day-to-day basis are varied, relationships between vendors themselves, customers and suppliers appear to be unthreatening and in many cases reciprocal and friendly. The most negative relationships occur between the vendors and the authorities where unequal power dynamics make vendors vulnerable to harassment and other negative forms of social conduct. This is clearly not indicative of social sustainability, particularly given the reported frequency of the interactions. More needs to be done to improve the relationships between the vendors and the police to create a more civilised environment which is more cohesive to the needs of all.

Rural–Urban Linkages

Urbanisation in Vietnam began in Hanoi as a result of Doi Moi (see Chapter 2 for a more in-depth discussion) introduced in the mid-1980s. Subsequently policies involving the redistribution of land have been implemented alongside urban development programmes, and consequently some people have been left with little or no land to subsist on, as had historically been the case in this agrarian economy. As a result, rural to urban migration has increased, with many people moving to the cities in search of alternative livelihoods, sometimes permanently but for many rural residents this is a temporal and seasonal arrangement. It is well recognised that many of the mobile street food vendors found in Hanoi are migrants from the surrounding countryside (Jensen et al. 2013). The movement of vendors to and from the villages keep rural and urban areas linked; when migrants move to the city they may seek support from family members or other people from their village who might already be working and living in the city (Steel 2012). This emphasises the importance of social networks to street food vendor livelihoods and the importance rural connections can play in formulating the street food vendor identity. In addition, in thinking about street food as part of the wider food system, the network of traders, suppliers, deliverers and farmers that work to provide the food that is sold on the street also facilitates the continued connections between rural and urban areas around Hanoi. This section explores how food from the surrounding countryside is incorporated into Hanoi’s urban food system and thus the street food sector. In briefly examining these flows of food it is argued that street food relies heavily upon its connections to rural areas despite increasing demands for non-traditional food stuffs and the growing trend of supermarkets.

The majority of street food vendors surveyed in this research obtained their produce directly from the seller by picking it up, either from the wholesale market or another market. However, a number of vendors have their goods delivered to them; this was most common
amongst fixed street food vendors, for example 32.5 per cent of street kitchens and 26.4 per cent of informal stationary vendors. Julie, who works close to a nearby street kitchen serving phở describes how the fresh noodles (bún) get delivered straight to the kitchen from a local village, despite there being a large all-day wet market which also sells the same noodles less than 50 metres down the road:

“Referring to the phở shop across the road, they get their delivery of noodles directly from the village, so it doesn’t go through the market. Umm and you see the um the baskets of noodle coming in directly from the village a couple of times per day. Two or three times a day. I would say that they would have a similar relationship with someone doing the chickens that they would come directly to them. You’re never too far away from your source here” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).

This also illustrates a level of personalised service provided by local producers. Another example is provided by Thi who works for a local NGO, when she describes how the sticky rice dish (xôi) is made not by the street food vendors themselves as it might appear, but by local villagers:

“We have a special rice and produced by village enterprise... they put [the rice] in rice paper and make rice cake, sticky rice cake, and many traditional things like this. And then, the street food vendor will collect the product from the village and they sell on the street” (Thi, Project Coordinator, Local NGO).

This suggests that some of the sellers have strong networks with nearby farms and villages who supply their goods either directly to the door or close enough that the seller can collect them directly from the producer, negating the need for a middleman. Many of the goods which come in to the overnight wholesale market are brought from the outskirts of Hanoi, around 40–50 km on small trucks or the back of motorcycles. Eugene who works for a Pan-Asia agricultural NGO describes the process to me:

“I think they also source their product or commodities from the traditional markets, the small markets where there are collectors. Normally there are farmers, and there is a collector who gathers from a number of farmers on a motorcycle or small vehicle and then they drive to Hanoi and then these ambulant vendors buy from the open markets” (Eugene, Regional Representative, Food and Agricultural NGO).

During the fieldwork I carried out observations at Hanoi’s Long Bien wholesale night market on the edge of the Hoan Kiem district to see this movement of food into the city and out of the marketplace for myself. It was a fascinating insight into Hanoi’s food system; there were hundreds of motorbikes parked up outside the market, some piled high with goods being brought in by the collectors from the surrounding countryside, and other collectors coming
to buy the goods to deliver to the street markets, kitchens and restaurants around the city. There were also hundreds of ambulant vendors with their poles and bicycles left outside of the market boundary whilst they went to stock up on fresh fruit, vegetables, meat and fish to sell for the day. I asked Eugene how many farmers the collectors might work with to try and get a sense of the scale of their operations:

“Of vegetables, it depends on product, leafy vegetables usually the collector can collect from different sets of farmers. Like a collector can have 10–20 farmers, this collector will collect from five on a Monday, another five on the Wednesday, something like that, so he or she doesn't collect from everybody at the same time. If they plant different crops then they will harvest on different days so that this collector will have something to deliver regularly, probably Monday, Wednesday, Friday or maybe even every day. For livestock like chickens and ducks and eggs, I think the same arrangement so they can supply, but I guess this would be less frequent, probably once or twice a week something like that. For chickens it takes time” (Eugene, Regional Representative, Food and Agricultural NGO).

John, a local restaurateur and local street market guide, also describes a similar process when asked about the food supply networks:

“Well, it's very much a direct process and that's part of the freshness thing, it's not industrial agriculture here. So, the majority of the products that you see in the market which is the source for the street food vendors and restaurants as well, is coming from very nearby and then some from the farther reaches of Vietnam and a little bit from surrounding countries, but for the fresh produce probably 70 per cent is within a 50 km radius of Hanoi and it's not going through a supply company for the most part, it doesn't get warehoused, it's on the back of a motorbike, in a small truck, on the train. It either goes right to the market or it goes to the overnight market and then it's distributed by morning, so you know often the produce you see at the market was in the field the day before. Even in some cases that morning” (John, Street Food Market Tour Guide).

This short food supply chain, which is characteristic of Vietnam, fosters connections between rural and urban Hanoi. It also mirrors some of the alternative food networks that have been trying to gain traction in Western nations in recent years, as has been much discussed elsewhere (DuPuis and Goodman 2005; Feagan and Morris 2009; Hendrickson and Heffernan 2002; Jarosz 2008; Maye et al. 2007; Morgan 2010). These alternative food systems are not without their disadvantages, largely criticised for their narrow middle-class appeal (Hinrichs 2000) and oversimplification of understandings of ‘local’ (Born and Purcell 2006); they have, however, been commended for their low food miles, emphasis on local and seasonal produce and for bridging the gap between producers and consumers such as local farmers’ markets (Blake at al. 2010; Hinrichs 2000; Holloway and Kneafsey 2000). However, as Vietnam
develops and the food system becomes more formalised these kinds of direct relationships which can be considered as forms of social embeddedness (Feagan and Morris 2009; Hinrichs 2000) between the producer, supplier, street food vendor and consumer are likely to become under increasing threat as Julie highlights:

“...if you look at the meat, the meat comes in twice a day at this market as well, so there is a morning kill and an afternoon kill. And once you get refrigeration in the markets there doesn't have to be that. It can come in once a day if there is the transport available” (Julie, Vietnamese Street Food Cookbook Author).

As refrigeration becomes more commonplace in Hanoi, street food sellers will be able to hold on to their goods, as produce will stay fresher for longer. This will remove the need for vendors to shop on a daily basis, potentially causing the relationships between the producer and the seller to become distanced. This presents a challenge because as is discussed in the alternative food systems literature, there is an emphasis in Western countries to promote closer producer–consumer relationships, firstly to promote the consumption of local food and secondly to foster social cohesion in the community (Fonte 2008). In Hanoi at present there seems to be a continual movement of food around the city which provides hundreds of jobs for people throughout the fresh food supply chain. Of those vendors surveyed 12 per cent currently stock up more than once a day; if a vendor runs out of stock they can easily re-buy fresh produce to continue their day’s trading allowing them to maximise their earnings. As previously alluded to, many developed countries are trying hard to promote the use of alternative food networks which involve shorter food chains and closer relationships between consumers and producers. Viewed from this perspective, Hanoi’s current system, although somewhat messy and chaotic in nature, does clearly demonstrate some social and economic advantages; however, a more modernised system that involves less travel by vehicles in the transportation of goods will be better for the environment and refrigeration may help prevent food waste. This presents a clear problem for policymakers as a balance between all dimensions, the social, economic and environmental (and arguably cultural) factors need to be considered in the creation of a sustainable food system. As may have been the case in the past in other countries, the social benefits of the current system should not be ignored, but instead harnessed to achieve desirable outcomes for all.

**Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter has explored the social inclusion, the social interactions and the rural–urban linkages of the street food environment in Hanoi. It has attempted to examine each of these
dimensions of social sustainability from the perspective of the vendors, consumers and stakeholders and drawn on other studies to support the findings where appropriate.

In the first section the street food environment was shown to be a ‘leveller’ in terms of turning public space into a ‘third place’ where people from all walks of life are able to come together to socialise, either in their own groups or with each other. The data showed that street food is consumed by a diverse section of the population, although it was largely favoured by students and the working class. However, some groups such as the migrant street food vendors are actively discouraged from selling on the streets and are therefore one potentially excluded group from this environment, despite their continued presence being seen as a form of resistance (Eidse et al. 2016; Eidse and Turner 2014).

The selling and consuming of street food presents a complicated social system with few actors anchored in one place. The fluidity of vendors, consumers, food, suppliers and authorities around the city and across the rural–urban continuum with sometimes conflicting needs and attitudes make unravelling and understanding the social structures with any great certainty difficult. What the data has shown in this chapter is that a variety of relationships exist between the different people involved in producing the street food environment as we know it. Some of these relationships are built on strong foundations of village and kinship networks that extend to the city, others are part of continuous development from repeat interactions that have resulted in the formation of trust and reciprocity, and thus indicate a presence of social capital. Other relationships continue to be strained and unclear, embedded within wider power structures.

In the final section street food vendors are shown to play a strong role in maintaining connections between rural and urban areas, firstly in terms of the daily movement of food and secondly through the temporary migrants who move to Hanoi to sell food in an attempt to diversify their livelihoods. However, there is a risk that the connections between the rural and urban could weaken as technological advancements become more culturally accepted, such as refrigeration and supermarket shopping. From a Western perspective this could be seen as detrimental to the local food system in terms of potentially increasing the length of the supply chain and causing the deterioration of producer–consumer relationships which have been heavily advocated in the West in recent years (Blake et al. 2010; Hinrichs 2000; Kirwan 2004). However, the advantages from a local and development perspective should not be overlooked for fear of romanticising a food system that also has many other adverse issues (see Chapter 5).
There are clearly many positive social aspects of street food vending identified in this research which have previously been overlooked in other studies. However, it would be naïve to suggest that all aspects are positive and thus contribute to the principles of social sustainability. This chapter argues that the social relationships between actors and the socially inclusive nature of the street food environment in providing people opportunity to use public space, both in terms of consumption and as a way of earning a livelihood, should be considered in policymaking in addition to the environmental and economic factors which appear to be most prominent in current decision-making processes.
Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage and Sense of Place
Introduction

Cultural heritage and sense of place are two elements of the social sustainability literature that were highlighted as being significant to social sustainability (Bramley e al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Dempsey et al. 2011; Jacobs 1999; McKenzie 2004). Cultural heritage is intrinsically tied to place, although this does not mean it is restricted to a physical space. Food and more specifically cuisine is a strong conveyer of culture and a widely researched phenomenon (Bessière 1998; Cook and Crang 1996; Duruz 2005; Duruz and Khoo 2014). The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the importance of street food to Hanoi’s cultural heritage and explore whether it has created a sense of place for sellers and consumers.

The chapter begins by exploring the cultural heritage of street food in Hanoi. In the research it emerged that cultural heritage is understood in two key ways by the participants, firstly through the notion of identity and secondly through the idea of street food as a traditional cuisine. Subsequently, the first part of this chapter discusses the cultural role and importance of street food by examining the identity of the street food vendor as a cultural symbol of Hanoi. The second part of the discussion around cultural heritage explores the idea that street food is a traditional part of Hanoi’s culture which some people feel should be preserved for future generations. The second half of the chapter focuses on the senses of place and belonging invoked by street food by looking at food and memory and the role of community.

Cultural Heritage

“It is a unique experience to sit on the pavements or in the traffic and eat something that is real, eaten by locals and prepared in front of your eyes. I don’t see any obvious disadvantages other than that there is a danger that this unique culture will disappear as Vietnam becomes more modern” (Mr Quy, Local Street Food Blogger and Tour Guide).

“In the past, people also ate street food on the pavement but the streets were not as crowded as today. We used to sit under the banyan tree which is now home to the big statute of Vietnamese heroic soldiers. In the past, there was only one female street vendor who sold dried beef salad and sitting next to her was a woman selling nine-cloud layers cakes. However, due to the rapid speed of urbanisation and the increase in population density, the demand for street food has also increased significantly. Therefore, recently people have opened many new food shops across many main streets in the 36-streets area [the Old Quarter] of Hanoi” (Ms Thuy Institute of Construction and Urban Economics).
Food is an important aspect of culture all over the world (Counihan and Van Esterik 2012) and it is one of the easiest forms of culture to share, display and transfer to different places, such as those foods found in diaspora communities (Cook and Crang 1996; Srinivas 2012). In Vietnam eating food plays an important politically charged role in people’s daily lives; since the implementation of Doi Moi food has come to symbolise the transition away from a state-controlled economy towards a market-oriented one (Thomas 2004). Prior to the transition period all food was distributed by the state, however, since the economic reform citizens have been presented opportunities to consume and use public space more freely for activities such as socialising and eating, enabling them to develop a “highly diverse street trading cultural life and also the possibility of people congregating in groups, at noodle soup shops, in parks and with tea and cigarette sellers on the pavements” (Thomas 2004, p. 56).

Ten years after observations made by Thomas (2004) Hanoi’s street life is still vibrant, pavements continue to be occupied by street food vendors and small plastic tables and stools spill over into the roadway in competition with a rising number of motorcycles.

Eating out in Vietnam is just one part of the cultural heritage associated with food; fresh foods such as vegetables, fruit, meat and fish are also bought on the street, typically multiple times per week at traditional street food markets, wet markets or from roving vendors. Despite rising incomes and the increasing availability of packaged fresh food in the growing number of supermarkets, recent research reports that traditional purchasing practises are still the preferred form of buying fresh foods in Hanoi (Wertheim-Heck and Spaargaren 2015). Food sold on the street, both cooked and uncooked still appears to be an important aspect of Vietnamese culture and this research sought to explore how this element of the local culture contributes to social sustainability.

Cultural heritage was explored with all research participants – vendors, consumers and stakeholders. Given the subjectivity of the concept at no point was cultural heritage defined, it was left as an ambiguous concept to be interpreted by the participant in order to later reveal how they understand it. A large proportion of research participants identified street food as a significant part of Hanoi’s culture; 76 per cent of vendors (124 respondents) said that street food was either ‘very important’ or ‘quite important’ to Hanoi’s cultural identity. When asked to explain their answer, 17 vendors said the food was a unique aspect of Hanoi’s culture, making it different to other cities. During stakeholder interviews Hanoi’s ‘uniqueness’ was often cited in comparison to Ho Chi Minh City in the south of the country which is a larger metropolis with a stronger Western influence, and where street food appears to be more organised like in neighbouring cities such as Bangkok. From the surveys
a further 11 vendors stated that street food is representative of Hanoi or something which they associate with Hanoi, suggesting that street food could be a potential symbol of the city. In support of these findings 82 per cent of consumers surveyed agreed street food is a part of Hanoi’s cultural identity; the strong support amongst the research participants may suggest a degree of ‘collective social memory’ (Bessière 1998) regarding street food. Collective social memory is produced when people share the same understandings and memories of a particular event, object or phenomenon, and is most associated with banal forms of identity which constitute a part of everyday life (Edensor 2002), such as the “humble meat pie” of New Zealand traditionally served from pie-carts (Bell and Neill 2014). The association of street food itself and subsequently the presence of street food sellers, positions the street vendor as a culturally significant figure of Hanoi’s landscape, and thus contributes to the identity of the city.

Cultural significance was identified as the third most positive aspect of street food vending (see Figure 7.1) by consumers when they were asked to openly identify the most positive aspects of street food. The results clearly demonstrate that street food in Hanoi is of cultural importance to a range of people; however, although there seems to be a consensus that street food is an important part of the culture of Hanoi, the very nature of what one understands as cultural heritage is subjective (Vecco 2010). In this research it became apparent that cultural heritage is understood in two main ways by participants; first it is considered a part of the city’s identity and second it is described as a traditional part of Hanoi’s culture which should be preserved. It is through these two interpretations of cultural heritage that this section is organised, each will be addressed in turn and placed in the wider debates about modernisation and used to reflect on the ideas about who the preservation of cultural heritage is for, and why.
Figure 7.1 Most positive aspects of street food vending in Hanoi identified by consumers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of respondents %</th>
<th>Convenient</th>
<th>Cheap</th>
<th>Cultural Significance</th>
<th>Delicious/Its Taste</th>
<th>Offers a diversity of Food</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>For everyone (inclusive)</th>
<th>Characteristic of Hanoi</th>
<th>Satisfies Food Demand</th>
<th>Enriches the Life</th>
<th>Creates jobs for People</th>
<th>Atmosphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on responses from 83 respondents

Street Food Identity

The identity of the street vendor was a key subject of discussion in conversations about cultural heritage. The image of a lady wearing a conical hat, carrying a yoke pole over her shoulder with a basket of goods balanced on either end is an iconic image of Vietnam (see Figure 7.2). The presence of these women in the city represents a connection with rural villages and a more traditional way of life, which due to urban sprawl, have gradually been eroded from the outskirts of the city. Although in decline, these vendors, referred to locally as ‘basket ladies’ (Jensen et al. 2013), maintain a strong presence in Hanoi today; they roam the streets carrying their wares, much like a “moving market” as described by one interviewee. Although the continued existence of these roaming vendors is contested, interviewees such as Ms Lien, a long-term resident and an officially recognised traditional chef, believes that the loss of mobile street vendors would be detrimental to the city’s identity:

“Street food is so special. However, I notice that they have faded away. Now over 90 per cent of its special characteristics have been lost. Because the original appearance of street food of the old days is no longer there. Another reason is the impact of the Government’s ban. They don’t allow street vendors to wander around the street pavements because they worry these street vendors would affect the city’s law and order. However, in my opinion, this would limit a cultural image which has always been a part of Hanoi’s identity.”

“Street food possesses special characteristics, for example, the image of a street vendor who wore a Vietnamese four-part dress or a brown shirt. This
rural image was very familiar to our life. For example, if I am selling Vietnamese green rice by carrying it on bamboo pole, there will also be a bundle of rice straw, newly cut rice straw, and there will also be lotus leaves or water-taro leaves in my basket. This is a very familiar image in our daily life. When seeing this image, people have the feeling that their life is very close to nature, always close to the agricultural products and gifts of nature. These images and dishes have created the soul of Vietnamese cuisine” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist – Cuisine).

Figure 7.2 'Basket ladies' - mobile vendors in Hanoi

In Ms Lien's description the street food vendor symbolises the past and also the countryside; the traditional street vendor represents a connection with nature and arguably a simpler way of life which appeals to notions of gemeinschaft (Tönnies, 1991 [1887]). The romanticism of agricultural pastimes is something which is not limited to Vietnam, but is also found in the Western countries where ideas of ‘community’ manifest in places such as farmers’ markets. In reality however, a connection with agricultural can often promote exclusion and have negative consequences (DuPuis and Goodman 2005; Slocum 2007).

Across the world, but particularly in developing world cities, some local people have been known to commodify traditional forms of culture such as dances or rituals in order to market
themselves to tourists (Cohen 1988; Wall and Mathieson 2006). These types of practises have been labelled as ‘staged authenticity’ (MacCannell 1973) although the term has been criticised for oversimplifying the relationship between authentic and inauthentic (Taylor 2001; Wang 1999). Hue, a local street food tour guide explained how in Hanoi, particularly around the Old Quarter, many young women adopt the image of the traditional street food vendor to try and capitalise upon the city’s growing tourist market. Some street food vendors, wearing the traditional conical hat and carrying a wooden yoke with fresh fruit balanced on either end, approach tourists and place their hat on the tourist’s head and encourage them to pose with their yoke pole for a photograph. In the process the vendor will ask the tourist for money and try to sell them the fruit at an inflated price. Hue explains that this gives the ‘real’ vendors a bad reputation amongst the international community and as a result can cause problems. Hue explains that ‘real’ vendors can be recognised easily because they will be carrying much heavier loads than the ‘tourist vendors’ and tend to go about their day without paying any attention to foreigners.

Moving beyond the authentic–inauthentic dichotomy, the basic fact that some local people have identified an opportunity to assume a particular cultural identity in order to capitalise upon it exemplifies the strength of the image associated with street food in Hanoi, one which wants to be seen by others and one which is embraced by the locals as a livelihood strategy. This is also not unique to Hanoi, or street food; in a study on handicraft vendors in Cusco, Peru, Seligmann and Guevara (2013) found that vendors tapped in to the ‘desires and expectations’ of the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry 1995), in order to make their living. Furthermore, in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, street vendor activities are recognised as a fundamental aspect of the developing economy and have been legitimised by the government for tourism purposes (Timothy and Wall 1997). This allows local people to benefit from the tourist market and creates a safe and regulated space for visitors to engage with and enjoy the local culture.

In relation to the subject of tourism, many of the local residents who took part in the research, whether through interview, survey or informal conversation, cited the unique characteristics of Hanoi’s street food as an opportunity to market the city on the world stage, for example, Ms Lien states:

“In my opinion, it is a cultural heritage of Hanoi. If we can preserve this image, I believe it is very original. It would make a profound image of Hanoi, of Vietnam in the world’s eyes, making it a distinctive characteristic which can’t be found in any other places. I think if we can preserve these aspects, if we can preserve its soul and images, it would be a distinctive cultural identity of Hanoi” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist – Cuisine).
The desire to share street food cuisine with outsiders, and to use traditional images which are often associated with backwardness (Cross 2000) to distinguish Hanoi from other places, demonstrates a deep-rooted connection between street food and the identity of Hanoi. In support of this, many of the vendors commented that street food in Hanoi is characteristically different from other places and that street food is something which represents Hanoi (see Figure 7.3). It is not uncommon for food to be considered symbolic of a particular region, place or nation for purposes of tourism, Bessière (1998), for example, has explored the development of gastronomical experiences in central France to encourage rural tourism and in a similar vein Everett and Aitchison (2008) have looked at the role of food tourism in the south west of England in the creation of regional identities. Julie, a long-term expatriate and Vietnamese street food cook book author believes that the food in Vietnam is one of its main attractions:

“If Vietnam is becoming a culinary destination - which I think that it is, people, I suppose a lot of people, are still a bit nervous about street food, they’re interested in it, but perhaps a little bit nervous to try. I think it is something that the Vietnamese tourism authorities should be capitalising on, and making the most of pretty quickly” (Julie, expat and street food cook book author).

Unlike traditional forms of cultural exchange which take place primarily through visual engagement, culinary tourism allows for a more embodied experience which goes “beyond the visual gaze” (Everett 2008). The proliferation of street food tours that I saw advertised in the Old Quarter during my observations, as well as online, also demonstrate how local entrepreneurs are utilising already existing local cultures to tap in to tourist desires. Furthermore, in support of this idea, when vendors were asked openly why they thought street food was important to Hanoi’s identity, one of the most popular answers provided cited the attractiveness and appeal of street food to tourists. These findings reinforce the desire and ability for street food to be positioned as an image representative of Hanoi internationally. Ms Lien also emphasised the appeal and reputation of Hanoian dishes all over the world: she speaks with true enthusiasm and pride about her city’s cuisine and believes that street food has a strong identity which is worth celebrating:

“Hanoi’s street foods unique characteristic is something that I find nowhere else. There is no other place you can find that culinary soul which is so special, so original. Hanoi dishes have become a special brand name. It is well known not only in our country but also all over the world and is recognized by our foreign friends” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist – Cuisine).
Ms Lien’s comments speak not only of the food itself but also of the ‘culinary soul’ which is a part of the street food vendor identity: street food does not exist without a chef. Although food from Hanoi is replicated all over the world the ‘original’ street food which includes the essence of ‘true taste’ is only found in Hanoi, drawing again on the notion of the authenticity – of not only the food but also the chef. According to Edensor (2002, p. 17) “national identity is grounded in the everyday, in the mundane details of social interaction, habits, routines and practical knowledge”, and as a significant part of people’s everyday lives, both past and present, street food can be considered in this way. However, by taking such an ordinary aspect of the culture and celebrating it as heritage, particularly when it is valorised for capital gain, runs the risk of romanticising street vendors and overlooking problems associated with this form of livelihood as discussed elsewhere in this thesis (see Chapter 5).

**Figure 7.3 Most cited reason for the importance of street food to Hanoi’s cultural identity**

![Chart showing the most cited reasons for the importance of street food to Hanoi’s cultural identity]

Street vendors appear to be so ingrained within the landscape of Hanoi that it is not until they are removed from the city that their presence is truly noted, reaffirming their presence as a banal form of identity. This reflected in Thi’s experiences of Hanoi during the National Tet holiday (Lunar New Year), when all residents, including temporary migrant street vendors return to their hometown to visit their families:

“They are an important part of the cultural and social life of the cities. Without them, the city will be very boring, I mean in Vietnam, during Tet holiday, Hanoi seems to lack something without their presence” (Thi, NGO Project Coordinator).
Thi’s comment suggests that street vendors contribute not only to the social life of the street (as discussed in Chapter 6) but also to the city’s culture.

The street food vendors and the food they produce and sell clearly forms an important part of Hanoi’s cultural identity. Their traditional appeal and uniqueness have been capitalised upon not only by external third parties who appreciate the appeal for tourism, but also by some of the vendors themselves. Arguably, this may have led to a decline in the authenticity of the street food found in Hanoi, however there is no doubt that it is helping to boost the economy. Considering Hanoi’s rapidly changing urban landscape, street food is one aspect of everyday society in Hanoi which remains constant, despite its contested existence. The next section explores the arguments for preserving street food to ensure it is maintained as part of Hanoi’s urban landscape.

**Preservation of Street Food**

It is the unique character of Hanoi’s street food which leads people to believe that it is worthy of preservation. As the city continues to develop and modernise there is a fear that this traditional way of buying, cooking and eating food will be lost. Historically, preservation of culture has tended to focus on the tangible aspects of society – the monuments, buildings or artefacts (Vecco 2010). The safeguarding of intangible forms of cultural heritage on the other hand, such as social practises or vernacular urban spaces, is less well established (Zukin 2012). In 2003 UNESCO introduced the idea of safeguarding intangible forms of cultural heritage, which include particular types of foods and cultural practices surrounding food, such as traditional Mexican cuisine, the traditional Mediterranean diet and the gastronomic meal of the French, all of which have been added to the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.²

In the research it became apparent that people felt street food in the Hoan Kiem district was unique to the city and should be preserved for its exclusive characteristics which are not found elsewhere.

“Heoan Kiem District is a very special area, this area contains many characteristics and images of Hanoi. Street food is also one of the most crucial factors of Hoan Kiem District’s culture until now. Thus, street food is considered in the gentrification plan for the city. The government try to orientate the development of streets in a specific framework to retain the cultural images” (Ms Linh, Institute for Urban and Rural Planning).

“Hanoi street food is a special cultural characteristic of the city. It has been in existence for about a few hundred years. It is a special cultural characteristic that needs to be preserved. How to preserve it would deserve more discussion” (Ms Thuy, Institute of Construction and Urban Economics).

The need to preserve the transmission of culinary knowledge from one generation to the next was also deemed an important aspect of preserving the intangible aspect of culinary cultural heritage. Many of the street food sellers in Hanoi specialise in one particular type of food for which they become ‘famous’. Hue, a local street food tour guide, states “they will do it [cook] with all their passion and all their love for the food”. Later, when describing how traditional recipes are handed down from previous generations Hue goes on to explain, “it’s like a really secret recipe and if you are not a member of the family, you do not know how to make it”. This illustrates the potential for ‘secret’ recipes dating back generations to be lost if traditional street food practices were to be removed. This preservation of culinary knowledge, particularly regarding the skills and techniques around horticulture, food preparation, cooking methods and recipes is also a concern in other cultures (Cheung 2013; Fonte 2008). Ms Lien, a Vietnamese Folk Artist specialising in Hanoian cuisine, explained that the process of handing down recipes by teaching descendants is known as “hereditary craft” which helps keep traditional Vietnamese folk culture alive. In the past hereditary craft was normal practice, but as the city and economy both continue to grow there is risk that the number of people taking on hereditary crafts may decrease over future generations if efforts are not made to harness this cultural capital (Daskon and McGregor 2012). This is a big concern for Ms Lien who is afraid that if street food culture is not preserved, the availability of traditional foods will become increasingly under threat and eventually extinct:

“If we can’t preserve it, it will disappear. When modernity comes in, there is no more place for traditional folk culture. Therefore, we need to be aware of what should be preserved... we need to preserve it and pass it down to the next generations in order to save our tradition, our traditional cuisine. If we do not preserve our folk culture and let it fade away, this is the loss of tradition” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist – Cuisine).

During my observations of the Hoan Kiem district I noticed an increasing number of coffee shops and stylish food outlets opening up in the city over a period of just six months. The new additions to the city were mostly modern coffee shops but many also served food – including local dishes such as phở and bánh mì (traditionally sold as street food) – at prices comparable to some neighbouring street food stalls. I was shocked at how quickly some of these outlets had emerged and how their clean modern appearance and competitive prices might attract some of the street food customers away from the traditional vendors. Having
said this, the main types of consumers in these new food outlets appeared to be middle-class adolescents. Upon speaking to some local students I was told that many young people only go the new places once or twice so that they can take a photo and put it on social media to share their new cultural tastes with their friends. Although many of the street food stalls appear to be thriving, the interest of young people in the new Western style food outlets may suggest a gradual shift in tastes and preferences which might emerge for younger generations in ways that were not previously possible, firstly, as a result of the historic political isolation of the country and secondly due to globalisation and the advent of information technology in recent years. In Vietnam, internet usage has grown from 31 per cent to 48 per cent of the population in the period 2010–2015 with 30 per cent owning a smart phone (ICT Development Index 2015).³

On further exploration of this issue during the interviews it appears that the gradual influx of overseas fast food outlets into Vietnam has not been detrimental to the enjoyment or availability of Vietnamese food in Hanoi. Interviewees discussed how ‘new style’ Vietnamese restaurants catering for the growing middle-high income population do not capture the authentic taste of traditional cooked foods that have conventionally been sold by street vendors:

“It definitely helps to preserve little things like the phở for example. They [the vendors] also have the traditional taste and I think that the Hanoi people always look for original taste; like the tastes from their childhood and they want to maintain that. So, that is why even now when there are new and more fancy restaurants opening up, some people still prefer going to the old vendors and look for that...”(Hong, Journalist).

Despite the increasing number of standardised food outlets which are absent of any tradition and identity (Bessière 1998) people clearly still rely on the skills and know-how of the street vendors to satisfy their desire for the taste of traditional foods. Research by Solomon (2015) on the ‘vada pav’, a traditional Mumbai street food, demonstrates how a local political party tried to capitalise on the popular food by processing its own version; however, despite its improved sanitation the ‘real’ vada pav still won over its consumers with one person stating, “The chaos of the street, the individualised taste of each vendor, that’s vada pav. That’s street food. You can’t make it uniform everywhere.” (Solomon 2015, p. 83) and another claimed that vada pav was not the same if it was not ‘fresh’ and ‘homemade’. As has been shown, the cultural significance of street food is not restricted to the image of the traditional

vendor but also transcends the food itself. The fact that people still frequent street food vendors with questionable hygiene standards allows us to assume a level of cultural meaning imbued within the practice of selling and eating street food that is powerful enough to override other concerns. Whether this is enough to warrant its preservation, however, is contested. Some of the stakeholders interviewed were enthusiastic about maintaining the culinary culture of street food, however, they were cautious to recognise that it cannot simply continue to exist in its current format:

“I think the Old Quarter should have a project focused on ensuring street food hygiene and safety, traffic safety, creating a clean and safe environment and beautiful city image. I mean we should keep street food but we need to have a plan to select which part of street food activities we should keep” (Ms Tien, Representative of Hanoi People’s Committee).

Efforts to improve the environmental hygiene of street food in the Hoan Kiem area are needed to ensure that it is truly socially sustainable as discussed previously in Chapter 5. There is little doubt that consumers, stakeholders and vendors themselves see street food as an important part of the cultural heritage and identity of Hanoi. However, to simply position the street vendor on a cultural pedestal as an image to be admired and romanticised over would be short-sighted. Street food plays an important role both in people’s everyday lives and as part of their geographic imagination; it has become so ingrained into the landscape of the city that it may even be considered as a banal form of national identity (Billig 1995) which has caused some to argue for its preservation in the face of globalisation. It is, however, clear in the first section of this chapter that the identity of the street vendors and to an extent the food itself is considered an important source of revenue from the tourist market. Preservation for the locals is about maintaining traditional foods and their original taste but with improved hygiene, rather than simply preserving street food as a whole.

**Sense of Place and Belonging**

The literature argues that a sense of attachment to place is important to social sustainability because “it is an integral component of people’s enjoyment of the neighbourhood in which they live” (Nash and Christie 2003 cited in Dempsey et al. 2011). Often, a sense of place refers to an emotional attachment with a physical place and therefore a physical sense of belonging (Tuan 1974); however, relationships to place can also exist through shared senses of community (Talen 1999) and shared senses of emotional belonging that are not necessarily physical. This section seeks to understand how sense of place is constructed through street food in Hanoi for both vendors and consumers. The discussion is focused on two parts; firstly,
food and memory and secondly, the role of community in the creation of a sense of belonging.

Place and memory are inevitably intertwined and memory can be social as well as personal (Cresswell 2013). In this research, street food appeared to hold a particular place in people’s individual as well as collective social memory; a sense of place was constructed through shared recollections of sights, sounds, smells, textures and tastes which assault “all ways of knowing” (Hayden 1995, p. 18). Lutpon (1994, p. 668) stipulates that “[t]he tastes, smell and texture of food can serve to trigger memories of previous food events and experiences around food”. Despite a lack of food during the interviews, a simple glance out of the window or short walk around to the nearest alleyway would be enough to encounter some form of street food to enliven the senses. Reflecting on their frequent interaction with street food, interviewees were keen to draw upon their own memories and experiences of buying and eating food in the street. Their descriptions of street food were very much situated in place; interviewees described the physical location as well as the atmosphere and sociality of the street. Place, after all, is not just about a particular locality, but about the deeper senses of meaning which are created “through the reiteration of practices – the repetition of seemingly mundane activities on a daily basis” (Cresswell 2013, p. 116). Ms Chau for example recalls:

“There are some special dishes that are only available in Hanoi. When thinking about a particular dish, we think about a particular place or street where that dish is served. This special feature has contributed to the general picture of Vietnamese culture and Hanoi culture” (Ms Chau, Old Quarter Ward Manager).

“Street food is a special characteristic of Hanoi... a special atmosphere still exists” (Ms Tien, Representative of Hanoi People’s Committee).

Central to Lupton’s (1994) idea about food and memory is that individual memories are drawn from everyday practices and often form part of a shared cultural experience. The positive memories of street food revealed by the participants propose a sense of place invoked by food that is drawn from strong notions of nostalgia; it is this association which appears to underpin the idea that street food creates a sense of collective memory. Interviewees used memories to illustrate how street food had changed and in some cases remained the same:

“It has changed a lot, changed in the quality, changed in the appearance. For example, talking about street food in the past, in an autumn season like this, people often ate snail noodle, ‘money’ noodle. ‘Money’ noodle is about this
size [make a shape about the size of a coin with hand]. It means you used a very small bowl. Street vendors often carried this noodle on bamboo poles, wandering around different streets. Street vendors also carried different types of sweetened porridge, the type of dessert in autumn season. And Pho, Vietnamese beef noodle, was carried on the bamboo poles as well. In general, people carried everything on their bamboo poles” (Ms Lien).

Now these types of hot dishes are more likely to be served from a stationary vendor or at street kitchens. Ms Tien, a representative of Hanoi People’s Committee, described how, in her experience, many of her friends remember the role street food vendors played in their daily lives, despite some of them no longer living in Hanoi:

“Many people who are living far away from Hanoi still remember and miss street food, especially people who are older than me. The cries of street vendors at night such as ‘Beef noodle, anyone’, ‘Khuc cake [sticky rice and mung bean dumplings], anyone?’ or the image of an old man selling beef jerky on a mobile food cart in a familiar street are still in the memories of so many people who are living far away from Hanoi” (Ms Tien, Hanoi People’s Committee).

The consumption practices surrounding street food in Hanoi such as the “cries of the street vendors” provoke powerful memories which give street food a symbolic meaning in the context of the city and situate the memories in place. The recollection of experiences are not just associated with the food and the vendors themselves, but also the intangible forms of heritage such as the smells and sounds and tastes of the food, reinforcing the sense of place invoked by street food.

The research sought to explore whether the street food environment promotes a sense of place and belonging amongst its users; using terminology proposed by Antonsich (2010) ‘belonging’ is understood as a feeling of being at ‘home’, not in a domestic sense but symbolically in line with key thinkers on place (Tuan 1974; Relph 1976) and also politically through socio-spatial understandings of belonging which are developed further in the section on social inclusion in Chapter 6. Sense of place, community and belonging were deemed to be important elements in social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Brindley 2003; Chan and Lee 2008; Dempsey et al. 2011; Rogers 2005), and for this reason questions addressing this theme focused on feelings of community and everyday practices involving street food. The notion of community, supported by the ideas of familiarity, was therefore central in the analysis of sense of place. Community is recognised as a multidimensional concept, for the purposes of this research it is understood as both spatial and relational;
people can feel part of a community without being in the same place as others, just as different people have individual senses of place of the same physical place (Massey 1994).

The results of the vendor survey suggest a strong sense of belonging amongst street food sellers, with 69 per cent agreeing that street food makes them feel a part of the community (Figure 7.4), with no apparent differences between the types of sellers; of the remaining 31 per cent, only one vendor disagreed with the statement.

**Figure 7.4 Selling street food makes me feel a part of the community**

It is assumed that the longer a person spends living in a particular place the more likely they are to develop a stronger sense of attachment to that community (Relph 1976). In order to test this assumption in relation to the vendors’ work location, the length of time selling at a particular site was cross tabulated with vendors’ answers as to whether they felt selling street food makes them feel part of a community (see Figure 7.5). Vendors who had been trading at their location for 11–15 years were more likely to feel part of the community, (91 per cent) compared to those who had been selling for 0–10 years (70 per cent).
Figure 7.5 Street food makes me feel a part of the community by time spent selling at location

This sense of community offered by street food is not just limited to the vendors’ sense of place, but was also revealed in conversations with stakeholders such as Hong, a local journalist, who describes how mobile food vendors are embraced into the local community:

“...before where I grew up we had one ice cream man and one tofu man who became like one of our community. Because he sold it every day and you know, as a child you look forward to meeting them and even like older people, they become... a very strange person can become somebody who is very familiar and especially when they sell good food and cheap food” (Hong, Magazine Journalist).

Here, food, like in many other situations can be seen as a bonding agent between people (Marshall 2005; Valentine 1999; Warde and Martens 2000), and in this case food encourages the integration of the street vendor into the local community. Hong emphasises that the appeal of welcoming this vendor into the community lies with the fact that his food is delicious and affordable. This sense of community created by street food is also emphasised by Quy:
“It [street food] encourages interaction and community-mindedness, even conversation amongst people who don’t know each other. Often, we have to share tables or benches with strangers. The conversation will be about food but also all of the activity going on around and the news of the day. It helps to keep neighbours, community, people connected because it’s in the street not a closed off venue where everyone has their own separate table or space” (Quy, Local Street Food Blogger and Tour Guide).

Quy comments on the communal nature of street food; in the process of consuming food people encounter strangers whom they often have to share a physical space with, this in turn encourages social interaction between different types of people (for further discussion on this matter see Chapter 6) but it also creates a shared social experience amongst diners who develop a shared sense of belonging which is reflected in their collective memories (Edensor 2002). Eating outside, in public space, is perceived somewhat differently to the act of eating inside – whether in a restaurant or in a domestic setting. Ms Tien makes this distinction:

“The atmosphere is different between eating inside and outside, right? There is a shared space among all the diners” (Ms Tien, Representative of Hanoi People’s Committee).

In contrast to eating indoors, which is deemed a private affair, outdoor space, such as the street is considered public – a shared space for all the diners. Given the high population density of the city, public spaces outside of the home are also important for providing opportunities for more intimate encounters, particularly for young people (Geertman et al. 2015); it also allows people to meet others in their community, as described by John:

“It’s a gathering of friends, office workers, families etc. and you know in the house there is often not enough space for bigger gatherings so if you want to get together with friends, you have to go someplace to do that. So I think it [street food] really reinforces social life and it’s also economical” (John, Local Food Expert).

Throughout my observations it was clear to see that street kitchens and some informal stationary vendors’ outlets offer important spaces for young people to socialise; the provision of basic facilities such as the short plastic stools for customers to sit at in conjunction with the availability of affordable local beer (Bai Hoi) or lemon tea make it a regular activity for many:

“Lemon tea is very very popular, if you go out to the cathedral area, every evening it’s packed out with people just you know, on stools. So it just like becomes the trend young people just love” (Hong, Magazine Journalist).
The area described by Hong was regularly visited during this research study, and indeed every evening, no matter what day of the week, it was crowded with young people socialising with their friends whilst drinking and eating snacks. The act of sitting out on the pavements socialising, eating, drinking or just watching the world go by is a very normal everyday activity for people in Hanoi, whatever time of day, as observed by Eugene:

“I think it is embedded in the society, there’s norm it, there is need for social belongingness, they [Vietnamese people] like to sit outside especially during this weather” (Eugene, Regional Manager for International NGO).

Taking part in the street food society appears to be cultural in itself, there appears to be something to be said about the simple act of sitting, snacking and watching that makes people feel a part of the community. In discussions about the street food and embedded within wider discussions about culture, Ms Lien describes how food gives meaning to people’s daily lives:

“Culinary culture is a very important part. Street food are not modern dishes, they are a part of the ancient streets, a part of ancient Hanoians and ancient culinary culture; therefore, they are very familiar to our daily lives. So for example, you can come to enjoy a bowl of snail noodle, a bowl of crab noodle. These are rural dishes which are only available in Vietnam. When enjoying these dishes, you recognise that this dish is made of those particular ingredients. The ingredients are from Vietnamese rural fields. Therefore, these dishes are close to the nature, to our daily life. All of this helps create a very meaningful life” (Ms Lien, Vietnamese Folk Artist).

The meaning associated with food links back to the previous discussion about nostalgia and cultural heritage; the fact that street food has the ability to invoke memories of a particular place and time allows it to raise the feeling of a sense of place. However, considering Vietnam’s rate of development there is a risk that sense of place in Hanoi will diminish as the city becomes homogenised (Wheeler 2004). This research demonstrates that the street food culture in Hanoi provides a unique experience for its users, and without street food there is a chance that a sense of place may be lost. Currently people appear to build a sense of place around the street food environment through active and passive engagement. Some people hold a sense of place because street food is embedded within their everyday life, whereas for others, perhaps those who no longer live in the city, street food can invoke an imagined sense of place through memory.
Chapter Conclusion

In the case of the Hoan Kiem district it can be argued that the presence of street food and street food vendors gives meaning to place. This chapter firstly explored the cultural heritage of Hanoi and identified a strong cultural association between street food and Hanoi. It became apparent in the research that the street food vendor is a symbol of Hanoi which transcends all scales: the international, national, regional and local. The street food vendor has been used as an image in the tourist industry by vendors themselves and external agencies, however, the street vendor is also an important icon locally which reminds people of rural pastimes and simpler ways of life.

With regard to the street food cuisine itself, some dishes were identified as having special ‘secret’ recipes which are at risk of being lost due a decline of hereditary crafts. For this reason, the preservation of Hanoi’s street food was considered, and although many felt that street food is worthy of protection it was suggested that a preference should be made for certain foods and types of street food vendors, rather than a blanket policy for all street food. Attention was also drawn to improvements concerning food hygiene and safety which need to be made before the preservation of street food can be seriously considered (see Chapter 5).

Street food vendors are not only paramount to the continued existence of this unique culinary culture, but they also facilitate the creation of a sense of place amongst users both in day-to-day life and in social memories. Street food vendors achieve a physical sense of place by creating a shared space where people can come together and socialise and feel part of the wider community. This was found to be true for both the consumers and the vendors themselves. The important role street food has in the everyday life of people in Hanoi has created a shared cultural identity amongst its users. Considering the cultural heritage and sense of place of the street food environment in isolation from the other aspects of social sustainability it appears to fulfil both criteria in that street food has a strong cultural identity in Hanoi which is maintained through the continued existence of street food and it also promotes a feeling of a shared sense of community and belonging in citizens.
Chapter 8: Conclusions
Introduction

The selling of food on the street and in public spaces constitutes a significant sector of the informal street vending economy worldwide, particularly in developing world cities where it makes up a significant component of many urban food systems. However, street food vendors are frequently ostracised in the city; they are criticised for increasing traffic congestion, causing pollution and creating environmental health problems due to unsafe food handling and cooking practices. Furthermore, street vendors are commonly perceived as promoting a ‘backward’ image which does not fit into the future visions of pristine and safe city streets that many developing cities are trying to achieve. The negative associations with street vending have led to the implementation of targeted removal policies across developing world cities, yet interventions have rarely been effective in the long-term. Often the policies to relocate or remove street vendors ignore the social function of street food; past research has tended to focus on the socio-economic and health issues of street food vending and has not explicitly explored the social benefits in any great depth. This research has attempted to fill this gap by exploring the sociality of street food using a conceptual framework of social sustainability.

This research sought to understand the social life of street food in Hanoi, and it specifically aimed to establish whether the street food environment fosters social sustainability. In order to fulfil this aim, a conceptual framework of social sustainability was developed and adapted based on the current literature. The framework consists of eight key themes: social justice, participation, quality of life, safety and security, social interaction and social networks, social inclusion, sense of place and cultural heritage which were identified as the most pertinent in the literature. Mixed methods were used to collect the data and included two surveys, one with street vendors and one with customers, observations and stakeholder interviews (all names stated in this thesis are pseudonyms). Following the analysis, themes were subsequently grouped under three broad ideas – social justice, social relations and culture – which were used to structure this thesis. This grouping was established as a best fit scenario merely to make sense of the data and does not mean to deny the fact that all three areas inevitably intertwine and overlap with each other. The objectives were designed around these three key areas and are each addressed in turn in the following section of this chapter. The succeeding section then focuses on the development of the social sustainability framework as a conceptual research tool which was used to test and rigorously explore the various tensions within the street food environment. It also outlines the contribution of this research to the literature on informal economies and street vending. The final section of the
conclusion discusses the potential for the framework to be applied in different economic and political contexts; it outlines the usefulness of the framework as a tool to be used by policymakers in order to gain a holistic view of street food in various contexts. The final section also highlights areas for future academic research where certain elements of this research could be explored in more depth.

**Street Food and Social Justice**

The first objective of this research was to investigate whether street food in Hanoi is socially just. Social justice and social equity were two core themes that were identified in the literature as underpinning social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Bramley and Power 2009; Cuthill 2009; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Jacobs 1999; Rogers 2005; Scott et al. 2000; Sharifi and Murayama 2012; Vallance 2011; Yitachel and Hedgecock 1993). To answer this first objective, questions were set around the four key dimensions in the social sustainability literature which best fit under this theme. The first question dealt with the idea of basic needs and quality of life:

**Does street food vending allow workers and consumers to lead a decent quality of life/meet their basic needs?**

One aspect of social justice is the ability for people to be able to meet their basic needs. For many people living in developing world cities street vending presents one of the few viable opportunities for those with little education or formal skills to meet their basic needs and earn a living (Bhowmik 2005; Bromley 2000). In the context of Hanoi, this research found that the majority of vendors surveyed (75 per cent) felt selling street food helps meet their basic needs, however, differences were found between the different types of vendors. Street food vendors who sold from fixed premises were more likely to report that selling street food meets their basic needs (83 per cent) compared with just 67 per cent of mobile vendors. This shows that inequalities may be experienced between different types of vendors, which resonates with other contexts, for example in Cusco, Peru, Bromley and Mackie (2009a) identified differences between the treatment and success of vendors from different minority ethnic groups. In Hanoi, income differences are likely to play a role; vendors with fixed selling spaces are more likely to have a more stable income, whereas those who are itinerant are often migrant workers who have additional outgoings and often sell their goods at lower prices.

Furthermore, on the whole, the research identified a general widespread tolerance for street food vending in the city with 80 per cent of the consumers surveyed agreeing that street food should not be removed from the city. Although there are official regulations to control
street vending in certain areas of the Hoan Kiem district (Eidse et al. 2016; Nguyen et al. 2013) they are frequently overlooked and often only strictly enforced when there is a national holiday or state visit. This was supported through both the observations made during the fieldwork and also by the interviews. Recent research by Roever and Skinner (2016) also recognises inconsistencies in the spatial regulation of street vending and argue for greater transparency in the implementation of legislation. In this research it was found stakeholders believed the lack of enforcement could be attributed to government sympathy with poor people who needed to become street vendors to survive. Moreover, it was felt street vending provides jobs and services for citizens and removing vendors would be detrimental to society. This was, however, stressed to be a temporary solution.

The findings suggest that although the selling of street food allows basic needs to be met for the majority of vendors it is important to recognise that basic needs are not being met for all street food vendors and that their experiences are heterogeneous. Furthermore, despite the apparent tolerance for street vending activity currently, it does not appear to be a long-term strategy and consideration of how to effectively manage the street food economy of Hanoi in the future requires further attention.

The second question asked was:

*Does street food contribute to the happiness and well-being of city life?*

Moving away from standardised ideas of basic needs, happiness was explored as a softer dimension of quality of life. A key finding in this research was that the majority of street food vendors (61 per cent) claimed that selling street food made them happy. Happiness, a key indicator of a person’s well-being, is often overlooked when trying to measure or establish how well an economy or population group is doing. Focus is ordinarily given to economic factors or normative measures of quality of life. However, this research demonstrates that street vending is, in fact, an occupation which can contribute to a person’s happiness and well-being; this find is supported by other studies which show that street vending is a livelihood choice that can be enjoyable (Bromley and Mackie 2009b) and potentially lucrative (Maneepong and Walsh 2013; Yasmeen 2001). Furthermore, a strong correlation was found between vendors who reported that selling street food made them happy and also met their basic needs, supporting Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs theory. The impact of street food on quality of life and well-being was also explored with consumer participants; for consumers street food was not as an important contributor to quality of life, only 45 per cent
agreed that consuming street food does make them happy and 36 per cent held a neutral opinion.

Thirdly, the research explored the question:

Are street food vendors and consumers engaged in decision-making processes regarding the development of the district and are they invited to participate?

Participation in Hanoi was explored through the context of civil society. In Vietnam involvement in associations and civil society networks can be considered very low, particularly in comparison to other places which also have vibrant street vending cultures such as Latin America (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Cross 1998; Roever 2006). This is partly explained by Vietnam’s political system which makes it difficult for civil society organisations and unions to form (Wells-Dang 2010). The research found that although there was a low awareness of either informal or formal associations, 41 per cent of participants expressed no interest, for various reasons, in joining such groups. According to stakeholders, consultation regarding changes to the city environment that will impact local residents is required by law, however, only a very small number of people in this research had been engaged in such activity. In addition, engagement did not appear to be proactive, but rather reactive to changes which had already taken place, for example one participant recalled being asked to give feedback on a development which had already happened, but not being requested in advance. The evidence provided by this research illustrates an apparent lack of participation and engagement with local workers and residents. However, it must be recognised that although engagement in Vietnam is minimal, some have argued that participation is subject to class-bias (Mueller and Stratmann 2003) and “slow [and] messy” (Purcell 2006 p. 1923).

Furthermore, in her discussions of the Just City Fainstein (2010) recognises that the simply advocating democratic participation as a means to achieve justice runs the risk of romanticising its merits and neglects to take into consideration its disadvantages. Arguably, this might be most pertinent in contexts where engagement is required with people who might be difficult to contact or not want to identify themselves in public forums. In this instance an authoritarian approach might in fact be more appropriate. Having said this, considering the wider context of social justice and the potential impact of developments or changes in rules on livelihood strategies, it would seem only fair for the consultation process described by the planning official interviewed in this research to be adhered to more consistently.
Viewed from a participatory perspective based on the key literature used in this framework, street food in Hanoi may not contribute to the principles of socially sustainability based on these findings. However, the research does also show evidence to suggest that increasing engagement and participation is high up the agenda of local civil society organisations and NGOs. Furthermore, recent success stories regarding civil society campaigns (although not without their own flaws) do show promise, for example Coe (2015) documents a successful campaign against major developments in a local park where residents fought for their use of public space, with Wells-Dang (2010) arguing that this type of collective action is resulting in a “rice-roots democracy” in Vietnam.

The fourth question asked to fulfil the first objective of this research, was:

*Is the street food environment safe? Does it foster negative or socially deviant behaviour? Do vendors and consumers have different experiences of safety in the street food environment? What are the differences in perceptions?*

The literature contends that for an environment to be socially sustainable it must feel safe and secure from criminal activity (Bramley et al. 2009; Dave 2011; Dempsey et al. 2011; Holden 2012; Rogers 2005; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). The research explored the crime and safety in the street food environment in Hanoi by looking at perceptions and experiences of crime. Three themes were identified as being important to the safety and security of the area: the sense of security and crime, public disorder and environmental problems. Overall, street food sellers felt safe whilst selling food on the street (84 per cent) and this was largely attributed to good security and police presence. However, differences in perceptions were noted between the various types of vendors, with those selling from more secure spaces, i.e. in fixed locations, feeling safer than those who sell using mobile equipment. People selling from fixed locations were found to be more embedded in their environment, having built relationships with neighbours and other local people, increasing their perceived sense of security and belongingness. This may also be partially explained by the fact that those selling from fixed premises were more likely to work with somebody, whether an employee or another family member, whereas the mobile vendors often work alone and may feel more vulnerable.

In terms of direct experiences of crime, overall the street food environment was considered safe by the majority of vendors, as 71 per cent reported to not have direct experiences of crime. Conversely, consumers had witnessed higher levels of crime with 70 per cent stating that they had previously witnessed a theft, and consequently 44 per cent felt that the street
The research has therefore identified an inconsistency between the opinions of vendors and consumers with regard to crime in the street food setting. Further in-depth research on this theme could help explain these differences.

Other forms of crime such as gambling and public disorder caused by alcohol abuse were highlighted as key causes of concern in the research, for example some vendors were found to act as a cover for gambling activities to supplement their income or sell unlicensed alcohol. These activities were shown to be the key causes of public disorder and affected the wider street food environment, including the harassment of other vendors. Further problems affecting the wider public include environmental problems which occur because of traffic congestion and disposal of litter.

Overall, although vendors appear to feel safe and report low levels of crime in the street food environment, this research draws attention to problems with the safety and security of street food in a broader sense. The perception of crime by consumers in the street food environment does not match the opinions of the vendors who spend most of their day in this setting and the further societal issues such as public disorder and environmental problems identified suggest that more needs to be done to ensure that the street food environment is a safe space for all vendors and consumers.

Street Food and Social Relations

The second objective of this research was to examine people’s behaviours and relationships in the street food environment. The literature cited different forms of sociality as being important to social sustainability, namely, social inclusion, social interactions and social networks (Bramely et al. 2009; Brindley 2003; Dave 2011; Demspey et al. 2011; Littig and Greissler 2005; Polèse and Stren 2000; Sharifi and Murayama 2013). The first question posed under this theme was:

*Who is excluded and who is included in the street food environment?*

A variety of different types of people were observed using the street food environment and overall it appeared to offer a socially equalising space for consumers. Although it was felt that street food is for and desired to an extent by everyone, it was found to be favoured by the young and those less well-off. Instances occurred where those who appeared to be very rich were identified in the street food environment and this is believed to be because of the authentic taste of the food not found elsewhere, over any other reason. The extent of interaction between the different types of street food patrons appears to be limited from
the data collected in this research; however, there is some evidence to suggest that positive social interactions do take place in this environment and as a result promote an acceptance of diversity and feelings of inclusiveness. However, regarding employment of people at larger street food establishments, most only employed family members (45 per cent), suggesting strong levels of bonding social capital. This finding resonated with other research in Hanoi (Turner and Nguyen 2005) which found that that employment outside kinship groups is limited, restricting opportunities for economic development in this sector.

Despite their large presence in the city, the research found that migrant vendors who often work itinerantly are excluded more so than other types of vendor from the city. Migrant vendors are ostracised by the authorities and some permanent vendors for causing traffic congestion and for giving other local vendors a bad reputation. Drawing upon other literature (Yamto 2008) migrant vendors are considered ‘out of place’ in Hanoi and there is a growing tension between urban and rural street food vendors who compete for space and customers. This is partly due to urbanisation which has left many rural residents with limited land to farm, forcing them to seek alternative forms of livelihood (Jensen et al. 2013).

Secondly, this objective explored social interactions by setting out to answer the following question:

**What (types of) social interactions are taking place? Between whom, where and how often?**

The research found that eating street food was very much a social activity, and 76 per cent of people in the survey reported to always eat street food with another person. It was found that even when people do eat at street food stalls alone, they often feel part of a wider group due to the communal tables and cultural acknowledgements which take place before starting a meal. This was considered to facilitate loose ties between strangers in public space and create opportunities for more meaningful relationships to form (Cattell et al. 2008). Furthermore, 74 per cent of those surveyed agreed that street food provides opportunities for positive social interaction. In support of this, 49.5 per cent of consumers reported making friends whilst eating street food and 38 per cent had met a business acquaintance; this illustrates the ability of the street food environment to incite important social interactions amongst strangers.

Vendors were found to interact with each other in a variety of ways. Fleeting interactions between vendors were observed such as holding short conversations as they passed each other in the street, as well as more trusting relationships, such as vendors looking after one another’s goods whilst deliveries were made. It also became apparent in the research that
some vendors, particularly migrant vendors, rely on one another for emotional and sometimes financial needs, indicating deeper levels of social interaction.

Interactions between vendors and consumers most often took the form of small talk (42 per cent of the time) or discussions about the food itself. The research found that transactions with mobile vendors were less likely to result in casual conversation; this is possibly due to their itinerant nature as they are unable to stop in one location for long periods of time. Firstly, this is because being on the move allows vendors to maximise profits by working in lots of different areas and secondly it is necessary for itinerant vendors to keep moving to evade police capture. Small talk was found to be the most common form of interaction between vendors and consumers at street kitchens; here seating is usually available in the form of short plastic tables and stools, allowing more time for conversations to take place. An interesting finding from the research was that 42.9 per cent of customers reported making friends with a street food vendor, suggesting that some simple business interactions can develop into more established friendships.

Confrontations between street food vendors and the authorities were observed in this research. It appeared that mobile vendors and those with informal stationary stalls were more likely to be targeted than those selling from street kitchens. Of those surveyed, 22 per cent of vendors said that they were likely to experience some kind of confrontational encounter with an authoritative figure on a daily basis. On occasions where the authorities carried out surveillance on street vending activity, only some vendors were observed removing their goods from the roadside, where other vendors did not move. This appears to suggest that some vendors have established relationships with authorities that prevent them from being targeted; it also suggests evidence of corruption and uneven power dynamics between vendors and the authorities.

Relationships between vendors and their suppliers were also explored. It was found on average almost half of the vendors buy from one supplier or market place and 39 per cent bought goods from a wholesale market. The majority of vendors (63 per cent) stock up once a day and a smaller number (12 per cent) stock up twice a day. This illustrates that most of the vendors interact with their supplier(s) at least once a day, with 76 per cent picking their goods directly from the seller; this results in frequent face-to-face interaction which is important to the development of trust and subsequently increases social capital.
Overall the interactions which take place between the vendors and other actors in the street food environment appear to be reciprocal and friendly, with the most negative interactions taking place between street food vendors and the authorities.

The third question posed under the second research objective was:

*What do the social networks of the street food environment in the Hoan Kiem district of Hanoi look like? How far do they span?*

Social networks of the street food environment are messy and complex; they are apparent within the city itself but also span across the rural–urban continuum to local villages and towns, particularly for the migrant street food sellers who have connections in both areas. One of the most interesting findings from this research was the direct relationship between rural enterprises and street kitchens. Instances were identified where produce is delivered directly from the surrounding countryside to the street kitchen, despite the goods being readily available and obtainable from a nearby market. Another example of a similar urban–rural connection was identified where a village enterprise produces packages sticky rice (xôi) a dish commonly eaten for breakfast, vendors go directly to the village to collect the sticky rice and then without any additional processing, sell them on the streets of Hanoi. These examples demonstrate how some vendors have strong networks with local farms or villages, removing the need for a middleman. However, still relatively little is known about the dependencies between street food and rural enterprises in the context of Hanoi and further research is required to better understand and fully recognise the role of this relationship in the street food system.

The food which is supplied to the wholesale markets in the city was found to largely come into Hanoi from surrounding farms just 30–50 km away. Collectors pick up goods from a selection of farms and drive the produce overnight to the market, often on a daily basis. This is illustrative of a short food supply chain which closely links urban and rural Hanoi. It is clear that the urban environment relies on the rural surroundings for food provision and also that the rural areas rely on the urban areas for selling their goods and for jobs. As food supply chains become more formalised and technology, such as refrigeration becomes more common place, it is predicted that these informal networks and associated social embeddedness might diminish. This would arguably come at a great loss to Hanoi, as current emphasis in other countries, particularly in the Western context, is on shortening food supply chains and promoting closer interaction between consumers and producers (Blake et al. 2010; Holloway and Kneafsey 2000; Hinriches 2000).
Street Food and Cultural Heritage and Sense of Place

The third research objective was to explore the place and culture of street food in Hanoi. Sense of place (Bramley et al. 2009; Brindley 2003; Chan and Lee 2008; Rogers 2005) and cultural heritage (Axelsson et al. 2013; Jacobs 1999; McKenzie 2004) emerged in the literature review as being significant to social sustainability, therefore two research questions were developed to explore the importance of street food to these two themes. The first question asked under this third objective was:

*Is street food a significant part of the city’s identity and how does it contribute to understandings about cultural heritage? Whose cultural heritage?*

Overall, the research found that street food was considered an important part of Hanoi’s cultural identity by over 75 per cent of street food vendors and 82 per cent of consumers. The cultural heritage of street food in Hanoi was interpreted as having two key strands; firstly, the identity of the street food vendor and the types of food that they sell, were considered iconic images of Hanoi. Secondly, street food was considered a unique aspect of Hanoi’s culture and worthy of preservation.

The traditional image of a basket lady wearing a conical hat and carrying a yoke pole over her shoulder was found to be a vision ingrained in Hanoi’s everyday cultural landscape; the image was considered to represent a connection with rural villages and a traditional way of life that is currently under threat. It became apparent in the research that the dress and style of the more traditional vendors had been appropriated by some non-rural vendors in order to make themselves more appealing to the tourist market. This exemplifies the strength of the street food vendor image in the making of Hanoi’s cultural identity and resonates with research on street vendors elsewhere (Timothy and Wall 1997). Street food culture was also considered a significant part of Hanoi’s identity for marketing itself on the world stage, particularly to tourists. Some street food dishes in Hanoi such as bún chả are deemed an authentic cultural asset which is distinct to Hanoi; the consumption of street food in terms of providing a culinary cuisine allows tourism to go beyond the visual gaze (Everett 2008) and offer a more embodied experience of the local culture.

Hanoi is a rapidly developing city and the unique character of Hanoi’s street food was the key message uncovered in this research that leads people to believe that it is worthy of preservation. Culinary cultural heritage has traditionally been passed down through generations via the transmission of knowledge and best practice. Many of the recipes sold as street food belong to a particular family and are kept ‘secret’. As the city and its culture
continue to change and develop there is a fear from some people that the knowledge and skills of hereditary crafts, such as the ways certain street food dishes are cooked and prepared, will be lost. Many of the meals available on the street are now also offered at fast food or more formal restaurants, but whilst the option is still available many people prefer to go to traditional vendors, driven by the desire for the ‘authentic’ taste; a similar finding was found regarding a certain type of street food in Mumbai (Solomon 2015). Although there was a strong feeling towards preserving street food, it is important to recognise that tensions are caused by the unhygienic practices associated with street food vending, a phenomenon not unique to Hanoi (Adjrah et al. 2013; Choudhury et al. 2011; Muyanja et al. 2011; Rheinländer et al. 2008; Von Holy and Makhoane 2006). It is argued that street food should be preserved for its distinctive culinary culture, but there should not be a simple blanket policy for all types of street food and vendors. The research found that people felt the preservation of street food should be selective of certain Hanoian dishes and that improvements should be made to improve the hygiene standards and environmental problems, rather than simply protecting it as it currently exists.

Street food is clearly of cultural importance in Hanoi and offers a form of intangible heritage that is unique to the city and its people. It therefore seems reasonable to suggest that street food offers significant cultural contributions towards the social sustainability in Hanoi by providing culturally appropriate food for citizens and in promoting the city’s culture to the wider world.

The final question explored in this research was:

What is the role of food in people’s sense of place? Is sense of place constructed through food? If so, how? And what does this mean?

A sense of place and belonging is deemed to be important to social sustainability (Bramley et al. 2009; Dempsey et al. 2009; Chan and Lee 2008; Jacobs 1999; McKenzie 2004). This research has demonstrated that the street food culture in Hanoi invokes a sense of place for its users, both imagined and real. Memories of food are triggered by familiar sounds and smells (Lupton 1994) and mere talk of street food in many cases summoned particular memories of certain types of street food or sellers for participants, transporting them back to a place in time, often involving memories of their childhood. For others, a sense of place is created through community, and the research showed that selling street food makes vendors feel a part of the community (69 per cent). This was a similar finding across all types of vendors, although analysis showed it was felt most strongly by those who had been selling
in the same spot for 11–15 years (91 per cent). As street food vendors often sell in the same locations they offer regular times and spaces for citizens to use the public space for socialising. The close proximity of informal dining furniture and the communal nature of street food consumption facilitates a shared social experience amongst patrons who appear to develop a shared sense of belonging in this space which promotes social inclusion. The idea of food as a social bonding agent between people is supported by other research (Marshall 2005; Valentine 1999; Warde and Martens 2000) and it appears in this instance street food is no different. The presence of a food vendor on a street encourages people to use public space and interact with each other, turning an otherwise ordinary empty space into a place.

**The Social Life of Street Food in Hanoi**

The overall aim of this research was to understand the social life of street food using a framework of social sustainability. The research found that Hanoi’s street food environment contributes to the principles of social sustainability regarding a number of dimensions but most prominently in relation to well-being, social inclusion, social interaction, cultural heritage and sense of place. However, other areas within the framework in the context of Hanoi face some challenges, such as participation, safety and security and food hygiene and safety. The following few paragraphs summarise, under each of the broader themes used to frame this thesis (social justice, social relations and culture) the existence or lack of social sustainability in street food in Hanoi.

In exploring social justice, the research identified that street food in Hanoi may contribute towards the principles of social sustainability regarding quality of life and well-being because it is accessible for both vendors and consumers. Street food vending allows those with few other skills or those with facilities to take advantage of (such as the ground floor of their homes) to become street food vendors, whilst consumers have easy access to a range of affordable cooked and uncooked foods. Furthermore, street food vending was found to contribute to the happiness of a large proportion of vendors, suggesting that many people achieve a sense of well-being through their work. However, the street food environment was not found to be socially just because of low participation rates, a lack of food quality and hygiene.

The social sustainability of street food in Hanoi came through most prominently in relation to social relations. The street food environment was found to facilitate social interaction and provide citizens with a space in which to socialise with friends and acquaintances in the
crowded city; moreover, these spaces were found to be socially equalising with a combination of people, young, old, rich, poor, foreign and local mixing within them. Regarding these social relations in the street food environment, many positive observations were made. The research found evidence to suggest that the street food environment provides a place which appears to be relatively socially equalising (Oldenburg 1989). Amongst the vendors strong relationships were identified such as support networks and sharing of resources, illustrating strong levels of bonding social capital between certain types of vendors. However, it became apparent in the research that migrant vendors can face difficult challenges integrating themselves socially in the city with other vendors who perceive rural–urban migrant vendors as threatening their livelihoods by creating competition.

Street food was found to be significant to the cultural heritage and identity of Hanoi; the street vendors themselves represent a strong image of Hanoi and street food cuisine was considered authentic and unique to the city. These original aspects of Hanoi’s street food economy appear to contribute significantly to the cultural life of the city and it was felt that it was worthy of preservation. Street food also offered vendors and consumers a sense of place both day to day and through shared social memories. For these reasons street food in Hanoi appears to contribute to the principles of social sustainability regarding cultural heritage and sense of place.

A key reoccurring theme that emerged from this research concerns the heterogeneity of experiences between the different types of street food vendors. Frequently, migrant and mobile vendors were identified as having more negative experiences than those who sold food from fixed locations. For instance, mobile vendors often have additional overheads because they must pay to store their goods somewhere and/or pay for accommodation, whilst selling their goods at lower prices. In comparison to sellers with fixed locations, a smaller number of mobile vendors felt that selling street food helps them meet their basic needs. Mobile vendors also reported higher experiences of crime and feeling less safe than their fixed counterparts and, in addition, to more confrontations with the authorities. Tensions caused by inequalities experienced amongst different types of vendors is not an issue unique to Hanoi (Bromley and Mackie 2009a); however, in this context where many positive social aspects of street food vending were identified, the apparent hierarchy amongst street food vendors may echo wider societal inequalities that undermine the otherwise potential social sustainability of street food in Hanoi.
The key areas for improvement to reduce the inequalities amongst street food vendors and improve the social sustainability are threefold. Firstly, the participation of street food vendors of all types is required in civil society organisations to ensure voices from the most marginalised are being heard and so that their rights can be defended. This argument can be considered in parallel to recent work by Roever and Skinner (2016) who argue for more transparency regarding the implementation of vending legislation. A lack of clarity around vending regulations was highlighted in this research and improved transparency around the rules could potentially help alleviate some of the tensions. Secondly, efforts to promote safety and security for mobile and migrant vendors is needed as well as strategies to improve feelings of safety for consumers. This could also help make the street food environment more socially inclusive for migrant and mobile vendors which it currently appears not to be. Furthermore, promoting inclusion of ‘others’ may also help improve social inclusion more widely in society. Thirdly, this research specifically identified concerns regarding food hygiene and food safety. Consumers expressed anxiety over food hygiene practices and the quality of street food in Hanoi, and these issues need to be addressed before street food in Hanoi can be said to contribute fully to the principles to social sustainability. If street food is to be considered a viable sustainable urban food system, access to healthy, affordable and safe food for all must be guaranteed.

**Development of a Social Sustainability Framework for the Informal Economy**

Social sustainability is a messy concept (Moore and Bunce 2009) made up of a number of overlapping dimensions. A review of the literature revealed eight key dimensions of social sustainability which were brought together in this study to develop a conceptual framework which was then applied to the street food vending context for the first time. The framework provided a rigorous basis for understanding and mapping out the different tensions between the overlapping themes of social sustainability. As with the framework developed by Vallance et al. (2011) the framework used in this research does not attempt to deny the complexity of a social environment, but to try and make sense of it. As a result of applying a framework of social sustainability to the context of street food, food hygiene emerged as an important subject which inevitably did not arise in the social sustainability literature; subsequently the framework was adapted to incorporate this important issue.

Applying and testing the social sustainability framework revealed important details about the social life and social function of the street food environment in Hanoi. The adapted framework therefore offers a suitable model for future studies of street food.
Lessons for the Informal Economy

This research has highlighted a number of lessons for the informal economy. It is commonly acknowledged that policymakers frequently seek to remove informal workers, including street food vendors, on the grounds that they cause congestion, create unfair competition, are a public health risk and taint the city’s image, amongst other reasons (Cross 2000). In light of these accusations researchers have argued against interventions to remove street vending and for it to remain based on its clear economic benefits (Bromley and Mackie 2009a; Mackie et al. 2014) and because of the right to use public space (Meneses-Reyes and Caballero-Juárez 2014). However, despite such proclamations, the removal and harassment of street vendors still persist all over the world.

This study, for the first time, concentrates on the social benefits of street vending, focusing on food specifically. It moves beyond typically fleeting statements about social interactions (Mackie et al. 2014) to provide further details about different types of sociality that are facilitated by street vending. This does not mean to imply that the informal economy always contributes to principles of socially sustainability, but that more attention should be paid to the many social benefits it does have. The evidence provided in this research suggests that the informal economy is something worth protecting and supporting in the Hanoi context and it is felt that this could certainly be true elsewhere.

Future Research Directions

This section outlines two potential future research directions to build on this research.

Firstly, the framework developed in this research requires further application to test the findings in different contexts; this could include a democratic political context or a more politically active context where the outcomes under certain themes may be drastically different. This framework is also not limited to application in the developing world and could be applied to street food in the global north to expand on the research in an alternative context (Koch 2015; Mukhija and Loukaitou-Sideris 2014; Newman and Burnett 2013). Application of the framework to other contexts would not only allow it to be tested but also enable it to be further developed and adapted to suit different scenarios.

Secondly, the research explores a range of themes at a high level and any single dimension of the framework might be explored in greater depth. The specific context of the research would determine the most relevant dimension to explore, however based on the findings of this study, food justice and the role of the informal street food economy and its integration into the wider food system might be of particular interest. The networks amongst sellers and
food suppliers in other countries might, for example, be of interest to the informal street food economy. In Hanoi street food appeared to have a short supply chain with much of the produce coming from local areas, however, in other contexts such as sub-Saharan Africa the informal economy supply networks have been found to expand as far as China (Lyons et al. 2013).

This research has argued for a holistic understanding of street food in the informal economy using a framework of social sustainability. The intention has been to give appropriate weight to the social benefits of street food vending that have been overlooked in previous studies of street vending. The approach and framework used in this research is intended to offer policymakers and planners a possible way of exploring the social benefits, as well as clearly highlighting the weaknesses of a street food environment in order for these challenging environments to be managed more effectively. In doing so it is hoped that functioning, sustainable street food systems can be developed that are socially just, inclusive and which help to sustain street food cultures for future generations to enjoy.
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APPENDIX A

Interviewer: .......... Hoan Kiem Street Food Vendor Survey

No: ........

VNU University of Social Sciences and Humanities & Cardiff University

Date .......... Time ................. Location of Interview ....................................

Introduction: Hello. I'm a researcher from the VNU University of Humanities and Social Sciences working with Natalia Stutter, a PhD Student from Cardiff University, UK. We are carrying out a study on the social aspects of street food vending and are interested in finding out about the everyday social interactions and lives of street food sellers. All the information collected in the survey is strictly confidential. Would you be happy to give up an hour of your time to take part in an interview?

1. OBSERVED INFORMATION

1.1 Gender ............... 1 = Male 2 = Female

1.2 Fixed or mobile ........... 1 = Fixed 2 = Mobile

1.3 Type .................... 1 = Informal (stationary) 2 = Mobile 3 = Street Kitchen

1.4 Presentation ............. 1 = Bike 2 = Pole 3 = Kitchen

4 = Kiosk/Stall 5 = Box

6 Display on the ground 7 = Trolley

8 = Other (specify) ........................................................................

1.5 What is being sold? ...... 1 = Uncooked/Unprepared food 2 = Cooked food

2. VENDOR DETAILS

2.1 Age ..........................

2.2 Place of Birth? District ......................... Province

........................................

2.3 Where do you live? District ......................... Province

........................................

2.4 How far is this from Hoan Kiem? ............ 1 = < 5km 2 = 10 – 20km 3 = 20 - 30km

4 = Over 40km

2.5 How do you get to work? ............ 1 = Walk 2 = Bicycle 3 = Bus

4 = Motorcycle 5 = Other

(specify) ........................................................................
2.6 If you moved to Hanoi, what year did you move?
(specify)………………………………………………… (N/A)

3. BUSINESS DETAILS

3.1 How long have you been selling food here?
(specify)………………………………………………

3.2 What time of day do you sell? .......... 1 = All day  2 = Morning  3 = Afternoon
  4 = Evening  5 = other …………..

3.3 Why do you sell at this time?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.4 Have you ever sold food in a different location? If so, where?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….. (N/A)

3.5 If you sold somewhere else, why have you changed location?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

3.6 How many different people or places do you buy your goods/ingredients from? ………

3.7 Where do you mainly buy your goods/ingredients from?

- [ ] wholesale market
- [ ] Large public market
- [ ] local market
- [ ] specialist local goods merchant
- [ ] street vendor
- [ ] Other ………

3.8 How do you get hold of the goods? .......... 1 = Pick them up  2 = Get them delivered
  3 = other (specify) …………..

3.9 How often do you stock up? .......... 1 = More than once a day  2 = Once a day
  3 = A few times per week  4 = Less often

3.10 How long have you been buying from your main supplier? .......... (days / months / years)

3.11 Why do you continue to buy from this supplier?

- [ ] Cheap
- [ ] Best
- [ ] Reliable
- [ ] Good customer service
- [ ] Support a friend’s business
- [ ] Support a family business
- [ ] Other ………

3.12 How would you describe your relationship with your suppliers?

1 = business like  2 = friendly  3 = indifferent  4 = other ………

3.13 Do you pay to rent your pitch/premises?  1 = Yes  2 = No  If yes, to whom? ….Amount: VND/………..  Period: 1 = a day  2 = a week  3 = a month
  4 = other (specify) …………..

3.14 Do you pay any other fees to enable you to trade? (e.g. bribes) .......... 1 = Yes  2 = No
For what? ......................................................... To whom? ..............................

Amount: VND/............ Period: 1 = a day ....... 2 = a week ....... 3 = a month......
4 = other (specify) ...........

3.15 Do you pay tax on sells? ...........1 = Yes 2 = No
3.16 Do you share your space with any other business? ..........1 = Yes 2 = No
3.17 How does this work? (please explain)
.................................................................................................................................
3.18 Do you have any employees? ......... 1 = Yes 2 = No How many? .........
3.19 Who are your employees? 1= Family members 2 = Friends 3 = someone previously unknown
4 = other (specify) .............
3.20 How did you obtain access to your trading site/premises?
1 = through family 2 = from the government 3 = through an external landlord 4 = through
another trader 5 = other (please specify) .........................................................

3.21 Is anyone able to sell food on the street? (E.g. are certificates or licences’ needed)
.................................................................................................................................

3.22 Why did you decide to sell you particular product?
.................................................................................................................................

IF A MOBILE OR INFORMAL VENDOR:

3.23 Do you trade in the same spaces every day/follow the same route? ........ 1 = Yes 2 = No
Please explain why?
.................................................................................................................................

IF SELLING COOKED FOOD

3.24 Where does your recipe come from?
.................................................................................................................................

3.25 Who taught you to cook?
.................................................................................................................................

3.26 Has this influenced you to sell this particular type of food in Hanoi?
.................................................................................................................................

IF AT A STREET KITCHEN

3.27 If the cooking equipment is outside the door/ or at the front of the shop, please ask why it
is positioned here?
.................................................................................................................................
(N/A)
4. SOCIAL INTERACTION AND NETWORKS

4.1 How many other vendors/street food sellers do you regularly interact with? ...........
   1 = None   2 = 1 – 5   3 = 6 - 10   4 = 10 +

4.2 How often do you interact with other vendors? ...........
   1 = More than once per day   2 = Once a day   3 = A few times per week   4 = Once a week
   5 = Less often   6 = other ........

4.3 How important are these connections to you?

Not at all   Quite   Neither   Quite   Very important
important       unimportant   important or       important
unimportant

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

4.4 In what ways do you engage with other vendors? (Select all that apply).
☐ I watch their goods   ☐ I look after their children   ☐ I help them with selling   ☐ I help them with cooking/preparation   ☐ I pick up their stock for them   ☐ I eat breakfast/ lunch/ dinner / with them (circle which meal)   ☐ We make small talk   ☐ We gossip   ☐ We talk about business   ☐ We talk about our personal lives   ☐ Other…………………………

4.5 Are there any other things which make these relationships important to you?
………………………………………………

4.6 Who are your customers? (select all that apply) ☐ Manager and Senior Officials
   ☐ Professionals   ☐ Mid-Level Professionals and Clerks   ☐ Service sector staff (sales and hospitality etc.)   ☐ Craftsmen and traders   ☐ Assemblers and machine operators’
   ☐ Skilled manual workers   ☐ Unskilled   ☐ Unemployed   ☐ Students   ☐ Tourists   ☐ Other………………

4.7 How often do customers return to you? ...........
   1 = Always   2 = Often   3 = Sometimes
   4 = Rarely   5 = Never

4.8 How many repeat customers do you have who buy from you (enter number of people):
   1) Daily? ...........
   2) several times per week? ...........
   3) Once a week? ...........
   4) Less often? ........

4.9 How would you describe your relationships with your customers? ...........
   1 = Friendly   2 = Detached   3 = Business like
   4 = Other ………………………………………

4.10 How do your customers generally interact with you? ...........
   1 = they just buy their food
   2 = we make small talk   3 = we talk about the food   4 = other………..
4.11 How often do different types of customer interact with each other? (I.e. poor/rich or tourists/locals)

1 = Always  2 = Sometimes  3 = Rarely  4 = Never

4.12 Please describe the extent to which customers interact with each other:

4.13 In addition to eating, what do your customers do when purchasing food? ..... 1 = Nothing  
2 = Chat  3 = People watch  4 = Use their phones/computers  5 = Play games/cards 
6 = other (specify)........ N/A

4.14 How often do the following clients purchase from you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several times per week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other street traders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15 How often do you have disputes/conflicts with the following people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Less than once per month</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other street traders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market regulators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.16 Please explain why you think these conflicts take place?
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................

4.17 If there are problems with officials, how are these usually resolved?
1 = individual negotiation with payment   2 = individual negotiation without payment
3 = through trader association   4 = through market administrator   5 = Other
(specific)........................................................................................................................................

5. PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

5.1 Are you aware of any informal or formal street food vendor associations or organisations in Hanoi? ........
1 = Yes   2 = No

5.2 Are you a member of any kind of street food vendor organisation or association? ........
1 = Yes   2 = No
If yes please explain what the purpose of the group is?

..................................................................................................................................................

Advantages of membership?
..................................................................................................................................................

5.3 If you are not, why not? (please explain decision)
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

5.4 Have you ever been asked for your views on development policies and plans going on in the city (e.g. masterplan)? ........ 1 = Yes 2 = No

5.5 If yes, please explain how you were engaged in these discussions’?
..................................................................................................................................................
### QUALITY OF LIFE

**6.1 To what extent do you agree:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Selling street food allows me to meet my basic needs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Selling street food makes me happy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Selling street food means I am helping to feed the city's population affordably</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Selling street food allows me to interact with others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Selling street food makes me feel part of the community</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY AND SECURITY

**7.1 Do you feel safe whilst selling food in the street? **

1 = Yes 2 = No

What specifically makes you feel safe or unsafe?

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7.2 Have YOU ever been a victim of any of these crimes?**

1 = harassment 2 = theft of goods 3 = physical assault 4 = other (please specify)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7.3 If yes, please explain what happened**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7.4 Have OTHER TRADERS nearby suffered from any of the crimes mentioned in 7.2 (give the story)**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**7.5 Have these experiences influenced where you sell your goods?**

1 = Yes 2 = No

If yes, how?

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
# CULTURAL HERITAGE AND SENSE OF PLACE

## 8.1 To what extent is street food important to Hanoi’s Identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Quite unimportant</th>
<th>Neither important or unimportant</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 8.2 Why do you say this?

........................................................................................................................................................................

## 8.3 Are there any particular parts of Hoan Kiem that are known for street food?

........................................................................................................................................................................

## 8.4 How important is street food to people’s everyday life in Hanoi?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Quite unimportant</th>
<th>Neither important or unimportant</th>
<th>Quite important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 8.5 What do you think are the main challenges facing street food vendors in Hanoi?

........................................................................................................................................................................

## 8.6 Do you believe people should be allowed to sell food on the street? 1 = Yes  2 = No


## EQUITY

## 9.1 Whilst selling, do you have access to the following services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free Access</th>
<th>Paid Access</th>
<th>Not required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean Running Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity/Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigeration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Do you believe everyone is provided with an equal opportunity to sell food in the city if they want to? Please explain.

9.3 How fairly are you treated by the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very unfairly</th>
<th>Unfairly</th>
<th>Neither unfairly or fairly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Very fairly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Your customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The general public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4 Please explain what you understand by ‘fair’ treatment?

9.5 Does your job allow you to earn enough money to meet your basic needs? ........
   1 = Yes   2 = No
   (food, shelter, children’s education etc.)

9.6 Is there anything which prevents you from carrying out your job (e.g. lack of transport, space to sell goods)?

9.7 Are there places in Hoan Kiem district where street food is banned, or discouraged?

9.8 Do you believe selling street food is regarded as a legitimate livelihood by others? ........
   1 = Yes   2 = No

9.9 Why do you think this is? (Please explain)

10 Any other information

10.1 What do you perceive to be the main advantages of street food?

10.2 What do you perceive to be the main disadvantages of street food?
10.3  What do you think will happen if you are relocated?

10.4  If street food is removed from the city streets, where will your customers go to buy their food (and socialise)?

10.5  Is there any other information regarding the social aspects of your job that you wish to discuss with us that we have missed which you think are important?

Thank you for completing this survey.
APPENDIX B

Hanoi Street Food Consumer Survey

Cardiff University and VNU University of Social Sciences and Humanities

Purpose Statement

This survey is being carried out by Natalia Stutter, a research student at the School of Planning and Geography at Cardiff University, UK. Natalia has spent some time in Hanoi and has become fascinated by its vibrant street life - particularly the street food. The aim of this study is to find out more about what consumers think about the social aspects of the street food environment. For the purposes of this study 'street food' includes any food which can be bought or consumed on the street, whether on the go or at a street kitchen. It also takes into account un-prepared/uncooked foods in addition to cooked foods. The geographical focus of this study is the Hoan Kiem District, Hanoi.

Before continuing to the study, please take time to read through the ethical statements below.

Ethical Agreement

I understand that my participation in this study will involve completing an online questionnaire about my opinions of street food in Hoan Kiem, Hanoi.

I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, that I do not have to complete all of the questions if I do not want to, and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without giving reason.

I understand that I am free to contact the researcher anytime with any questions or concerns I may have.

I understand that the information provided will be held anonymously, and it will be impossible to trace this information back to me individually.

I understand that the data will be held indefinitely and will be used as part of the researcher’s doctoral thesis and in presentations, reports and publications.

At the end of the questionnaire I will be asked for personal contact information which will allow the researcher to follow up with an interview. I understand that the sharing of identifiable information is entirely voluntary and any information that I do share will be treated with the utmost confidentiality and used by the researcher for contact purposes only.
By selecting "I give consent" below you indicate that you are over 18 and have read and understood the above statements, and that you consent to participate in this survey.

☐ I give consent

☐ I do not give consent
SECTION 1: Personal Characteristics

1.1. Gender

☐ Male ☐ Female

1.2 Age Group

☐ 18-24 ☐ 25-34
☐ 35-44 ☐ 45-54
☐ 55-64 ☐ Over 65

1.3 Area of Residence

☐ Hoan Kiem District ☐ Hoang Mai
☐ Hai Ba Trung ☐ Long Bien
☐ Dong Da ☐ Cau Giay
☐ Tay Ho ☐ Other .........................
☐ Thanh Xuan ☐
☐ Gai Lam

1.4 Area of Occupation

☐ Leader/Manager ☐ Assemblers and machine operators
☐ High-level professional ☐ Skilled manual worker or related
☐ Mid-level professional ☐ Cau Giay
☐ Clerk ☐ Unskilled occupation
☐ Personal services, protective workers or sales worker ☐ Other .........................
☐ Craft and related traders

SECTION 2: Consumer Use

2.1 Do you buy cooked or unprepared food from street vendors? (please select just one option)

☐ Cooked ☐ Uncooked/Unprepared
☐ Both ☐ None (go to section 3)
2.2 Which types of vendors do you buy cooked food from? (please select all that apply)

- Street Kitchens (food sold from a fixed premises, with dining area on the pavement)
- 'Informal' Street Vendors (no fixed premises)
- Mobile Vendors (those wandering the streets)
- Other 

2.3 Which types of vendors do you buy uncooked or unprepared food from? (please select all that apply)

- Street Market (Outdoor)
- Informal Street Vendors (goods sold from a fixed spot, but not part of an outdoor market)
- Mobile Vendors (those wandering the streets with poles, on bikes etc.)

2.4 How often do you purchase street food (which can be consumed immediately)?
(please select one answer for each meal time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several times per week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less often than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Where do you buy street food from most often? (Please give the street name)

...........................................................................................................

2.5.1 Why do you buy street food here?

- Convenient
- Cheap
- Recommended
- Family go here
- Friends go here
- Colleagues go here
- I know the vendor
- Other

2.5.2 Which meals do you buy here? (please select all that apply)

- Breakfast
- Lunch
- Dinner
- Snacks
- Other 
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2.6 Please list 5 other places you buy street food (please provide street name)

1. ..............................................................................................................
2. ..............................................................................................................
3. ..............................................................................................................
4. ..............................................................................................................
5. ..............................................................................................................

2.6.1 Using the streets above 1-5 please indicate what meal times you most often buy from this street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Dinner</th>
<th>Snacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2 Please indicate the reasons why you buy street food from Street 1 (select all that apply)

☐ Convenient
☐ Cheap
☐ Recommended
☐ Family go here
☐ Friends go here
☐ Colleagues go here
☐ I know the vendor
☐ Other.................................

2.6.3 Please indicate the reasons why you buy street food from Street 2 (select all that apply)

☐ Convenient
☐ Cheap
☐ Recommended
☐ Family go here
☐ Friends go here
☐ Colleagues go here
☐ I know the vendor
☐ Other.................................
2.6.4 Please indicate the reasons why you buy street food from Street 3 (select all that apply)

☐ Convenient  ☐ Friends go here
☐ Cheap  ☐ Colleagues go here
☐ Recommended  ☐ I know the vendor
☐ Family go here  ☐ Other……………………………………….

2.6.5 Please indicate the reasons why you buy street food from Street 4 (select all that apply)

☐ Convenient  ☐ Friends go here
☐ Cheap  ☐ Colleagues go here
☐ Recommended  ☐ I know the vendor
☐ Family go here  ☐ Other……………………………………….

2.6.6 Please indicate the reasons why you buy street food from Street 5 (select all that apply)

☐ Convenient  ☐ Friends go here
☐ Cheap  ☐ Colleagues go here
☐ Recommended  ☐ I know the vendor
☐ Family go here  ☐ Other……………………………………….

2.7 Considering cooked and unprepared food, to what extent do you purchase food from the same vendor(s)?

1  2  3  4  5
Never  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  Always

2.8 How often do you eat street food in the following places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several times per week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less often than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At a street kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.9 How often do you eat street food with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Several times per week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less often than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 3: Perception of Street Food Environment

Please rate on the scales provided below to what extent you agree with each statement. If you don’t know, please leave question blank.

#### 3.1 Street food is an accessible source of food for everyone

If you don’t know, please leave question blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3.2 People chat to one another when buying a selling street food

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

3.3 People buying and selling street food will meet people with different incomes and backgrounds

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

3.4 The street food environment is a safe place to be

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

3.5 Street food is a part of Hanoi's cultural identity

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

3.6 Street food should be removed from public space

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree
3.7 Street food is an important part of everyday life for people in Hanoi

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □
Strongly agree □ □ □ □ □

3.8 Vendors and consumers should be asked their opinion about the selling of street food before any new rules are put in place by authorities

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □
Strongly agree □ □ □ □ □

3.9 Buying and eating street food makes people happy

If you don't know, please leave question blank.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree □ □ □ □ □
Strongly agree □ □ □ □ □

SECTION 4: Street Food Experiences

4.1 Have you ever witnessed any of the following crimes in the street food environment?
(to yourself or others)

☐ Mugging  ☐ Dealing of illegal goods
☐ Theft  ☐ Other............................................................
☐ Physical assault
4.2 Have you ever witnessed any of the following? (please tick all that apply)

☐ Food vendors being forcefully removed from the street
☐ Food vendors arrested when they have been selling good where they shouldn't

☐ Food vendors having their goods confiscated
☐ Food vendors asked to leave their position on the street

4.3 Have you ever been invited to participate in discussions regarding the regulation or future of street food?
☐ Yes ☐ No

4.3.1 If 'yes' what did these discussions involve?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4.4 Through consuming street food, have you ever:
(please tick all that apply)

☐ Made friends with other consumers
☐ Met new business acquaintances
☐ Made friends with a street food vendor
☐ Had an argument with another consumer
☐ Engaged positively with people outside your own social group (different background, income group etc.)
☐ Had negative experiences interacting with others in the street food environment
☐ Had an argument with a vendor
☐ None of the above
☐ Other……………………………………………………

4.5 What role does street food play in your everyday life? (please tick all that apply)

☐ It helps me to fulfil my nutritional needs
☐ It allows me the freedom to choose what food I eat
☐ It helps me to fulfil my social needs
☐ Other………………………………………………..
SECTION 5: Final Remarks

5.1 What do you think are the main challenges facing street food in Hanoi?

..............................................................................................................................................................

5.2 What do you think are the most negative aspects of street food vending?

..............................................................................................................................................................

5.3 What do you think are the most positive aspects of street food vending?

..............................................................................................................................................................

5.4 Any other comments?

..............................................................................................................................................................

Personal Details

If you would be interested in taking part in a follow up interview, please leave your details below.

Name:

Contact Telephone Number:

Email Address:

How would you prefer to be contacted?

☐ Telephone ☐ Email

Survey End

Thank you for participating in this survey.

If you have any questions about this study please contact Natalia Stutter, PhD Researcher at Cardiff University at StutterN@cardiff.ac.uk