

## THE EFFECT OF INFORMALITY AND INEQUALITY AGAINST INFORMAL WORKERS

Narumol Nirathron<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

This paper discusses linkages between informality and inequality, focusing on inequalities faced by workers in the informal economy. Specifically, the paper highlights the street vending context in Bangkok and how urbanization, globalization, and reinforcement of government policies perpetuate inequalities and employment precarity, especially during the Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Data from a survey research conducted from 2020 to 2021 are presented to support the argument. The target groups are street food vendors, buyers and vendors in the raw material sources. Findings reveal the employment situation, linkages between informality and inequality, consequences of government pandemic-era policies and practices. The recommendations are offered to reduce inequality.

**Keywords:** Informality, Inequality, Street vending

### Introduction

Informal economy is vital to employment internationally, not just in developing countries. In 2018, the International Labour Organization (ILO) estimated that two billion workers, or 61.2 percent of employed people, worked in this sector (ILO, 2018a). Disadvantages of informal workers include low capital, educational levels, and income precarity in old age as well as job insecurity and inadequate employment and social protection and promotion. This leads to insufficient risk preparation. In addition, informal worker protection is more complicated than for formal economy workers due to the number of agencies involved and lack of labor protection laws, as well as lack of public awareness and corresponding obliviousness reflected in government policies. Informal work occupations range from street vending, homework, recycling, domestic duties,

manual tasks and transportation-related activities such as driving taxis (automobiles, motorcycles, et al.). These laborers play significant roles in urban life, but their livelihoods are vulnerable to the macroeconomic situation and urban policy as well as different economic shocks. (Reed et al., 2017, p. 6).

The role of the informal economy in Thailand is significant in terms of economic contribution and employment. In 2020, informal economy workers accounted for 53.8 percent of employees in Thailand. In Bangkok, informal workers comprised 25.7 percent of laborers (National Statistical Office, 2021). In terms of economic contribution, the informal economy amounted to one-fourth of the official gross

---

<sup>1</sup>Professor Dr., Labour and Welfare Development Specialization, Faculty of Social Administration, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand  
E-mail : narumolnira@hotmail.com ; lwnn@staff.tu.ac.th, corresponding author

domestic product (GDP)<sup>2</sup>. The informal sector was estimated at its largest dimensions in 1998, as an effect of the 1997 Asian financial crisis. This reflected the cushioning function of the informal economy (Buddhari and Rugpentum, 2019, p.5). A high percentage of informal workers implies that they are vital to revitalizing economic and social potential under changes accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Traditionally, informal workers have been treated unequally and in Thailand, they have been most severely affected. (ILO, 2020a, p.1).

This research article addresses issues of informality and inequality faced by Bangkok street vendors. The first section presents the situation of informal workers. The second section presents the framework, the informal workers, street vending, and vendors. This section highlights informal workers and informality. It portrays the situation of informal workers based on the National Statistical Office of Thailand (NSO) survey. It links to the third section, analyzing inequality and how policies perpetuate inequality experienced by street vendors due to the pandemic's impact. Data collected in 2020 about Bangkok street vendors will be presented to support the arguments. The final section contains recommendation on reducing inequality.

### **Informal Workers in Thailand: The Situation**

The NSO defines informal workers as workers who are unprotected, lacking the social security customary in formal employment (NSO,

2015). This official definition captures the inequality between workers in the two sectors.

In 2020 informal workers account for 53.7 percent of employees in Thailand. Of this number, 55.6 percent work in the agricultural sector (NSO, 2021). Despite the annual survey of informal workers by the National Statistical Office, there is no reliable registration data on the informal workers by occupations.

Many government agency mandates address work activities, occupational diversity, and job aspects. For example, governance of street vending involves issues of entrepreneurship, food safety, tax and revenue, public space use. This extends over at least four agencies pertaining to business promotion, food safety, tax collection, and public space and environmental monitoring. For the Bangkok metropolis, the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA) has authority to supervise street vending. But in practical terms, the City Law Office dominates. This demonstrates how the BMA considers street vending as an issue of public space, rather than other dimensions. Other BMA divisions which should supervise street vending include the Health Department. Unlike formally established workers, whose protection and promotion is assigned to the Ministry of Labour, no agency assumes responsibility for protecting informal workers. Governance of the self-employed depends on occupation. For example, motorcycle-taxi drivers must register with the Department of Land Transport, Ministry of Transport, and BMA district office.

<sup>2</sup> Estimation was based on electricity consumption approach. The currency demand approach came up with

the size of informal economy in Thailand as 38.76% of GNP (Buddhari and Rugpentum, 2019, p.5)

### Informal Workers and Decent Work

Using economic opportunity, workers' rights, social protection and employee voice, the four pillars of decent work, as criteria, the situation of informal workers in Thailand is clearly deficient<sup>3</sup>. Apart from statistical findings, research also shows that limited employment opportunities and work-related problems amount to restricted labor rights. Thailand has a relatively comprehensive social protection system, although benefits provided has often been deemed inadequate. In addition, there are barriers to service and some limitations to service quality (WIEGO & Homenet Thailand, 2017). But informal workers are not covered by any work-related social protection scheme. In fact, extant

social protection schemes fail to address the root causes of the problem: invisibility of informal workers and prejudice against street vendors. If we consider social protection in terms of root cause of risks as well as service provided, social protection should be transformative<sup>4</sup>. Yet no law promotes informal worker collective action organization. Informal workers have seen difficulty of organizing as a leading problem.

Table 2 outlines differences between formal and informal workers according to the decent work framework. For own-account workers, the difference is mainly in terms of access to capital; informal workers cannot use employment as collateral.

**Table 1:** Decent work pillars for formal and informal workers

Decent work pillars	Formal Workers	Informal Workers
Productive employment	Dependent on economic situation.	Dependent on economic situation. But urban policy is uncondusive.
Rights and Protection	Labor Protection Act, B.E. 2541 (1998)	-
Social Protection (through work)	Social Security Act, B.E. 2533 (1990) (Section 33 : 7 types of benefits) Workmen's Compensation Act, B.E. 2537 (1994)	Universal Health Coverage Social Security Act, B.E. 2533 (1990) (Section 40) : Voluntary basis; 3 options; benefits depend on option
Social dialogue	Labor Relations Act, B.E. 2518 (1975)	-

Source: Compiled by the author

<sup>3</sup> According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), decent work 'involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men' The four pillars of decent work are: full

and productive employment; rights at work; social protection; and promotion of social dialogue (ILO, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> 'Transformative' refers to the pursuit of policies that integrate individuals equally into society, allowing everyone to take advantage of the benefits of growth, and enabling excluded or marginalized groups to claim their rights.

### **Informal Workers and Inequality: The framework**

Informal economy activities have been linked to underdevelopment. They were seen as temporary and non-standard, as opposed to formal economy employment, with labor laws protecting workers. Generally, there are two job types: paid (employees) and self-employed (employers, own-account workers, contributing family workers, and members of producer cooperatives). Own-account workers and contributing family workers are likelier to lack elements associated with decent employment, such as adequate social security and worker voice. These two categories are classified as vulnerable employment (ILO, 2018b).

Longstanding dominance by the formal economy and the fact that most workers in developed countries are formally employed overshadows the existence of informal economy workers in developing countries. In addition, working informally overlaps with poverty, with elevated percentages of informal workers experiencing employment vulnerability. Informal employment also significantly overlaps with non-income dimensions of inequality, with less access to decent work compared to formal economy workers (Chen and Carr, 2020, pp. 2-3).

According to Chen, informal workers face inequalities between capital and labor as well as between formal and informal work; and within the informal economy. Inequality between capital and labor derives from technological progress enabling owners of capital to exploit workers in diverse ways. Informal workers encounter greater deficits than formal workers in terms of the four pillars of decent work, according to the Decent Work Agenda developed in 1999 by the ILO. The self-employed

are more prone to risks such as policy uncertainty and hostility as well as economic shocks due to limited legal and social protection (Chen, 2019, pp. 2-3).

Studies on informal workers in Thailand reveal inequalities in income, labor protection, access to social protection, occupational rights, access to capital, and organization (Chaiwat, 2016, pp. 5-6).

These inequalities differ by employment status. For employees, labor protection, access to social protection and organization are highly significant, as they are not otherwise protected by labor law. For own-account workers who are already vulnerable, further challenges exist in terms of occupational rights, access to capital, and organization to guarantee livelihoods. Imparity between capital and labor is reflected when capital owners contract labor without contributing to worker benefits or protections, as well as the growing number of convenience stores compared to the declining amount of street vendors<sup>5</sup>.

An NSO survey about workers in the two economic sectors is informative (Table 1). Informal economy workers tend to be older, with lower educational levels. The percentage of those employed for fewer than 40 hours weekly implies that informal workers tend to be underemployed. By contrast, the percentage of workers with over 50 hours of employment suggest that some are overworked. The high percentage of own-account workers and contributing family workers signifies high levels of vulnerable employment. Issues revealed by the survey demonstrate a lack of rights and social protection.

<sup>5</sup> 7-Eleven, a convenient store that offers fresh and a wide variety of non-food and food products, ready-to-eat meals, and beverages operated by CP. 7-Eleven outlets in Thailand expanded from 7,429 outlets in

2014 to 12,432 outlets in 2020 (CP ALL 2014; 2021). On the contrary the number of street vendors in Bangkok were 20,170 and 7,996 for the same years (Nirathron, 2020; City Law Office, 2020a)

**Table 2:** Selected statistics on formal and informal workers

(% of respondents)

Aspects	2015		2017		2020	
	Formal	Informal	Formal	Informal	Formal	Informal
<b>Characteristics</b>						
Percentage of employed persons	44.1	55.9	44.8	55.2	46.3	53.7
45 years and over	28.0	55.0	29.1	56.9	31.6	59.7
60 years and over	2.6	16.2	2.8	17.9	3.5	20.1
Primary education level	27.6	62.6	25.9	60.5	24.5	57.2
<b>Weekly work hours</b>						
10-39 hours	18.4	33.3	17.0	31.6	21.2	38.4
50 hours and over	17.7	25.6	17.3	26.1	10.2	18.8
<b>Employment status</b>						
Employer	1.3	4.1	0.9	4.1	0.9	3.6
Own-account workers	3.0	55.0	2.7	55.0	4.0	57.0
Contributing family workers	1.5	31.9	1.3	31.2	1.7	31.0
<b>Average employee salary (THB)</b>						
Agriculture	6,458	5,010	6,136	5,210	6,182	5,394
Manufacturing	12,464	6,624	13,002	7,139	13,920	7,362
Trade and service	12,049	7,465	16,729	6,869	17,405	7,400
<b>Problems</b>						
	2015		2017		2020	
Income	51.5		56.0		47.6	
Discontinuous work	18.2		16.1		19.1	
Hard labor	18.0		14.7		15.1	
No welfare	6.0		7.1		8.2	
No holiday	1.5		1.4		1.9	

Source: NSO (2015, 2018 and 2021)

### Street vending in Bangkok: A Testimony to Inequality

Despite its economic, social and cultural contributions, street vending in Bangkok has limited economic opportunities. This is due to many constraints, including local policy, limited space, and public attitudes towards street vending.

Debates on street vending in many cities, including Bangkok, contrast the need for livelihoods and intrusion into public space, traffic obstruction and unfair competition. There is also the image problem of backwardness and unsightliness seen by some as unsuitable for modern cities. Nevertheless, positive economic, social, and cultural elements of street vending ensure its ongoing practice, despite challenges to

vendors. Street vending is known to generate employment for people of diverse economic statuses, not just the underprivileged. This is due to many factors, including limited opportunities for wage employment, a search for flexibility by a new generation of workers, and potential earning opportunities from street vending activities (Nirathron & Yasmeen, 2019). Street vending participates in reducing social inequality, while itself inherently struggling against different forms of inequality.

Street vending in Bangkok is under BMA administration. Curtailing street vending has been on the BMA agenda since 1973. Periodic relaxations occurred due to economic exigencies such as the 1970s energy crisis (Nirathron, 2006). The Act on the Maintenance of the Cleanliness and Orderliness of the Country, B.E. 2535 (1992)

was a milestone for street vending. The Act permitted the sale of goods in public spaces as authorized by local officials (and as approved by the traffic police. Nevertheless, sales venues in Bangkok were incommensurate with the number of street vendors. Official counts of street vendors apparently do not reflect the reality in Bangkok. Recent statistics offered by Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) for 2017 and 2018 counted around 100,000 street vendors in Bangkok. Market traders were more numerous than street vendors during both years. (Poonsap, Vanek, & Carré, 2019). Notably, the official number of street vendors registered with the BMA comprised fewer than one tenth of these: 10,064 market traders and 8,163 street vendors, respectively. (Table 3)

**Table 3:** Number of street vendors and market traders in Bangkok

Years	BMA	WIEGO	
		Street vendors	Market traders
2013	21,065	N.A.	N.A.
2014	20,170	N.A.	N.A.
2017	10,064	143,838	167,118
2018	8,163	139,149	152,144
2019	8,021	N.A.	N.A.

Source: Nirathron (2020); Poonsap, Vanek & Carre (2019)

To some extent, the official count of street vendors in Bangkok reflects a failure in understanding a paradigm shift in employment. Indeed, self-employment becomes crucial due to limited wage employment at changing times in the global production system, combined with preferences among a young generation of workers for flexibility instead of fixed office hours. Street vending helps cultivate microentrepreneurship,

with potential for expansion into larger ventures with adequate support (Nirathron, 2006; Government Savings Bank, 2013; Nirathron, 2017). Street vending is also a vital link in the market value chain, from production farmers to fresh markets and consumers. It also promotes social and cultural capital, which is no less important than economic capital (Cross, 2000; Nirathron, 2006; Roever 2014)<sup>6</sup>. Many supplementary aspects

<sup>6</sup> Another example of paradigm shift in employment is the development of theories that explains the phenomena of street vending. The theories are :

Legalist School, Voluntarist Schools have been added to the Dualist School and Structuralist School (Chen, 2012)

of street vending are worthy of further consideration. (Nirathron, 2017) These signify diverse management aspects, not limited merely to space. By focusing only on the space issue, other significant aspects are overlooked, many of them with policy implications. Street vending may also be analyzed by temporal aspects, employment status, legal status, vendor economic status, skills classified in the International Standard Classification of Occupation (ILO, 2012), types of

goods sold, and reasons for vending (Table 4). Diverse classifications imply different aspects to managing street vending and vendors, such as protection, promotion, and development. For instance, policies should be sensitive to differences in economic status and types of foods sold. Vendors who sell food should be subject to strict regulation on food hygiene. Therefore, management of street vending, always challenging, requires careful consideration about these aspects.

**Table 4:** Diverse aspects of street vending

Aspects	Categories
Use of Space (McGee 1970, pp. 19-21)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Focus agglomeration (outside markets, transportation stations, in the community)</li> <li>2. Street hawkers</li> <li>3. Bazaars or periodic markets</li> </ol>
Temporary or permanent (Wakefield, Castillo, and Beguin, 2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sideline (by event)</li> <li>2. Opportunistic (depends on circumstances)</li> <li>3. Nomadic</li> <li>4. Traditional transient (on the street or in public spaces)</li> </ol>
Employment status (Bromley and Gerry, 1979)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. True self-employment</li> <li>2. Disguised wage work (earned commissions)</li> <li>3. Dependent work (depending on company for goods sold)</li> </ol>
Legal status (Greenburg, Topol, Sherman and Cooperman, 1980)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Legitimate vendors (legally registered)</li> <li>2. Ephemeral vendors (temporary, unregistered)</li> <li>3. Underground vendors (unregistered, more permanent than ephemeral)</li> </ol>
Vendor economic status (Nirathron, 2004)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subsistence level earnings</li> <li>2. Accumulated capital, preference to maintain size</li> <li>3. Accumulated capital, desire to expand trade</li> </ol>
Standard of Occupation (ISCO-08) (ILO, 2012, pp. 246-7)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 5212 (Food vendors): Skills level 2</li> <li>2. 9520 (Non-food vendors): Skills level 1</li> </ol>
Types of goods sold	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Non-food</li> <li>2. Food (vegetable, fruit, made to order, ready-made, ready-to-cook, and others)</li> </ol>
Reasons for vending	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Survival strategy</li> <li>2. Voluntary (including perceived opportunities)</li> </ol>

Source: Nirathron (2560)

While the BMA focus on the issue of space and obstruction of traffic, studies confirm that street vending does not obstruct pedestrian traffic. On the contrary, pedestrians prefer walking on streets where vendors are present. Street vending is seen as providing eyes on the street in the well-known phrase of the theorist Jane Jacobs, providing informal surveillance of the urban environment. Walking in areas with street stalls helps stimulate the economy (Phutnark, 2020).

The number of street vendors in Bangkok increased significantly after the 1997 Asian financial crisis. Street vending gradually transformed from a survival strategy of impoverished workers into an alternative occupation for more advantaged employees. This was due to changes in attitudes about self-employment offering more flexibility than salaried jobs. The paradigmatic employment shift made wage employment seem relatively limited. Street vendors range across different economic levels, from subsistence to accumulated capital ready for expansion. Vendors selling in prohibited areas are willing to pay fines in exchange for opportunities to sell at popular locations. Some resort to illicit means, including bribery, to be tolerated in such places. The sentiment towards street vending depends on management effectiveness and good governance. Bangkok residents with negative impressions about street vending may be reflecting ineffective management. This produces multiple consequences. First, it makes many street vendors resort to illicit means to sell in prohibited areas. Street vendors who resort to this approach feel that they have purchased irrevocable rights. Secondly, this situation renders expansion uncontrollable. Thirdly, it creates negative public feeling about street vending as disorderly obstruction of traffic.

One study on street vendors and buyers (Nirathron, 2017) found that most vendors are forty years old or more. Their highest educational level was primary school and their main income derived from street vending. Ongoing concerns for street vendors include local government policies and health risks (*ibid.*). Health is a matter of concern because vending requires irregular work hours. Some vendors toil seven days weekly. Those who sell during mornings must arise by 2 or 3 a.m. to prepare their wares. Those who sell during evenings usually start in the late afternoon and continue until after midnight. Irregular working hours have long-term effects on health (Angsuthonsombat, 2019, p.2). Still, the study confirms that the salespeople did not opt for vending because of limited choice. High percentages of vendors cited autonomy as a motivation for vending. Street vending was the principal source of income. Vendors had long working hours, some from ten to twelve hours daily, including preparation and cleanup after closing. The findings also confirmed the role of the fresh market as materials source. Challenges experienced by vendors included sales locations, access to capital, toilet facilities, utilities, and illicit fees demanded by state officers, reflecting deficits in employment opportunities. The same study situated buyers in lower income groups. Food sold by vendors were significant food sources for consumers from different income levels, especially those earning low incomes. The average investment was 2,237 baht<sup>7</sup> and earnings 3,208 baht, with daily profit of 971 baht. The investment reflects backward linkage to the market and producers, as 80 percent of vendors purchased materials from fresh markets, strengthening the grassroots economy of informal workers.

---

<sup>7</sup> 1 baht is equivalent to 0.029 USD or 0.20 RMB (May 26, 2022)

A study on food security based on 2017 data stated that traditional retail stores and street vending have a 32 percent market share, generating 3.34 million jobs (86.3 percent of total employment). This far exceeds 460,000 modern retail stores and convenient store jobs (13.7 percent of total employment). Each modern retail store generates 14 to 15 jobs, whereas traditional retail sales generates 287 jobs. Food from traditional retail stores is more diverse, involving many agricultural producers, micro- and small scale entrepreneurs, compared to modern retail and convenience store food, which is likelier to originate from group company channels (Bio-Thai, 2020).

#### Ban on street vending

In 2014, BMA began to restrict vending in sites as part of a program to return pavements to pedestrians. Restrictions started in a mission to restore order to Bangkok streets, eventually escalating into a ban of street vending. Under the campaign, hundreds of legal vending sites lost a designated status. Relocations occurred on short notice under threat of fines, and bans have been placed on daytime vending. Some vendors were evicted to locations which could not generate sufficient income, leading them to return to their original sites. The order to ban street vending is in effect an exclusionary process. Worse, the ban lacks accompanying support or compensation that might otherwise assist vendors to continue earning livelihoods. By contrast, in 2013, the BMA permitted the highest-ever number of locations and vendors<sup>8</sup>.

In 2017, an advisor to the governor of Bangkok announced that vendors would be cleared from the remainder of the city within four

months, but allowed in two of the city's prime tourist destinations as part of the focus on improved hygiene and safety.

By 2018, a research on 23 Bangkok locations reveals that the ban significantly impacted vendors. They earned up to 70 percent less than before the ban and struggled to economize on what remained of their incomes. Many are responsible for mortgages, car leasing, and student tuition fees. Some have to provide financial and physical support to disabled children, parents, grandparents and other relatives. In several instances, children had to be withdrawn from school to alleviate financial strain. Many families were forced to reduce or suspend spending to support these dependents after the vending ban. Some vendors accumulated debt, including through informal usurers (Angsuthonsombat, 2019, pp. 3-4).

Lacking revenue to support their vending businesses, others have switched to new jobs. Some former vendors have become security guards or motorcycle taxi drivers. Others have entered domestic work as cleaners or carers. They earn less in these occupations and may face higher occupational health and safety-related risks. Those with financial responsibilities or required expenditures often take the risk of selling in their original spaces or smaller alleyways. (*Ibid.*)

Evictions halted in 2020, temporarily delayed by BMA due to economic hardships from the COVID-19 pandemic. In 2020, the number of street vendors reduced from 21,065 in 726 locations to 8,021 in 175 locations. Nevertheless, many vendors remained in business. They agreed to pay fines and unofficial service fees in exchange for permission to sell even after the

<sup>8</sup> The campaign "Street Vending: Charms of the City" started in 2011. In 2012 BMA and the Metropolitan Police Bureau came to accept that street vending is here to stay. Orderliness is important for the coexistence of

street vendors and the people who use public space. Locations permitted for selling increased from 667 areas in 2008 to 726 areas in 2013 (Nirathron, 2014; Yasmeen and Nirathron, 2014)

return pavements to pedestrians campaign was launched.

#### The struggle for living and the counter movement

This round of street vending evictions in Bangkok was not the first of its kind. But evictions during this time were the most extreme and far-reaching that the city ever experienced (*ibid.*, p.1). The official figures for street vendors from 2013 to 2020 indicate that almost 12,000 lost their licenses. Adding the aforementioned unlicensed vendors, the numbers affected are likely far higher than the official statistics.

Other phenomena emerging from the situation included formation of the Network of Thai Street Vendors for Sustainable Development (NEST) representing vendors from 23 districts and 34 vending areas in Bangkok. NEST's aim was to provide support and solidarity to vendors and protect their rights<sup>9</sup>. NEST committed to 1) mobilize members to participate in consultations, pilot projects, training, festivals and pedestrian streets, and other events organized by the BMA

or district offices; 2) ensuring that members complied with all city-level ordinances regulating vending, including stall size, distance to pedestrian areas, and fees; 3) safeguarding that members adhere to local-level rules, customs, and good practices, including waste management, uniform wearing, and market zoning by product (NEST, WIEGO & HomeNet Thailand, 2018). NEST engaged in several activities to reinstate street vending independently and in collaboration with other organizations to boost solidarity among street vendors. Many participants opted for earning opportunities rather than participating in the campaigns. Some vendors were reluctant to join in for fear of negative responses from the authorities.

The movement to persuade the BMA to revise its vending policy was supported by several government and non-governmental agencies, including the Urgent Law Reform Commission<sup>10</sup>, Academic Network for Inclusive Cities<sup>11</sup>, Prime Minister's Delivery Unit (PMDU)<sup>12</sup> overseeing

---

<sup>9</sup> NEST was part of the Federation of Informal Workers in Thailand (FIT), its objectives are 1) to campaign for laws and policies protecting, promoting, and developing street vending; 2) occupational rights advocacy, providing assistance and advice to members; 3) upholding social justice and reducing inequality in street vending; and 4) representing street vendors in policy-making related participation (Nirathron, 2020).

<sup>10</sup> The Urgent Law Reform Commission was appointed in 2017 by Order of the Prime Minister. The Commission's mandates are to give ideas and recommendations for urgent law reform. The Commission recommended law reform concerning occupations in public space to the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration and Metropolitan Police Bureau in 2018 (Urgent Law Reform Commission, 2018). A short-term recommendation was to develop agreements between agencies concerned on the policy and plan to manage public areas for street vending

purposes in a clear-cut manner, while the long-term agreement was to set criteria for considering temporarily permitted areas in a clear-cut manner. There should be a committee to develop a plan to use and manage such areas and prescribe fees to be paid to the State for the use of public areas. Urgent efforts should be made to reform laws on the conduct of occupations in public areas in Bangkok. The recommendations were endorsed by the Cabinet resolution in February 2021.

<sup>11</sup> "Academic Network for Inclusive Cities" was formed in 2018. It comprises academic in social sciences, economics, architecture and urban planning. The Network submitted a request to the Prime Minister to review the revocation of temporary street vending permission in Bangkok and recommends participative governance.

<sup>12</sup> The Prime Minister's Delivery Unit is a special unit which support the government in strategic and integrated mandate. It focuses on urgent issues that require

implementation of prime ministerial policies<sup>13</sup>, and The Bangkok Network Health Assembly<sup>14</sup>. Throughout, the BMA has been adamant in its policy to abolish street vending in Bangkok. Yet in January 2020 the BMA announced a Directive on Methods and Conditions of Determination of Designated Areas and Selling in Public Areas dated 28 January B.E. 2563<sup>15</sup>.

The advent of COVID-19 and the ensuing lockdown made BMA delay evictions. Meanwhile, the BMA started to implement the Directive at two locations. One prominent principle was to call for approval from the community, business organizations, and pedestrians, leading to repercussions. On the one hand, this approach takes into consideration opinions of area stakeholders. On the other, it may lead to adverse effects, as some Bangkok residents do not favor

---

coordination among government and non-government agencies

<sup>13</sup> The Prime Minister delivered his policy on 25 July 2019. The first out of 12 urgent policies was solving bread-and-butter concerns by easing restrictions on the occupations for the Thai people; using digital technology in the management of public transportation; reviewing arrangements and standards for street stalls and vendors in Bangkok and greater Bangkok to retain the uniqueness of the city as the “Capital of Street Food”; maintaining cleanliness and orderliness. (The Secretariat of the Cabinet, 2019)

<sup>14</sup> Health Assembly is a process and platform of developing participatory public policy based on wisdom. The Assembly is organized by National Health Commission Office. It seek to bring together three sectors – the government sector the academia sector and the people sector – from health and non-health background – to dialogue for healthy public policies and solutions. In Thailand, there are three types of health assembly, namely the National Health Assembly, Area-based Health Assembly and the issued-based health assembly. In November 2020, Bangkok Network Health Assembly

street vending. As it turned out, the populations of some districts were largely unwilling to accept street vendors. This fact reaffirmed the need for transformative measures to evolve attitudes of Bangkok residents who disfavored street vending.

In 2018, research reaffirmed the economic contribution of street vending. Without street food vending, Bangkok residents added 357 baht to their average monthly food costs (Carrillo-Rodriguez and Reed, 2018). In 2020, a report by the Senate Standing Committee on Poverty and Inequality Reduction estimated that the economic contribution of street vending in Bangkok was 67,728 million baht<sup>16</sup>. (Senate Standing Committee on Poverty and Inequality Reduction, 2020).

In 2020, during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, survey research was conducted to explore the role of the informal

endorsed a resolution on ‘Management of street vending and the common use of Bangkok public space’. The resolution includes the 5-year goals in the management of street vending, taking into consideration the balance of the benefits and challenges of street vending. Plans include recommendations on the implementation of the Directive; setting up area-based mechanism to manage public space; coordination of concerned agencies and stakeholders. The BMA set up a task force to oversee the mobilization of the resolution in 5 years. This task force will coordinate with the Committee of Bangkok Health Assembly. This is another milestone in the mobilization of the issue of street vending in Bangkok.

<sup>15</sup> The Directive covers issues such as the requirement on locations, the arrangement of the stall, stall design, duration of permission, qualifications of vendors, selection of vendors, conditions for vending, selling practices and monitoring and control (City Law Office, 2020b)

<sup>16</sup> Estimation is based on the number of street vendors (170,000 vendors), days of work by month (20 days) the net profit (1,000 baht daily) and the marginal propensity to consume (MPC: 0.66)

economy in the urban economy.<sup>17</sup> Samples were street food vendors, buyers, and material sources for food vendors in three districts of Phra Nakhon, Bang Rak and Bang Kapi (Nirathron, Carrillo and Theerakosonpong, 2021). The research covered fifty vendors from each district, thus totaling 150, 100 consumers from each district, totaling 300, and 150 vendors of raw material sources. The mixed-method study included a survey to obtain quantitative and qualitative data, collected mostly during the daytime. Food vendors and consumers were chosen by accidental sampling, while raw material vendors were selected on two levels: first, raw material sources or markets were chosen according to the number of mentions by vendors in the three districts. Then, a proportion was calculated, based on the number of markets most mentioned by vendors, and a proportionate number of samples was decided accordingly.

The research found that most street vendors were women over forty years of age, half of whom finished primary education as their highest level of educational attainment, and sixty percent of whom were not domiciled in Bangkok. They either worked alone or with family members. About 30 percent had employees. Most sold food in public areas. Almost all vendors stated that their main incomes derive from selling street food. In all three districts, food was sold at different times, for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Most vendors sold in unauthorized public areas. They were obliged to pay fines to municipal law enforcement officials who acted like city police. The government officials they most encountered were city police. Fines were collected monthly, ranging from 200 to 2,500 Thai baht (THB). Many vendors used

electricity and water supplies from neighbors and nearby shops, paying for such services accordingly.

Most vendors purchased raw materials from the market. In terms of business performance, one-third of vendors made less than 1,000 baht daily profit. Earnings from food sales constituted the major household income. Income level could be classified as subsistence and savings. Food prepared onsite and ready-made food resulted in higher profits.

Most consumers were young females who have earned bachelor's degree or higher in educational levels. They were formal workers (under section 33 of the Social Security Act (SSA)). Street food played a significant role for consumers at every income level. Half purchased street food an average of 12.2 of 21 weekly meals. Lower income consumers attached less importance to street food than higher income ones. Seventy percent of consumers reported that they were negatively impacted by the street food sales ban.

Data on market vendors was collected from eighteen markets. Market vendor characteristics resembled those of food vendors. Most were female over the age of forty, with lower secondary education as their highest education level. Most were Bangkok and Central Thailand residents and had considerable professional experience. Earnings from market food sales constituted their major family income. About one-third worked alone, while the rest had employees. Raw material sources for most vendors were wholesale markets, such as the Si Mum Mueang Market, Thai Market, and Pathom Mongkhon Market (in Nakhon Pathom Province), followed by production farmers, mostly for fresh vegetables, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) for

---

<sup>17</sup> The objective of the research on "The Role of Informal Economy toward Urban Economy – A Study of Street Food in Bangkok Metropolis" are threefold: 1) to study the concept of "informality" and its role in the urban

area, 2) to study the practice of "informality" and its role in the urban area, using street food as a case study, and 3) to make policy recommendations on the management of informality in light of the real situation.

products such as noodles and meatballs. Thirty percent of their customers were street food vendors. Thus, over eighty percent of street vendors stated that they were affected by the order to ban street food, while over half reported that their income had been halved.

In addition to the aforementioned role of street food in the urban economy, a significant number (16%) of vendors were over age sixty, demonstrating the importance of the informal economic sector to work opportunities for the elderly.

Data about consumer food buying behavior and the significant variety of food sold in the three districts confirms that street food and market vendors play important roles in food security for the Bangkok population. Foods sold include vegetables, fruits, made to order food, ready-made food, ready-to-cook food, and others for breakfast, lunch and dinner meals. Data also revealed that consumers from all economic levels purchased meals from street food vendors. High income consumers attached equivalent importance to street food as those with lower incomes.

The role of street trade in the urban economy was made evident by this research in the following ways: the relationship between food vendors and raw material sources could be assessed from purchase volumes; the relationship between food vendors and buyers was assessed from number of meals bought and daily purchase quantity; and food and market vendor operation value reflected the informal operation economic role. When this phenomenon was linked to the concept of marketing at the bottom of the pyramid, it was found that all these informal sector operations could be likened to a pyramid base endowed with a high economic, as well as moral, value, enabling many people to work and earn money. Unfortunately, such values are not understood by local government and central authorities.

In terms of the BMA's supervisory role, in every district, local supervision is dominated by officials of the City Law Office. The BMA Department of Health, an organization directly responsible for food sanitation, apparently has little influence. However, supervision by City Law Office workers appears unregulated, with uneven frequency. In more expensive districts, supervision is done every other day, sometimes almost every day, or at least once weekly. Remaining districts have less frequent supervision. It may be discerned that the BMA attaches greater importance to the area real estate values than food sanitation.

Vendors in all three districts must pay fines for selling in restricted areas. Tellingly, street vendors pay double fines, to municipal law enforcement officials and also to city police officers. After fines are paid, vendors assume the right to use public areas for sales purposes. This kind of area management serves as a direct and indirect instrument for exclusion and support. Such indirect support facilitates public access to a wide variety of food, while creating a counter sentiment as the public space become overcrowded with street vendors.

#### The COVID -19 pandemic

Research indicated that food vendors adjusted to the pandemic without assistance or support from BMA authorities, who provided no alcohol-based hand sanitizers or surgical masks. During the first wave of the pandemic, fines were waived, but the third wave featured no such exemptions, despite its more severe economic impact. This situation forces street food vendors, directly affected by the pandemic, to continually adjust their lives to new developments. Many vendors are unable to manage financially. They could not obtain loans from financial institutions, even from the Government Savings Bank. Those earning subsistence incomes tend to be elderly, unable to access resources, or develop their businesses. They keep going, just for survival.

Some street food vendors changed raw material sources, choosing to purchase from major wholesalers. During the general lockdown during the first wave of the pandemic, they could not obtain raw materials from markets and were obliged to buy from wholesalers, some of whose prices were cheaper than in markets. In this way, the COVID-19 pandemic broke the supply chain. Meanwhile, market vendors were also directly affected. Their incomes declined due to fewer customers. Some faithful customers opted to purchase from wholesalers, reducing their earnings even further. The impact was further felt by raw material transporters. Vendors also faced competition from food ordering applications (apps). They could not use them as main sale channels insofar as added delivery services can reach 35 percent, plus value-added tax (VAT). Several vendors estimated that their earnings dwindled by from 70 to 80 percent. These vendors, already fragilized by the ban, had limited immunity for coping with the pandemic as a sudden shock to earnings.

The impact led to greater informal economy dimensions as well as a wider gap in public authority management. The latter do not quite realize the extent of benefits from the informal economy. This is even more striking, when considering how vital the informal economy is to the urban public, including street food vendors, producers, and consumers. In this way, the COVID-19 pandemic was revelatory of economic and social vulnerability as well as chronic inequality long neglected in Thai society. Vulnerable workers became even more vulnerable. Measures to counter the pandemic adversely affected these workers. Seeking measures to counter violent and severe risks, recommendations have been offered to ease the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The ILO recommended employment coping measures such as maintaining employment or earning opportunities, extending social

protection schemes, reducing cost burdens for the self-employed and employers such as utility fees and low interest loans (ILO, 2020b). Yet essential preliminary steps are to obtain reliable data on workers and having a labor organization effectively representing workers.

In terms of management of informal workers, creating employment is of primary importance, supporting all enterprise levels; revising unfriendly or exclusionary policies against workers; formalizing worker status to provide protection; supporting social protection by the life cycle approach; and improving worker competency. Workers should be encouraged to organize and advocate for their rights, fully participating in policy making about their occupation and livelihood by assuming roles as citizens and economic units (ILO 2020b; Chen and Carré, 2020; Chen, 2019; 2012)

#### Inequality

The positive aspects of street vending apparently are unconvincing to local administrations. Historically, the BMA has constantly banned street vending, even during changes in economic and social contexts. It may be asserted that overpopulation of Bangkok street vendors is a direct result of BMA ineffectiveness and a failure to understand the employment paradigm shift. These flaws resulted in an ongoing deficit of street vending economic opportunities, as well as long work hours and financial vulnerability. In addition, street vendors enjoy scant basic supportive utilities, such as water and electricity. In terms of access to capital, informal activities and local administration instability hampered opportunities to obtain loans from financial institutions. Many vendors resorted to informal loan sources (Nirathron, 2017). Those who managed to obtain loans from financial institution sometimes found themselves evicted due to earning shortfalls, making it impossible to continue formal borrowing.

To obtain social protection, workers must imperatively have protective immunity from risks. Safe working conditions, adequate leisure and rest time, and access to benefits such as healthcare are vital for conquering health risk. In turn, economic risks may be reduced by economic participation and participation in social insurance schemes. Street vendors are eligible for health and medical welfare and health protection from the Universal Health Coverage. Some are also covered by social security as participation in the scheme is not compulsory. Street vendors over the age of fifteen and under sixty may apply for voluntary insurance under Section 40 of the Social Security Act B.E. 2533 (1990). Three options may be selected from, with different contribution and benefit rates leading to different governmental support. But benefits covered by social protection do not reduce risks posed by unfavorable events. The situation that they are facing warrants transformative action to address root causes of problems and the ambient prejudice felt against their trade.

Social dialogue on this point is at a formative stage. Unsuccessful attempts to reinstate street vending have weakened the solidarity of NEST. Participation in activities has also been hampered by threats from authorities. Genuine organization of street vendors to obtain a civic voice and begin bargaining with authorities remains a distant prospect. Furthermore, there is no law facilitating their rights to organize.

Inequality in Bangkok street vending may be associated with a framework of economic opportunity, social protection, and social dialogue as interconnected, mutually influential aspects.

### Recommendations

Policies to reduce inequality should emphasize the following issues: first, understanding the nature and significance of informality, including economic and moral values of street vending; second, policies on job creation

and occupational development should build on, and link to, work of relevant agencies, including BMA and government social protection aimed at reducing poverty and promoting occupational growth; such policies should be applied to vendors who must relocate and to those remaining to ply their trade in situ, to support market vendor work security and overall food security for Bangkok inhabitants; third, opportunities for workers to earn sufficient wages by reducing exclusion measures detrimental to occupational engagement and increasing work support measures related to vending areas, structural or educational support, recognizing and respecting extant supply chain connections, especially urban ones, and providing comprehensive and continuous supervision; fourth, opportunities for street vendors to recover economically after the COVID-19 pandemic in conjunction with different agencies as a grassroots economy linked to many related economic units; fifth, considering concurrent recommendations made by different agencies, including the Urgent Law Reform Commission and the National Health Assembly, to integrate strategic plans in street trade management; and sixth, promoting Bangkok as an inclusive and healthy city, as recommended by the National Health Assembly and as a smart city, exemplifying the balance between modernity and conserving cultural wisdom.

From the issues above, recommendations are as follows:

1. Set a strategy to manage street food vending, stressing poverty reduction, expanding business operations and management practice to create an inclusive and healthy, as well as a thriving smart, city;
2. Promote creation of business operators and entrepreneurs at different levels by exchanging learning and financial inclusions not specifically limited to accessing loan sources, but also including savings and insurance schemes geared for financial security;

3. Attach greater importance to food sanitation measures, covering food inspection as well as education and area-related management, including structural management, through incentive measures and publicizing the importance of food safety;

4. Current or future revocations of vending areas should be accompanied by measures covering vending area provisions, capital arrangements, and other necessary supports; and

5. Provide comprehensive supervision, considering diverse dimensions of street vending.

### Acknowledgements

The research was supported by the Thailand Research Fund and the National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT). The author would like to thank the respondents: the street vendors, the market vendors and the customers for their cooperation during the course of this research. The author also appreciate the comments from the reviewers on the earlier versions of the manuscript.

### References

#### (In Thai)

- Bio-Thai (2563). A close watch on future of retailing and its impacts on food security. <https://biothai.net/node/30590>
- Chaiwat, T. (2016). Informal Sector: A State of Knowledge. Bangkok : National Research Council, pp. 5-6.
- CP ALL Public Company Limited. (2014). Annual Report 2014. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from [https://www.cpall.co.th/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/CPALL\\_2014.pdf](https://www.cpall.co.th/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/CPALL_2014.pdf)
- CP ALL Public Company Limited. (2021). Annual Report 2020. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from [https://www.cpall.co.th/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CPALL-One-Report\\_EN\\_2020.pdf](https://www.cpall.co.th/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/CPALL-One-Report_EN_2020.pdf)

City Law Office. (2020a). Permitted Area for Street Vending. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <http://data.bangkok.go.th/dataset/permittpoint>

City Law Office. (2020b). Guidelines on the Implementation BMA Directive on Methods and Conditions of Determination of Designated Areas and Selling in Public Areas dated 28 January 2020. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://webportal.bangkok.go.th/upload/user/00000109/SellingAreaGuide/SellingAreaGuide.pdf>

Informal Labour Protection Division, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare (2019). A research project on Knowledge Synthesis of the Research on Informal Workers for Effective Management of Informal Workers. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from [http://informal.labour.go.th/images/Report/1\\_Cover\\_Outer\\_Informal\\_worker\\_1May2019.pdf](http://informal.labour.go.th/images/Report/1_Cover_Outer_Informal_worker_1May2019.pdf)

Government Savings Bank (2013). For fulfillment of Grassroots People, People Bank Project. Bangkok: Government Savings Bank.

Kiriwat, K. (2020). Why walkable cities makes economic good. Retrieved November 11, 2563 from <https://theurbanis.com/economy/14/10/2020/3752>

National Statistical Office. (2021). The Informal Employment Survey 2020. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from <http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014/DocLib/13/%E0%B8%94%E0%B9%89%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B1%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%A1/%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%82%E0%B8%B2%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3>

- %E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2  
%E0%B8%99/Informal\_work\_force/2563  
/fullreport\_63.pdf
- National Statistical Office. (2018). The Informal Employment Survey 2017. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from [http://web.nso.go.th/en/survey/lfs/data\\_lfs/2015\\_iep\\_Full%20Report.pdf](http://web.nso.go.th/en/survey/lfs/data_lfs/2015_iep_Full%20Report.pdf)
- National Statistical Office. (2015). The Informal Employment Survey 2015. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from [http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014/DocLib13/%E0%B8%94%E0%B9%89%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B1%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%A1/%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%82%E0%B8%B2%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99/Informal\\_work\\_force/%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B0%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%9A\\_2560/%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B0%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%9A\\_60.pdf](http://www.nso.go.th/sites/2014/DocLib13/%E0%B8%94%E0%B9%89%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B1%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%A1/%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%82%E0%B8%B2%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99/Informal_work_force/%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B0%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%9A_2560/%E0%B9%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%87%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%AD%E0%B8%81%E0%B8%A3%E0%B8%B0%E0%B8%9A%E0%B8%9A_60.pdf)
- Nirathron, N., Carrillo, J. & Theerakosonpong, K. (2021). The Role of Informal Economy toward Urban Economy – A Study of Street Food in Bangkok Metropolis. National Research Council.
- Nirathron, N. (2021). Street Vending and the Pandemic. Proceedings from the Annual Conference, Faculty of Social Administration, Thammasat University, January 25, 2021. Retrieved 25 October 2021 from [https://socadmin.tu.ac.th/uploads/socadmin/file\\_document/cfp67/%20Processdinga%20%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%96%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%9B%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%93%E0%B8%B0%2067%20%E0%B8%9B%E0%B8%B5%20\(27%20%E0%B8%A1.%E0%B8%84.64\).doc.pdf](https://socadmin.tu.ac.th/uploads/socadmin/file_document/cfp67/%20Processdinga%20%E0%B8%AA%E0%B8%96%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%9B%E0%B8%99%E0%B8%B2%E0%B8%84%E0%B8%93%E0%B8%B0%2067%20%E0%B8%9B%E0%B8%B5%20(27%20%E0%B8%A1.%E0%B8%84.64).doc.pdf)
- Nirathron, N. (2020). Organizations of Street Vendors: A Path to Transformative Social Protection. Proceedings from the Annual Conference, Faculty of Social Administration, Thammasat University, January 25, 2020.
- Nirathron, N. (2017). Management of Street Vending in Thailand: Situation and Desirable Direction. Thailand Research Fund.
- Nirathron, N. (2014). Management of street vending in Bangkok: Observations and recommendations. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 33(2): July-December 2014, pp. 47-72.
- Phutnark, V. (2019). ‘WALKABLE CITY’ and the economic stimulation. Retrieved November 11, 2020 from <https://citycracker.co/city-design/walkable-city/>
- Prime Minister’s Delivery Unit. (2019). Introducing Prime Minister’s Delivery Unit. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from [https://www.pmdu.go.th/about/Senate\\_Standing\\_Committee\\_on\\_Poverty\\_and\\_Inequality\\_Reduction](https://www.pmdu.go.th/about/Senate_Standing_Committee_on_Poverty_and_Inequality_Reduction). (2020). Policy Recommendation on the Management of Street Vending in Bangkok for the Promotion of Grassroots Economy, Lives and Communities.

- The Secretariat of the Cabinet (2019). Policy Statement of the Council of Ministers Delivered by General Prayut Chan-o-cha, Prime Minister, to the National Assembly Thursday, 25 July B.E. 2562 (2019) Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.labour.go.th/attachments/article/61/SCAN0602.pdf>
- Urgent Law Reform Commission (2018). Opinions and recommendations on the law reform concerning occupations in public space. (Unpublished document).
- (In English)**
- Angsuthonsombat, K. (2019). Bangkok's Street Vending Ban: A Summary of the Research on the Social and Economic Impacts (WIEGO Resource Document 12). Manchester, UK: WIEGO. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/file/Angsuthonsombat-WIEGO-Resource-12-Bangkok-Vending-Ban.pdf>
- Buddhari, A. and Rugpentum, P. (2019). A Better Understanding of Thailand's Informal Sector. Focus and Quick (FAQ) Issue 156, p.5. Retrieved October 21, 2021 from [https://www.bot.or.th/Thai/MonetaryPolicy/ArticleAndResearch/FAQ/FAQ\\_156.pdf](https://www.bot.or.th/Thai/MonetaryPolicy/ArticleAndResearch/FAQ/FAQ_156.pdf)
- Carrillo-Rodriguez A. and Reed, S.O. (2018). If Street Food Disappears — Projecting the Cost for Consumers in Bangkok. Retrieved October 21, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/Carrillo-Rodriguez-Reed-Bangkok-Street-Vendor-WIEGO-Resource-Document-9.pdf>
- Chen, M. (2019). Informality and Inequality in a Globalized and Urbanized World. Retrieved October 15, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/publications/informality-and-inequality-globalized-and-urbanized-world>
- Chen, M.A. (2014). Informal Economy Monitoring Study Sector Report: Home-Based Workers. Cambridge, MA, USA: Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing.
- Chen, M.A. (2012). The Informal Economy : Definitions, Theories and Policies. Retrieved August 15, 2020 [https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/Chen\\_WIEGO\\_WP1.pdf](https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/Chen_WIEGO_WP1.pdf).
- Chen, M. and Carré, F. (2020). Introduction. In “The Informal Economy Revisited : Examining the Past, Envisioning the Future.” Edited by Martha Chen and Françoise Carré. London : Routledge., pp. 1-27.
- Cross, J. (2000). Street Vendors, Modernity and Post-Modernity : Conflict and Compromise in the Global Economy. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 20(1/2), 30-52.
- International Labour Organization. (2020a). COVID-19 crisis and the informal economy: Immediate responses and policy challenges. Retrieved August 15, 2020 from [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/briefingnote/wcms\\_743623.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/briefingnote/wcms_743623.pdf).
- International Labour Organization. (2020b). COVID-19 employment and labour market impact in Thailand. Retrieved August 15, 2020 from [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/documents/briefingnote/wcms\\_747944.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/documents/briefingnote/wcms_747944.pdf).
- International Labour Organization. (2018a). Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture. 3rd ed. Geneva : International Labour Organization.

- International Labour Organization. (2018b). Paid employment vs vulnerable employment : A brief study of employment patterns by status in employment. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from [https://ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms\\_631497.pdf](https://ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_631497.pdf)
- International Labour Organization. (2016). Decent Work. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/decent-work/lang--en/index.htm>
- International Labour Organization. (2012). International Standard Classification of Occupation. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/isco08/>.
- Network of Thai Vendors for Sustainable Development, WIEGO & HomeNet Thailand. (2018). Street Vending for Sustainable Urban Development in Bangkok. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/resources/files/Policy%20Brief%20%E2%80%93%20Street%20Vending%20in%20Bangkok.pdf>
- Nirathron, N. (2019). When crisis creates opportunity : The Making of Organizations of Bangkok Street Vendors. Paper submitted XIV Global Labour University Conference, Reflecting 100 years of ILO : Shaping the rules for a new century of labour Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Berlin, March 27- 29.
- Nirathron, N. (2006). Fighting Poverty from the Streets : Survey of Street Food Vending in Bangkok. Bangkok : International Labour Organization.
- Nirathron, N., Yasmineen, G. (2019). Street vending management in Bangkok: the need to adapt to a changing environment. *The Journal of Public Space*, 4(1), 15-32, DOI 10.32891/jps.v4i1.562
- Poonsap, W., Vanek, J. and Carré, F. (2019). Informal Workers in Urban Thailand: A Statistical Snapshot. Retrieved August 15, 2020 from [https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/file/Informal%20Workers%20in%20Urban%20Thailand%20WIEGO%20B%2020\\_1.pdf](https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/file/Informal%20Workers%20in%20Urban%20Thailand%20WIEGO%20B%2020_1.pdf)
- Roever, S. & Tulaphan, P. (2020). Building the everyday economy from the ground up: a crisis resilience strategy Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/053175da-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/053175da-en>
- Reed, et al. (2017). Informal Workers in Bangkok, Thailand: Scan of Four Occupational Sectors Manchester, United Kingdom : Women in Informal Employment : Globalizing and Organizing
- Roever, S. and Rogan, M. (2020) Informal Workers See a Long Road to Recovery Ahead — Unless Governments Act. (COVID-19 Crisis and the Informal Economy Policy Insights No. 1). Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/resources/file/PI1English.pdf>
- Roever S. (2014). Informal Economy Monitoring Study Sector Report: Street Vendors. Cambridge : Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing.
- Roever S. and Skinner C. (2016). Street vendors and cities. *Environment and Urbanization* 28(2): 359-374. Retrieved August 15, 2020 from DOI : 10.1177/0956247816653898

- Rogan, M., Roever, S., Chen, M. A., & Carré, F. (2017). Informal employment in the global south: Globalization, production relations, and “precarity”. In A. Kalleberg & S. Vallas (eds.), *Precarious Work* (pp. 307-333). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R. & Devereux, S. (2007). Social Protection for Transformation, IDS Bulletin Volume 38 Number 3 May 2007. Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43539382.pdf>
- WIEGO & HomeNet Thailand (2017) Informal Workers in Bangkok: Considerations for Policymakers  
Retrieved October 20, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/resources/files/Reed-Considerations-for-Policymakers-Informal-Workers-in-Bangkok-Eng.pdf>
- Yasmeen, G. & Nirathron, N. (2014). Vending in Public Space : The Case of Bangkok. WIEGO Policy Brief (Urban Policies) No 16 May 2014. Retrieved October 11, 2021 from <https://www.wiego.org/sites/default/files/publications/files/Yasmeen-Vending-Public-Space-Bangkok-WIEGO-PB16.pdf>