Determinants of Rural Families Benefiting from Social Protection Arrangements under the "Decent Life" Initiative in ELKom ElAhmar Village, Shebin Elkanater District, Qaliobia Governorate, Egypt

Sarah A. Abdelraouf; Jacinthe I. Rihan; Hend M. Diab and Heba N. Mohamed[1]

ABSTRACT

This research aims to identify the determinants of rural families benefiting from social protection arrangements under the Decent Life Initiative in ELKom ElAhmar Village, Shebin Elkanater, District, Qaliobia Governorate, to identify the correlation between the social and economic variables, and the degree of benefit received by the rural families. The geographical area of the study is El-Kom ElAhmar Village, Shebin El-Kanater District, Al Qaliobia Governorate. Cochran's equation was used to determine the sample size of 250 respondents, (heads of households) representing 10% of rural families' beneficiaries which consists of a total of 2,224 families. The questionnaire applied via the personal interview to collect the field data, was conducted during February and March 2023. Data collected were coded and analyzed using frequencies, percentages, Pearson's correlation, and stepwise regression. Obtained results of the research were found as follows:

- **Most of the respondents (57.2%) are in the category of high beneficial level, the respondents (21.6%) are in the category of medium beneficial level, and (21.2%) fall in the category of the low beneficial level of the total sample respondents This result clarifies the significant role played by the "Decent Life" initiative to support the most vulnerable families.**

- **The most significant factors affecting the rural families benefits are; the degree of benefiting from the role of organizations and institutions, the type of social protection programs, and the husband`s age. these factors affect a total of (47.1%), the remaining effect attributed to other variables. These results highlight the importance of the "Decent Life" initiative in supporting the most vulnerable families.**

Keywords: Social Protection –Rural Families –Decent Life Initiative.

INTRODUCTION

Social protection refers to a set of policies and programs aimed at reducing poverty and vulnerability. It achieves this by promoting efficient markets, minimizing people's exposure to risks, and enhancing their capacity to protect themselves against hazards (Asian Development Bank, 2003). The importance of social protection evolved due to poverty alleviation and resilience building within the framework of efforts to enhance food security and development. Evidence from some African and Asian countries shows that social protection programs leave a wide range of social and economic effects that contribute to the overall transition from extreme poverty to sustainable earning. Development is a process of human liberation that includes the liberation of the individual from poverty, oppression, and exploitation (Al-Issawy, 2003). The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) bases its efforts on social protection on evidence of the critical role of social protection in increasing food security, nutrition, and rural development outcomes. FAO supports the expansion of social protection to effectively reach the rural poor in all agricultural sub-sectors and to increase operational linkages between Social Protection and Agriculture (FAO, 2016). Agriculture in Egypt is the mainstay of the economic and social structure, as it contributes a large share to the overall development and advancement of society, and its importance is increasing as a profession associated with it and its various activities, more than half of the population, whether in the productive, marketing or manufacturing activity of Agriculture (Fayed and Harhash, 2019). Community development programs aim to enhance community participation, decision-making, and financial contribution to implemented projects, as well as ensure the sustainability of the program and the preservation of provided services (Hashem, 2015). The delivery of social protection programs is fragmented, with different ministries and institutions implementing programs that lack a common system or coherent approach. This problem increases in countries less developed countries, where it is possible to create a parallel structure that provides humanitarian and emergency aid, which is often funded through external donors, without any link with national programs. Better coordination of social protection interventions by governments may be key to improving the quality of implemented programs and enhancing their impact on poverty reduction in general (Gutner, 2002). The study stressed the importance of the social protection network

in bringing about real human development, for poor segments of the population (Kawakeb, 2016), showed that the "Decent Life" Initiative, the century project and the ground floor of Egypt and is the largest project in the world for its investment and 600 billion pounds. Targeting the development of income-generating job opportunities, social protection, and poverty reduction (Shams Eldin, 2022). Explain the extent of the contribution of the Takaful program in improving the quality of life for rural people (healthily - educationally - economically – socially- and psychologically) to determine the satisfaction degree of rural beneficiaries of the Takaful program (Fadel, 2023). The evidence from various developing countries strongly indicates that social protection programs have effectively reduced poverty levels, often with significant impact. Moreover, the absence of such programs poses a substantial risk to poverty eradication efforts. One estimate suggests that without social protection programs, approximately 150 million individuals in the developing world would be living in poverty (Fiszbein *et al.,* 2014). Social protection is a basic human right that has been acknowledged by international conventions and the 2030 Agenda. The Social Development Goal (SDG) Target 1.3 specifically calls for the establishment of nationally suitable social protection systems and measures that encompass everyone, including the implementation of minimum standards to provide extensive coverage for impoverished and vulnerable populations by 2030 (FAO, 2021). Egyptian society, particularly in rural areas, faces poverty, lack of services, and extreme deprivation the rural areas suffer from. In response to this issue, the Egyptian Government has implemented a set of arrangements, programs, and initiatives to support those in need. These initiatives are represented by social protection programs for vulnerable people (Gad, 2023). The "Decent Life" Initiative is one of the most important and prominent national initiatives, its role is to consolidate all the efforts of the state, civil society, and the private sector. The institution of Decent Life was established in 2019. To address multidimensional poverty and provide a decent life with sustainable development for the group most in need in the Governorates of Egypt. Which applies through several sectors, including (social interventions and human development, decent housing, educational services, medical services, infrastructure, and environmental interventions), to provide a decent life for citizens throughout the Governorates of the Republic (Haya Karima Initiative, 2019). The targeted villages most in need were divided according to the data and surveys of the Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS) into three phases. The first phase of the initiative includes villages where their poverty rates range from 70% or more, The

First Phase of Implementing the Initiative targets 1413 villages most in need and the most vulnerable ones. It also targets 20 Governorates, 52 centers, and 10611 dependencies. Where Al Qaliobia was one of the first phase Governorates (Haya Karima Initiative, 2019).

Thus, the research aims to identify the application of the social protection program "Decent Life" and its impact on the socio-economic aspects of rural families in a village in ELKom ElAhmar village- Shebin el-Kanater District- Qaliobia Governorate, Egypt.

- What is the respondent's benefits degree from social protection and support programs?
- What are the factors affecting the respondent's benefits degree from social protection and support programs?

Objectives of the study:

The research aims to:

1. Determining the respondent's benefits degree from social protection and support programs in El Kom El-Ahmar village.
2. Studying the factors affecting the respondent's benefits degree from social protection and support programs in El Kom El-Ahmar village.

Methodology

The study applied a social survey methodology. A sample from respondents in ELKom ElAhmar Village- Shebin el-Kanater District- Qaliobia Governorate to identify the degree of rural households' benefit from the social protection arrangements provided by the "Decent Life" Initiative and its relationship with the studied economic and social variables.

Sampling

To identify the determinants of rural families, benefit from social protection arrangements and their relationship with the studied economic and social variables, the study relied on a field research approach. The study area was El-Kom ElAhmar Village, Shebin el-Kanater District, El Qalyubia Governorate as a geographical area for the study. Cochran's equation was used to determine the sample size, which was 250 households, representing more than 10% of the total number of beneficiary households in El-Kom El-Ahmar village, which consists of 2,224 families.

A questionnaire was prepared to collect the study data. The questionnaire included open and closed questions divided into two sections, the first section included questions related to some economic and social characteristics of the respondents, and the second section included questions related to some indicators to measure social protection arrangements, Questionnaires were collected through personal interviews with respondents during the period from February to March 2023.

Measurements

The questionnaire also included sets of questions to measure about 22 variables related to respondents' socioeconomic status, as follows:

1) **Type of Head of Household:** Refers to the person responsible for the household, whether the responsible person is male or female, Values of (2, 1) were assigned respectively.

2) **Husband's age:** It is the raw number of years representing the age of the husband, at the time of conducting the data collection.

3) **Wife's age:** It is the raw number of years representing the age of the wife, at the time of conducting the data collection.

4) **Husband's educational level**: Refers to the educational level of the husband, whether the husband is illiterate, literate, in primary education, preparatory education, intermediate education, for above-average qualification education, university degree, or postgraduate studies. Values of (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) were assigned respectively.

5) **Wife's educational level:** Refers to the educational level of the wife, whether the husband is illiterate, literate, in primary education, preparatory education, intermediate education, for above-average qualification education, university degree, or postgraduate studies. Values of (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8) were assigned respectively.

6) **Number of marriage years:** Refers to the raw number of years the marriage has lasted, measured by the number of years the couple has spent together at the time of conducting the data collection.

7) **Number of family members:** Refers to the number of respondents living in the same household at the time of conducting the data collection.

8) **Family financial status:** Refers to whether the family (poor, middle-class, or rich). Values of (1, 2, and 3) were assigned respectively.

9) **Age at start of work**: Refers to the age at which the respondent started working.

10) **Monthly income average:** Refers to the monthly income average of all family members.

11) **Possession of electrical devices**: Refers to electrical appliances the respondents have. This variable includes 11 elements reflecting the types of appliances owned by the research participants. The research used a classification of (available/unavailable), and values of (2, 1) were assigned respectively.

12) **Housing condition:** This variable was measured by using 9 elements reflecting the construction status, maintenance, geographical location, conditions of comfort and safety in the house, and availability of basic amenities such as water, electricity, and sanitation. The study used a classification of (available/not available), and values of (2, 1) were assigned respectively.

13) **Agricultural land tenure**: Refers to land ownership, whether they are (owner/ co-partner/ tenant/ unavailable), and values of (4, 3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

14) **Farm animals' tenure:** This variable was measured through the availability of (livestock/sheep and goats/chickens and rabbits/unavailable), and values of (4, 3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

15) **Small Business Ownership:** Refers to the type of commercial activity conducted by respondents. This variable includes 7 elements. The research used a classification of (owner/ co-partner/ unavailable), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

16) **Information resources:** This variable included 7 elements to identify the sources of information about the "Decent Life" Initiative. The research used a classification of (yes/no), and values of (2 and 1) were assigned respectively.

17) **Social Protection Program types:** Refers to a group of policies and programs that aim to provide support and protection to vulnerable and needy groups in society to reduce poverty and promote social justice. This variable includes 15 items from various programs such as "Non-Governmental Organizations/"Decent Life" Initiative/Subsidy Programs for Basic Commodities/School Food Program". The research used a classification (significant beneficiary, beneficiary, and non-beneficiary), and values (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

18) **Social Protection Programs Benefits:** Refers to the positive outcomes or benefits experienced by respondents when they participate in social protection programs. This variable includes 15 elements, and the study used a classification of (great benefit, medium benefit, and no benefit), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

19) **Social Support and Protection Resources:** Refers to the resources that provide financial support and social services to families. This variable includes 23 elements, and the study used a classification of (beneficiary/ significant beneficiary/ non - beneficiary), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

20) **Family Relationships:** Refers to relationships and interactions that occur among family members. This variable includes 8 elements, and the research used a classification of (agree /neutral/disagree), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

21) **Social Relationships:** Refers to the interactions among respondents and others in society members outside the family, including friendships and neighbors. This variable includes 6 elements, and the study used a classification of (agree/neutral/disagree), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

22) **Social Problems:** Refers to the challenges facing the family. This variable includes 7 elements, and the study used a classification of (agree/neutral/disagree), and values of (3, 2, and 1) were assigned respectively.

- Hypotheses

-To achieve the objectives of the study, a theoretical hypothesis could be formulated as follows: There is a significant influencer relationship between the beneficial degree of social protection programs of the "Decent Life" Initiative and the studied 23 economic and social variables. Based on the theoretical hypothesis, 23 statistical hypotheses were formulated. As "no significant relationship".

Statistical analysis

Frequencies, percentages, Pearson's simple correlation, and Stepwise regression analysis were used for data analysis and presentation.

Description of the study sample

-Respondents' Characteristics:

Figures in Table (1) represent the social and economic characteristics of the sample families that benefited and did not benefit from social protection programs, where the following is evident:

- Type of Head of household: male family fathers of household represent about 79.6%, while female family fathers of household represent a percentage of 20.4%.

-Husband and Wife`s age: it was clear from the table; the highest percentage of respondents about the husband and wife`s age was placed in the fourth category (more than 45 years old representing 34.2 and 28% of the total sample respondent respectively.

- It is clear from the table that the majority of male and female heads of household have received education at different rates, as the illiterates almost represent the lowest percentages, as they were 14.1% for males, and 8.8% for females, respectively. The data shows that the percentages of those who had fundamental education reached 2.4%, 8.4%, and the percentage of secondary education was 9.1%, 24%, the percentage of above-average education was 58.3%, 33.6%, and the percentage of university education reached 8.5%, 13.2%, while the percentage of those with postgraduate studies was

7.5%, 12 % of the study sample for males and females, respectively.

- Number of marriage years: table showed that the marriage years, the highest percentage of 47.2%, fell placed in the second category (5-15 years).

- Number of family members: It is clear from the table that the size of families, which falls between 2-4 members, represents the highest percentage of 69.2%.

- The data showed that the percentage of the financial status of the participating families in the sample is medium, as their percentage was 66%, while the percentage of families with a poor financial condition was 18.8%, while the percentage of families with a high financial condition was 15.2%.

- It is clear from the table that the percentage of the start work age of the participating families, the highest percentage placed in the third category (21-22 years) with the rate of 55.6%.

- It is clear from the table that the percentage of the monthly income average of the participating respondents, the highest percentage placed in the lower medium category (3000-6000 pounds) with a rate of 62.8%.

- It is clear from the table that the highest percentage of electric devices held by the participating respondent, the highest percentage placed in the medium category with the rate of 82.8%.

- The data in the table showed that the housing condition of the dwelling and its medium equipment for families represents the highest percentage, reaching 81.2%, the table also shows The extent of household possession of various electrical appliances, where 70.4% was the highest percentage of the high category.

- It appears from the table that the highest percentage of agricultural land tenure under the ownership system was 84.8%, while it comes with a rate of 5.2% for agricultural land tenure under the sharing and lease systems, respectively, while the percentage of those who do not own agricultural land is represented by 10%, as also shown from The table shows that the highest percentage is 79.6% of the owners of farm animals of the livestock.

- It is clear from the data in the table that the families that own a small business represent the highest rate of 79.2%.

-It is clear from the table that the percentage of information resources on the "Decent Life" Initiative of the participating families in the sample is hearing high, as their percentage was 66.4%.

  -The table also shows the families which families benefited from social protection programs in the

village, where it came to the families highly benefited category at a rate of 57.2%.

- It is clear from the data of the table that the benefited from the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families in villages, where it came to families who highly benefited category at a rate of 56.4%. Also, same the table illustrated the satisfaction degree about the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families in villages, where it came to families who were highly satisfied category at a rate of 53.6%, and it helped rural families who benefited from social protection programs.

- It is clear from the data of the table that the agreed degree of respondents about the level of family relationships in the studied village, where it came to families who highly agree with the category at a rate of 56.4%. Also, the table illustrated the agreed degree of respondents about the level of social relationships in the studied village, where it came to families highly agree with the category at a rate of 88.8%.

-On the other hand, the table exposed the level of social problems that surround the family in the study area, where it came to families who highly agree category at a rate of 85.2%.

Table1. Characteristics of social variables respondents

No.	Social variables	Frequency	Percentages
1	**Type of Head of Household:**		
	First category (Male)	199	79.6
	Second category (Female)	51	20.4
2	**Husband's age:**		
	First category (less than 25 years old)	33	16.6
	Second category (25-35 years old)	41	20.6
	Third category (36-45 years old)	57	28.6
	Fourth category (more than 45 years old)	68	34.2
3	**Wife's age:**		
	First category (less than 25 years old)	53	21.2
	Second category (25-35 years old)	66	26.4
	Third category (36-45 years old)	61	24.4
	Fourth category (more than 45 years old)	70	28
4	**Husband's educational level:**		
	First category (Illiterate)	28	14.1
	Second category (Fundamental education)	5	2.5
	Third category (Intermediate education)	18	9.1
	Fourth category (Above average qualification)	116	58.3
	Fifth category (University education)	17	8.5
	Sixth category (Postgraduate education)	15	7.5
5	**Wife's educational level:**		
	First category (Illiterate)	22	8.8
	Second category (Fundamental education)	21	8.4
	Third category (Intermediate education)	60	24
	Fourth category (Above average qualification)	84	33.6
	Fifth category (University education)	33	13.2
	Sixth category (Postgraduate education)	30	12
6	**Number of marriage years :**		
	First category(less than 5 years)	45	18
	Second category(5-15 years)	118	47.2
	Third category (16-30years)	65	26
	Fourth category (more than 30 years)	22	8.8

Cont. Table1. Characteristics of social variables respondents

No.	Social variables	Frequency	Percentages
7	**Number of family members:**		
	First category(2-4 persons)	173	69.2
	Second category (5-6 persons)	69	27.6
	Third category (more than 6 persons)	8	3.2
8	**Family Financial status:**		
	Poor	47	18.8
	Medium	165	66
	High	38	15.2
9	**Age at the start of work**		
	First category(less than 18 years)	2	0.8
	Second category(18-20 years)	47	18.8
	Third category (21-22years)	139	55.6
	Fourth category (more than 22years)	62	24.8
10	**Monthly income average:**		
	Low category (less than 3000 pounds)	55	22
	Lower medium category (3000-5999pounds)	157	62.8
	Upper medium category (6000-9000pounds)	28	11.2
	High category (more than 9000 pounds)	32	12.8
11	**Possession of electric devices:**		
	Low category	37	14.8
	Medium category	207	82.8
	High category	6	2.4
12	**Housing conditions:**		
	Low category	29	11.6
	Medium category	203	81.2
	High category	18	7.2
13	**Agricultural land tenure:**		
	Owning	212	84.8
	Renting	8	3.2
	Sharing	5	2
	Nothing	25	10
14	**Farm animals' tenure:**		
	Livestock	199	79.6
	Sheep and goats	21	8.4
	Chickens and rabbits	14	5.6
	Nothing	16	6.4
15	**Small business ownership:**		
	Owning	198	79.2
	Sharing	48	19.2
	Nothing	4	1.6
16	**information resources:**		
	High	166	66.4
	Low	84	33.6
17	**Social protection program types:**		
	High beneficial	143	57.2
	Medium beneficial	54	21.6
	Low beneficial	53	21.2

Cont. Table1. Characteristics of social variables respondents

No.	Social variables	Frequency	Percentages
18	**Beneficiary degree from the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families in villages**		
	High beneficial	141	56.4
	Medium beneficial	76	30.4
	Low beneficial	33	13.2
19	**Satisfaction degree about the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families in villages**		
	High satisfied	134	53.6
	Medium satisfied	64	25.6
	Low satisfied	52	20.8
20	**Family Relationships:**		
	High agrees	210	84
	Medium agree	34	13.6
	Low agree	6	2.4
21	**Social Relationships:**		
	High agrees	222	88.8
	Medium agree	24	9.6
	Low agree	4	1.6
22	**Social problems:**		
	High agrees	213	85.2
	Medium agree	29	11.6
	Low agree	8	3.2

Source: study's findings

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The benefits degree from social protection programs

Presented data in Table (2) showed that the actual range of respondents beneficial to the degree of benefiting from social support and protection programs within the studied village ranged between a maximum of 45 degrees and a minimum of 15 degrees. The arithmetic mean was estimated at 31.91 degrees with a standard deviation of 2.957 degrees.

By dividing respondents into three categories according to their scores, it became clear that most of the respondents (57.2%) are in the category of high beneficial level, the respondents (21.6%) are in the category of medium beneficial level, and 21.2% of the samples are falling into the category of the low beneficial level of the respondent beneficial total. It

clarifies the significance of the role played by the "Decent Life" initiative in supporting the most vulnerable families.

1. Factors affecting the degree of benefit from social protection programs:

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to determine the direction, strength, and significance of the bivariate relationships of the variable in the study, as shown in Table (3).

The value of the correlation coefficient closer to one indicates the existence of a strong relationship. Findings in Table 5 show that there are nine variables that were a significant relationship with respondents' beneficial degree of benefiting from social support and protection programs (Y) at both 0.01 and 0.05 levels of probability. These variables are Type of head of household (No.1),

Table 2. Statistical analysis of the beneficial level of benefiting from social support and protection programs within the studied village

Range		Mean	Standard deviation	Beneficial level					
Minimum	Maximum			High (3)		Medium (2)		Low (1)	
				15-25 degrees		25-35 degrees		35-45 degrees	
				Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
15	45	31.91	2.957	143	57.2	54	21.6	53	21.2

Source: study's findings

Table 3. Pearson's correlation coefficients of factors affecting respondents' beneficial degree of benefiting from social support and protection programs in the studied area.

Hypothesis number	Independent variables	Pearson's correlation coefficient
1	Type of head of household:	-.194**
2	Husband's age:	-.116
3	Wife's age:	.062
4	Husband's educational level:	-.098
5	Wife's educational level:	.319**
6	Number of marriage years :	-.045
7	Number of family members:	-.190**
8	Family financial status:	-.183**
9	Age at start of work:	-.060
10	Monthly income average:	.076
11	Holding electrical devices:	-.017
12	Housing conditions:	.091
13	Agricultural land tenure:	.284**
14	Farm animals' tenure:	.049
15	Small Business Ownership:	-.043
16	Information resources:	.025
17	Social Protection Program types:	.524**
18	Beneficiary degree from the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families:	.606**
19	Satisfaction degree about the role of organizations and institutions concerned in supporting rural families:	.122
20	Family Relationships:	.072
21	Social Relationships:	.316**
22	Social Problems:	.282**

Source: study's findings

Husband`s age (No.2), wife`s age (No.3), Age at start of work (No.10), Information Resources (No.16), Degree of a beneficial from social protection programs (No.17), Degree of benefiting from the role of organizations and institutions (No.18), Social relationships (No.21, and Social problems facing the family (No.22).

Table (4) showed the result of regression analysis based on three independent variables namely, the degree of benefiting from the role of organizations and institutions in supporting rural families, social protection program types, and the Husband's age, indicating the positive relationship and statistically significant relationship (P 0.000 < 0.01) with the dependent variable (Y) (respondents' degree of benefit from social protection programs). The independent variables accounted for 47.1 percent $R^2 = 0.471$ of the variance independent variable.

From a statistical perspective, the significance value of the F-statistic is less than 0.05. The results in Table 6 revealed that the most significant factor influencing the dependent variable respondents' degree of benefit from social protection programs (Y) including the degree of benefit from the role of organizations and institutions in supporting rural families (explains about 36.7%) followed by Type of social protection program, (explains about 8.8%), and Age of husband, (explains about 1.6), there was sufficient statistical evidence to support hypotheses.

Table 4. Accumulative effect of the studied variables on respondents' benefiting from social support and protection programs within the studied village.

	Variables	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F Calculated	% of explained variance
1st	Degree of benefiting from the role of organizations and institutions	0.367	0.364	143.7	36.7
2nd	Social protection program types	0.455	0.450	103.01	8.8
3rd	Husband's age,	0.471	0.464	72.8	1.6

Source: study's findings

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the achieved results, the following recommendations can be demonstrated:

- Strategies and interventions to maximize the effectiveness of social support and protection. Moreover, assess the specific needs and challenges faced by different family types, considering factors such as age, occupation, and social relationships.

- Guide policymakers and program implementers to develop appropriate protection programs tailored to the vulnerable group's needs to maximize the benefits of social protection.

- Raise Awareness and build the capacity of rural families through participation in available development opportunities to solve their problems independently.

- Support non-profit organizations and institutions with cash or in-kind transfers such as food stamps and family allowances to vulnerable groups, temporary subsidies such as energy life-line tariffs, housing subsidies, or support of lower prices of staple food. to provide more social protection programs for vulnerable families.

REFERENCES

Al-Issawy, I. 2003. Development in a changing world, a study in the concept of development and its indicators. Dar Al-Shorouk, Cairo.

Asian Development Bank. 2003. Our framework policies and strategies paper. Social Protection 1, 2003.

Fadel, M.A.R. 2023. The contribution of the social protection program "Takaful" to improving the quality of life for some rural people The villages of MitGhamr Center, Dakahlia Governorate. J. Agric. Econ. Soc. Sci. 14: 49-56

FAO. 2016. The international fund for agricultural development and the world food programme. Food and Agriculture Organization, Achieving Zero Hunger: The Critical Role of Investments in Social Protection and Agriculture.

FAO. 2021. Improving social protection for rural populations in Europe and central Asia – Priorities for Food and Agriculture Organization. Budapest.

Fayed, A.A. and M.E.A. Harhash. 2019. The current status of contract cultivation of the sugar beet crop in Nubaria and the expected role of agricultural extension in it. J. Agric. Environ. Sci. Damanhour Univ. 18.

Fiszbein, A., R. Kanburb and R. Yemtsovc. 2014. Social protection and poverty reduction: Global patterns and some targets. World Dev. 61: 167–177.

Gad, M.A.Kh. 2023. Social protection systems in Egypt experience global and local experiments "Takaful and Karama Model ". J. Res. Dev. Soc. Serv. Univ. Beni Suef. 158.

Gutner, T. 2002. The political economy of food subsidy reform: the case of Egypt. Food Policy 27: 455–476.

Hashem, Y.M.M. 2015. Mechanisms of social protection in Egypt: an analytical study. J. Sci. Res. Humanit. Ain Shams Univ. Fac. Women Arts Sci. Educ. 1: 269-290.

Haya Karima Initiative. 2019. All rights reserved. https://www.hayakarima.com

Kawakeb, S.H.A. 2016. Social service, protection networks, and social safety (Future Horizons). Al-Tarha J. Hum. Sci. 2, 2016 AD.

Shams Eldin, E.N. 2022. The development of small projects in the villages of dakahlia in light of haiahkarima initiative for the development of the Egyptian country development. J. Agric. Econ. Soc. Sci. 13: 95-100.

الملخص العربي

محددات استفادة الأسر الريفية من تدابير الحماية الاجتماعية ضمن مبادرة "حياه كريمة" بقرية الكوم الأحمر مركز شبين القناطر محافظة القليوبية، مصر

سارة عبد الرحمن عبد الرؤوف؛ جاسنت إبراهيم ريحان؛ هند مختار دياب؛ هبة نور الدين محمد

تستهدف الدراسة إلى التعرف على درجة الاستفادة من برامج الدعم والحماية الاجتماعية في محافظة القليوبية، دراسة العوامل المؤثرة على مدى استفادة المبحوثين من برامج الدعم والحماية الاجتماعية في قرية الكوم الأحمر مركز شبين القناطر بمحافظة القليوبية. وتحديد العلاقة بين المتغيرات الاجتماعية والاقتصادية المدروسة ودرجة استفادة الأسر الريفية من تدابير الحماية الاجتماعية المقدمة من المبادرة.

وتحقيقا لأهداف البحث اعتمدت الدراسة على أسلوب البحث الميداني، وقد تمثل إطار المعاينة بقرية الكوم الأحمر، مركز شبين القناطر، محافظة القليوبية كمجال جغرافي للدراسة. تم استخدام معادلة كوكران لتحديد حجم العينة والتي بلغت ٢٥٠ أسرة يمثلون ١٠% من إجمالي عدد الأسر المستفيدة بقرية الكوم الأحمر الذين يتكونون من ٢٢٢٤ أسرة. وتم تصميم إستمارة إستبيان جمعت بالمقابلة الشخصية خلال الفترة من شهر فبراير إلي مارس ٢٠٢٢،

واستخدم في تحليل البيانات إحصائياً التكرارات والنسب المئوية ومعامل الارتباط البسيط بيرسون، وتحليل الانحدار المتعدد المتدرج لتحليل بيانات الدراسة. وقد تمثلت أهم النتائج في: اتضح أن معظم المستجيبين (٥٧,٢%) هم في فئة المستوى الأعلى، والمستجيبون (٢١,٦%) هم في فئة المستوى المتوسط، و٢١,٢% من العينات تتدرج في فئة المستوى المنخفض من إجمالي المستجيبين المستفيدين، كما بينت أن أهم من العوامل المؤثرة على استفادة الأسر الريفية هي أنواع برامج الحماية الاجتماعية المقدمة للمبحوثين، درجة الاستفادة من برامج الحماية الاجتماعية، وعمر الزوج تؤثر كلها بنسبة ٤٧,١% والباقي يعزي لمتغيرات أخري. يوضح ذلك أهمية الدور الذي تلعبه مبادرة "حياة كريمة" في دعم الأسر الأكثر فقراً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحماية الاجتماعية– الأسر الريفية– مبادرة حياة كريمة.