

Measurement of Social Welfare the Households in Rural Areas

Case study: Township Zahak

Hadi Rasti*

Ph.D. Candidate of Geography and Rural Planning, University of Isfahan

Raziyeh Jahantigh

M.A. Geography and Rural Planning, University of Sistan and Baluchestan- Zahedan

Received: 22/4/2014

Accepted: 4/4/2015

Extended Abstract

Introduction

Supply of social welfare including the most important goals of any economic system and providing suitable conditions for life of all segments of society is considered the main task of economic actors and authorities. Thus, the change in social welfare including the areas of assessment is the economic systems. Changes in welfare and living conditions in human settlements, especially in deprived and marginalized areas that in terms of the level of welfare and development indicators faced with a variety of challenges and problems, makes it essential more than any other issue study and measure social welfare.

Study and measurement of social welfare in order to monitor the policies and programs of welfare and social security is a basic necessity and requirement. Because based on its findings, decision makers with an understanding of the forces that act within rural settlements and governments, are better able to develop interaction and policies that result in improvability, lived and stability be in these areas. Hence the present study aimed to measurement the social welfare in rural areas of Township Zahak (Sistan and Baluchestan province) located in the South East of Iran has tried to analyze the social welfare indicators.

* Responsible Author: Rasti.hadi@geo.ui.ac.ir

Methodology

The research method is descriptive- analytical survey, based on a completing the questionnaires. The population of the study is all households living in rural areas of Township Zahak, that based on 1390 the census has been population of 61,090 people and 14,709 rural households.

In this study were selected 30 villages as research sample. Method of sampling were using the Cochran method that were selected the number of 329 heads of household as the samples. Research indicators and variables are included: employment and income, housing, health and medical, health, leisure, participation, education, access and of life satisfaction. Collected data through statistical methods are processed and analyzed by SPSS software.

Findings and Discussion

In order to study the level of social welfare in the villages studied were the significance level of less than 0.05 and was approved from the statistical viewpoint and the level of social welfare in terms of all the indicators of the economic and social dimensions, with an average value of 2.76 was measured below average and poor. Since the main livelihood of the villagers is based on agriculture and subdivision and with the emergence of long droughts in the past, including the past 15 years (1998-2013) and after the closure of the border (2005 -2011) rural social welfare state is damaged greatly. However have been neglected an alternative livelihoods for the villagers. Because their livelihoods (agriculture, livestock, fishing and handicrafts) is damaged seriously. Also access to welfare services, participation in rural development is low and weak. In addition because of weather and natural problems, lack of adequate access to health care is an unfavorable villagers health conditions. According to the statistical results indicators of "health", "education" and "housing" are sequentially ranked first to third and indicators "leisure", "life satisfaction" and "income and employment" have taken place in the final ranking. In the villages studied, because of relative access to clean drinking water, nutrition, physical and mental health of relative household, health indicators have taken place in the first rank. But in connection with indicators with lowest ranking are

noteworthy the lack of infrastructure and recreational facilities and Pleasant entertainment, the basic weakness of the rural economy in the region and unfavorable climate (which has a lot of negative consequences) and the inadequate support from the government to diversify the rural economy. The village of "Qala No" with the mean (3.32), the highest and village "Deh Mastikhoon" with the mean (1.92) have the lowest rates of social welfare.

Conclusions

The results indicate that the level of social welfare in the villages studied, in terms of all the indicators studied is below average and poor. This indicates that the welfare state the region especially in terms of basic indicators of employment, income and access has not been considered necessary and revision of in planning and policy making of welfare is necessary. Status welfare villages in the region over all challenged in the fields of life satisfaction, income, employment and leisure. But welfare status of sample villages in relation to indicators of health, education, housing, is a little better. However, the health of rural people is threatened because of unfavorable climatic conditions, water fluctuations and droughts, resulting in a weakness economic foundation. Study of the social welfare in each of the villages in the sample indicated that there were significant differences. Village of "Qala No", because having tourist attraction and better economic opportunities have most level of welfare and the village "Deh Mastikhoon", have the lowest social welfare.

Keywords: Social welfare, Social and economic indicators, Rural areas, Township Zahak.

References

- Aynali, J. and Taherkhani M., 2005, **Performance Evaluation the Service Centers of Welfare in Welfare and Rural Development (Township Khodabandeh)**, Journal of Science Teacher, No. 9 (4), PP. 73-55.
- Bannet, F., 2004, **Development of social Security**, Social Policy Review, University of Bristol, Great Britain: The Policy Press.
- Brehm, J.M., 2003, **Amenity Migration and Social Change: Expanding the Concept of Community Attachment and its Relationship to Dimensions of**

- Well-being in the Rural West**, Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, Department of Sociology.
- Christakopoulou, S., Dawson, J. & Gari, A., 2001, **The Community Well-Being Questionnaire: Theoretical Context and Initial Assessment of Its Reliability and Validity**, *Social Indicators Research*, 56(3), PP. 321-351.
- Courvisanos, J. & Martin, J., 2005, **Developing Policy for Australia's Small Towns: From anthropology to sustainability**, Conference on the 2nd Future of Australia's Country Towns, Bendigo.
- Eftekhari, A.R. and Tavakoli, M., 2003, **Rural Social Welfare; Cognitive Approach in Explaining Reagents**, *Journal of Humanities Teacher*, No. 29, PP. 84-61.
- Ekstrom, H., Dahlin Ivanoff and Elmstahl, S., 2007, **Restriction in Social Participation and Lower Life Satisfaction among Fractured in Pain Results from the Population Study "Good Aging in Skane"**, *Since Direct Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, PP. 1-16.
- Fitz Patrik, T., 2002, **Theory of Welfare**, Translated by Hormmoz, Homayon Poor, Tehran, Institute for Social Security Research.
- Ghasemi Ardhaei, A., 2008, **Comparative Analysis of Welfare in Rural and Urban Areas**, *Journal of Village and Development*, No. 2, PP. 1-20.
- Giddens, A., 2006, **Sociology**, Fifth Edition, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Hewstone, B. & Strobe, W., 2001, **Introduction to Social Psychology**, Blackwell publishers, Third edition.
- Hezarjaribi, J. & Safari Shali, R., 2011, **Social Welfare and the Factors Affecting it, Case Study: Tehran City**, *Journal of Research and Urban Planning*, No. V, PP. 22-1.
- Javan, J. & Heydari, H., 2011, **The Role of Wells to Diversify of the Rural Economy (Case Study: Township Zahak in Sistan and Baluchestan Province)**, *Researches of Human Geography*, No. 76, PP. 66-49.
- Midgely, J., 2000, **Context of Welfare Theory: a develop mentalist in perpetration**, Center for social development, Washington university Pup.
- Mowlaei, M., 2007, **Compared to the Degree of Development and Social Welfare Services the Provinces of Iran during 1994-2004**, *Journal of Social Welfare*, No. 24, PP. 241-258.
- Musa Khani, Gh., 1999, **The Analysis of Social Welfare and the Demission of Influence from Income Inequality**, M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Economics, University of Shiraz .

- Negaresh H. & Khosravi M., 2000, **Study of Agricultural Climate of Sistan and Baluchistan**, Sistan and Baluchestan University Zahedan, Research Department.
- Omran, M., Farajzadeh, Z. & Dahmardeh, M., 2009, **Factors that Determine the Poverty and of Rural Households Welfare Changes in Sistan Region**, Journal of Agricultural Economics Research, Volume 1, No. 2, PP. 21-42.
- Ramsey, D. & Smit, B., 2002, **Rural Community Well-being: Models and application to changes in the tobacco-belt in Ontario**. *Geoforum*, 33, PP. 367-384.
- Saunders, P., Brown, J. and Eardely, T., 2003, **Patterns of Economic and Social Participation among faces Customers**, Social Policy Research Center, No. 19, University of New South Wales, PP. 1-67.
- Shayegan, F., 2010, **Attitudes toward Social- the economy welfare and its relationship with political Trust in Tehran City**, Journal of Planning of welfare and social development, No (3), PP. 176-145.
- Sheikh Bigelow, R., Taghvai M. and Varesi H., 2012, **Spatial Analysis of Deprivation and Inequality of Development of the Townships in Iran**, Journal of Social Welfare, No. 46, PP. 214-189.
- Srinivasan, S., L.R.O. & Dearry, A., 2003, **Creating Healthy Communities, Healthy Homes, Healthy People: Initiating a research agenda on the built environment and public health**, American Journal of Public Health (93) 9, PP. 1446-1450.
- Taghavi, N., 2006, **Study of Factors and Aspects of Participation in Regional Development, Townships of East Azarbaijan province**, Tabriz, East Azarbaijan Management and Planning Organization.
- Trazkar, M.H. and Zibaei M., 2004, **Indicators of Social Welfare and Income Distribution and Poverty in Rural and Urban Communities (Case Study in Fars, Isfahan & Semnan Provinces in Iran)**, Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development, No. 48, PP. 164-137.
- Young, M.A., 2008, **Exploring Community Well-being and Sustainability at a Local Scale: Finding the Differences of Measurement of social welfare the households in rural areas**, Case study Township Zahak.
- Zarrabi A. and Sheikh Bigelow R., 2011, **Classification of Health and Development Indicators, Provinces of Iran**, Journal of Social Welfare, No. 42, PP. 128-107 .