



Investigating and Analyzing Factors Causing the Spreading out of Rural Poverty in Miyandoab County through the Application of Q Technique

Mir Sattar Sadr Mousavi¹- Mohsen Aghayari Hir²- Mohammad Valaei^{3*}

1- Full Prof. in Geography & Rural Planning, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.

2- Assistant Prof. in Geography & Rural Planning, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

3- Ph.D. Candidate in Geography & Rural Planning, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.

Received: 26 May 2018

Accepted: 10 January 2019

Abstract

Purpose- The purpose of this study was to investigate the factors causing the spreading out the poverty in rural areas of the county of Miyandoab. knowledge of the extent of poverty affecting the community and the factors affecting it are important issues in the formulation of poverty reduction programs.

Design/methodology/approach- The current research is exploratory and descriptive-analytical and follows a hybrid approach. However, the present research adopts a quantitative approach in (Q) and a qualitative approach, and in the process of factor analysis. The philosophical framework is a kind of interpretive paradigm-positivism, and is a field research the community of discourse includes rural managers (governors, heads of government departments, County Department, rural directors and Dehyars), experts and local experts in the County of Miyandoab. The discourse community was identified through targeted sampling (snowball) and the (Q) collection (41 items) was arranged by 28 members of the statistical community. For data and information analysis, Stephenson's factor analysis was used based on an individual basis.

Findings- Findings of the research showed that the Spreading out of rural poverty are: 1) Low economic power And inappropriate macro policies of the state, 2) Social barriers, insufficient service and investment insufficiency, 3) Environmental hazards and the level of education and awareness, 4) The weak sources of sustainable earnings and marketing mechanisms, (5) Natural sources of inappropriate production and limited spatial flows, and (6) Vulnerability of income sources and the weakness of support institutions (insurance, etc.). Among them, the first factor with a specific amount of 7.17 and a %25.64 variance was identified as the most important factor affecting rural poverty in Miyandoab County.

Research limitations/implications- The most important Constraints of this research were the lack of cooperation of the authorities in the process of completing the questionnaire, and the lack of accurate statistics on rural poverty.

Practical implications- The most important ways that can improve the growing situation of the poor in the study area include diversification into rural economies, improvement of economic infrastructure and change in government policies in the field of creating new and small rural businesses.

Originality/value- The phenomenon of poverty in most rural settlements, especially in developing countries, has been caused by various factors such as economic, social, environmental, physical, and political ones, which have led to the spread of this phenomenon. However, few studies have been conducted in this area, especially in the County of Miyandoab. Therefore, consideration of the phenomenon of rural poverty and the factors influencing its expansion with the Q method is essential for accurate and logical planning by planning organizations such as the Ministry of the Interior (Governorate and Governorate), the Deputy Rural and Nomad Committee, and academic researchers.

Key words: Rural poverty, Factors of poverty, Q method, Miyandoab County.

Paper type- Scientific & Research.

Use your device to scan and read the article online



How to cite this article:

Sadr Mousavi, M. S., Aghayari Hir, M. & Valaei, M. (2019). Investigating and analyzing factors causing the spreading out of rural poverty in Miyandoab County through the application of Q Technique. *Journal of Research & Rural Planning*, 8(3), 27-44.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22067/jrrp.v5i4.73055>

* Corresponding Author:

Valaei, Mohammad, Ph.D. Candidate

Address: Department of Geography & Rural Planning, Faculty of Planning and Environmental Sciences, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.

Tel: +98914 981 9067

E-mail: valaei1365@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of poverty has long been associated with human beings (Christiaensen, Joachim, Weerdt & Yasuyuki, 2013), and one of the teachings of all religions in the world is the capture and protection of the poor. This is a solid proof of the age of poverty and its problematism for the social order of societies throughout history (Shirvaniyan & Najafi, 2011). Today, most developing countries in the world are suffering from severe and chronic deprivation and more than 1.2 billion people in the world are affected by poverty, the majority of whom live in the rural areas of these countries. Among them, 795 million people suffer from severe malnutrition (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 2018). Economists have identified poverty as one of the major issues of development literature, and its removal from society is one of the main goals of economic development (Mahmoudi & Samimifar, 2005). It should be noted, however, that poverty is not a single-dimensional term with an absolute concept, but a multiplicity and multidimensional phenomenon (Sanfo & Gérard, 2012), which is not just an economic dimension to satisfy basic needs, but social, political, physical, environmental ones as well. (Abdollahi, Velaei, & Anvari, 2014). Thus, geographers always regard it as a bitter societal reality - whose adverse effects, and effects are reflected in all aspects of individual and social life of individuals and spatial dimensions- and in this line, the geography of poverty has entered into the world's geographic literature (Boshaq, Taghdisi, & Taghvaei, 2015).

However, in the 1980s, with the modest policies, the issue of poverty was forgotten, to the point where the World Bank called this decade the "decade of forgotten poverty" (Eftekhari, Karami, & Nouripour, 2012). But attention has been paid to poverty alleviation and protection of vulnerable groups at the international level since the 1990s, and the serious support of the United Nations (UN) and its affiliated institutions has led to this in the agenda of the government to be. In the same vein, the United Nations named this decade as the "war on poverty or the root of poverty" (Taleb, Piri, & Mohammadi, 2010). The global bank also called for a world free of poverty and urged governments to take effective action to eliminate hunger, housing development and access to health and education

(Zahedi Mazandarani, 2005). The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESKAP) members in Asia and the Pacific committed themselves to take the necessary steps to eradicate poverty by 2010, however, the information and evidence available in the countries suggest that, despite this international mobilization, significant results this is not the case, and the number of poor is still rising (Yazdani, 2014). If, unofficial estimates reflect the poverty of 20% of the world's population, most of them live in rural areas (UN, 2010).

In general, poverty in developing countries is much higher than in developed countries, and often these countries face poverty and especially rural poverty (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 2015). The fact is that most of the poor in these countries, and generally the poorest, living in rural areas (Pourtaheri, Eftekhari, & Hosseini, 2011) to the extent that in the world the word "poverty", with the words "village" and "agriculture", "has found great affinity, as it is associated with poverty and deprivation in developing countries, the countryside and agriculture (Ogundipe, Oduntan, Adebayo, & Olagunju, 2016), and those living in these areas are isolated and scattered and do not have much access to socio-economic services and other types of service (Mohammadi Yeghaneh & Velaei, 2014). Poverty in rural areas has been caused by economic, social, cultural (Barbier, 2015), political, and historical factors, and ultimately due to the lack of developed mentalism, it has created adverse outcomes in these societies throughout human history (Sadeghi, 2012). However, poverty, in general, is not allocated to rural areas and its proportion is higher in rural areas due to the emergence of the crisis in the agricultural sector, the lack of industrial development, the lack of infrastructure development, climate change, disasters and environmental crises, and lack of appropriate technology in agriculture. (Binam, Oduol, Olarinde, Diagne, & Adekunle, 2011). If 70% of the world's poor live in rural areas (Christiaensen et al, 2013), thus, given the existence of poor people in rural areas, it is essential to formulate policies and programs to reduce poverty. But knowing the extent of poverty affecting the community and the factors affecting it, is an important issue in defining poverty reduction programs. However, the lack of attention to

influential factors in various programs leads to inappropriate financial policy, waste of economic resources, inefficiencies in efforts and programs, and the persistence of poverty, as well as the prevention of sustainable development (Grivani, Ahmadi Shadmehri, & Fallahi, 2013). Therefore, the World Bank summarizes the factors affecting rural poverty in four economic, social, political and ecological factors (Chen et al, 2015). Experts also believe that the most important factors affecting the high number of poor in rural areas are low per capita income, low land productivity, low level of literacy, unemployment and limitation of facilities and employment opportunities with high productivity (Boshaq et al, 2016), the low level of environmental culture, low environmental biology and so on (Sharifinia, Moshirinia, & Hosseini, 2010).

Our country, like other developing countries, faces poverty and the extent of this phenomenon in a part of its rural society (Rezvani, 2011). Despite poverty in rural areas of the country, in the pre-revolutionary period, policies and programs that directly addressed the issue of poverty eradication are not observed and the policies and objectives of development plans follow the theory of Growth Poles, focusing more on the facilities and heavy industries in big cities and giving priority to the urban economy and industry. They did not pay enough attention to rural areas, the agricultural sector, rural economy, of villagers without land and low land, etc. (Moteiei Langeroodi, 2013). But after the victory of the Islamic Revolution, the first issue of deprivation and study of its quantity and quality was introduced during the time of the Shahid Rajaei government, and then principles 3, 21, 29, 31 and 43 of the constitution explicitly addressed the issue of poverty and Welfare of vulnerable populations. (Khandouzi, Shamsavari, & Khandouzi, 2016). Also, the Shahid Rajaei government has been developing and implementing mid-term (five-year) development plans and some other supportive measures to deal with poverty (Arshadi & Karimi, 2014). In spite of the development of various programs and annual budgets in order to reduce poverty, several factors, such as economic recession, unemployment, population changes, and other socioeconomic factors, have also contributed to the problem of poverty (Khodadad Kashi & SoleimanNejad, 2013).

Meanwhile, in the County of Miyandoab, the majority of villagers are active in terms of employment, income, and investment in agriculture.

Today, however, the agricultural sector in this county is in decline due to limited water resources, low productivity, employment restrictions, agricultural mechanization and so on. Also, the study area is in the southeastern margin of Lake Urmia and in the highly sensitive ecological area, which in recent years has been strongly influenced by the drying of this lake, and the low-water crisis and a sharp decline in efficiency agricultural products. This factor has led to a decrease in income, employment, investment, labor productivity, agricultural land and finally the increase in the number of poor in the villages and an increase in the number of immigrants among rural youths and the vacancy of some villages in the County of Miyandoab. Therefore, considering the above-mentioned issues, it seems necessary to root out the factors affecting the development of rural poverty and consider these factors in compilation programs. However, the main purpose of this research is to investigate and identify the causes of poverty development in rural settlements of Miyandoab County. It attempts to answer this question: what is the most important factors affecting the exacerbation and expansion of rural poverty in the Miyandoab of County?

2. Research Theoretical Literature

Poverty is a category that is normative and under the influence of value judgments existing in society, therefore, depending on these judgments, there are several definitions (Khodadad Kashi & Soleymannejad, 2013). For example, Townsend's definition of poverty in the 1960s and 1970s is presented in his poverty studies: "individuals, families and population groups can be considered as poor when they lack the resources to acquire Diets, participation in activities and living conditions" (as cited in Liu, Liu, & Zhou, 2017). In his 1981 study, Amartiyasen also pointed out that all definitions of poverty are somehow referring to deprivation. Of course, deprivation is a relative concept that may vary completely in different places and times (Liu, Liu, & Zhou, 2017). Accordingly, in a developing country, poverty may be considered to be a disincentive for facilities such as food, housing, medicine, etc., which is essential for the continuation of life, while in a developed country, a relative deprivation of the conditions and possibilities of an average life are significant (Arshadi & Karimi, 2014). Also, according to the

definition of the World Bank, poverty is inability to visit a doctor while being sick, poor access to school and unfamiliarity with reading and writing, joblessness, fear of the future, and life only for the same day, loss of child. Poverty is lack of access to

clean water, power poverty, lack of representation and lack of freedom. So far, several definitions of poverty have been presented, some of which are displayed in [Table 1](#).

Table 1 - The most important definitions of poverty

(Source: Researchers, 2018)

Scholar and year	Definition
Mark Henry, 1995	In short, poverty defines the inability to provide basic needs for a decent, human life or condition in which income is not enough to satisfy livelihood needs.
Razavi, 2003	Poverty is part of a social and symbolic hierarchy in which the poor have played the role of loser, the more poverty that goes on, the more hierarchy there is.
McCulloch, 2003	Poverty is a lack of income or consumption in meeting basic needs.
Lemmi & Gianni, 2006	Poverty is a failure to meet social needs.
Gregory et al, 2009	Poverty is a term used to refer to the welfare state and non-welfare state, in which one cannot demonstrate his ability to act as a personality.
Sanfo & Gérard, 2012	Poverty is a multi-dimensional concept in which individual level and social welfare are in an unacceptable and inadequate situation.
Townsend (1979)	Poverty "is the lack of resources to participate in activities, customs and diets that are usually approved by the community.

In general, poverty can be said to be multidimensional, which includes lack of opportunities, lack of empowerment, insecurity, malnutrition and poor health ([Liu, Liu, & Zhou, 2017](#)). Therefore, we realize that poverty is not only a lack of economic factors, but also includes the loss of opportunities, the lack of access to social services and other social exclusions. ([Alkire & Seth, 2015](#); [Liu, Zhou, & Liu, 2016](#)).

Given that the world's poor are farmers living in rural areas of developing countries ([FAO, 2018, p. 2](#)), therefore, one of the main challenges is the fight against poverty in rural areas ([FAO, 2015](#)). At a world-wide level, rural people are at a lower level than their counterparts in terms of health and hygiene ([International Labour Office, 2015](#)). For example, the study of health status in rural areas in Canada, Australia and the United States shows that rural authorities are mostly elderly people and that they have less access to health facilities. Therefore, the areas of health and well-being are more severe, because they include more diseases, shorter life expectancies, high infant mortality rates, and the prevalence of chronic and contagious patients ([Rice & Webster, 2017](#)).

In the same vein, scholars have identified several factors for the spread of poverty. As Chambers (1995) examines rural poverty from a systematic

point of view, it is the result of several factors, including the inability to manage, the political weakness of villagers, the geographical dispersion of villages and their access to facilities, poverty of capital and infrastructure facilities, and most importantly, the direction of developmental policies towards cities that are in line with Iran's conditions. Also, Chambers criticized the researchers and development factors for their efforts in a genuine and profound understanding of rural communities of low importance ([Panahi & Malek Mohammadi, 2013](#)). The weakness of the economic infrastructure, including the inequality of the agricultural economy against the industrial and service economy, the lack of investment capital, the strengthening of the foundations of sustainable economy are considered as factors of rural poverty. Also, the weakness of insurance products, the weakness of rural bargaining power against urban dealers and marketers, severe product fluctuations, income inequality, severe dispersion of land lots, lack of optimal use of water and soil resources, high levels of pesticide and other factors Economic factors are considered as factors of rural poverty development ([Mohammadi Yeghaneh et al., 2014](#)). Moreover, some social factors such as the gender of the household, capitalism ([Arif & Shujaat, 2011](#)), the type of occupation and the characteristics of the

employment of household members (Krishna, 2011) etc., are considered as factors in the extension of rural poverty. In addition, the World Bank has also explained the causes of rural poverty in various factors such as economic (low per capita income, low return on land and limited job opportunities)

and social (low level of literacy, high household size, inappropriate health, education, food, and housing). Along with the reasons for the World Bank, the political and ecological causes have been added and displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Factors affecting the increase and extension of Rural poverty

(Source: Findings of the literature review of Researchers, 2018)

Factors	Features
Economical	Limited employment opportunities (hidden unemployment) and a shortage of entrepreneurial numbers (Ogundipe, Oduntan, Adebayo, Olagunju, 2016); low labor and land productivity (Dadvarkhani, Salmani, Farhadi & Zare, 2011); limited access to the farmland; the transfer of the minimum income (Ogundipe et al., 2016); the price volatility of agricultural products, the increase in income inequality and risk aversion (Hilary Hoynes & Ann, 2006) and...
social	Low level of human capital; natural growth of the population (Dadvarkhani et al., 2011); low level of education and literacy (Mailumo, Ben, Omolehin, 2013; Boshagh et al., 2016; Achia, Wangombe and Khadioli, 2010), lack of family-friendly cultural facilities (Ogundipe et al, 2016); and...
Political	Lack of investment in rural development allocated to the GDP; inappropriate rural infrastructure such as transportation, communication and irrigation (Dadvarkhani et al., 2016); Not targeting poverty reduction programs and no cause and effect crash when checking the village. (FAO, 2015); lack of macro policies for controlling and pricing appropriate agricultural commodities; lack of programmed import and export of agricultural products (Dadvarkhani et al., 2011) and...
Ecological	Risk of agricultural production against natural disasters (Dadvarkhani, Salmani, Farhadi & Zare, 2011); Changing climatic conditions; Water scarcity; Inappropriate soil (Chen et al., 2015) and so on.

According to the above table, rural poverty is not only from the lack of income in rural areas and, in general, economic factors. In addition to economic factors, the affecting factors for rural poverty are: lack of self-confidence and social acceptance (Srinvas, 2007, p. 5), lack of risk, classic traditions and resistance to change, lack of skilled manpower because of their immigration to large cities, excessive pressure on natural resources, pollution of water and soil resources, natural disasters and

natural hazards, lack of physical capital, accumulation of the cost of promoting and training the agricultural sector, the absence of large-scale political programs for control and suitable pricing for agricultural products, poor rural transport, environmental problems, etc.

Various studies have been carried out on the issue of rural poverty and the factors affecting it both inside and outside the country. Those which are more relevant to the subject of this research are referred to in Table 3

Table 3. Summary of studies on rural poverty

(Source: literature review of Researchers, 2018)

Researchers	Conclusion
Yazdani Gharatappeh (2014)	Factors such as low diversity, low employment rate, high household size, housing pattern and limited access to desirable land, inappropriate and non-income jobs, low number of people employed in the family are some of the factors affecting poverty in rural areas.
Boshagh et al., (2016)	The second-order rural poverty model is under the influence of hidden social, economic and political factors. The value of p of all the lambda parameters in the second-order model indicates all of these relationships. Finally, fitting indicators of the model show that social, economic and political factors can well measure rural poverty.
Achia, Wangombe & Khadioli, 2010	Among the variables that affect rural and urban household poverty in Kenya are factors such as the age of the head of household, the size of the household, the number of livestock and education.

Table 3.

Researchers	Conclusion
Bergh and Nilsson (2014)	There is a meaningful relationship between globalization and the reduction of absolute poverty, and the reality is that in recent decades many low-income countries have begun the program of economic liberalization to combat poverty, and the most important way of dealing with absolute poverty is the economic integration of countries at global levels.
Barbier (2015)	The results showed that 15 developing countries account for 90 percent of the world's poor. Low-income countries have the highest levels of poverty and this rate is decreasing with increasing per capita income in the country. The countries of South Asia, East Asia, the Pacific and sub-Saharan Africa are the most important regions in the world in terms of rural poverty.
Imai et al., (2015)	Access to non-farm employment in rural areas has reduced vulnerability and poverty in both Vietnam and India. If the expansion of domestic and non-residential jobs reduces the risk of such dangers. The importance of a tendency to non-profit businesses is that this sector does not need to train or acquire special skills, which has led to the employment of a large part of the poor, and decline in their number and vulnerability in India and Vietnam for some years.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Geographical Scope of the Research

The study area is located in the County of Miyandoab, which is located between the

geographical coordinates 44', 36° and 18', 37° north latitude and coordinates 36', 45° and 54', 46° east longitude, and its average elevation is 1280 Meter from sea level.




Figure 1. Location of the study area in the province and country

The County is located in the south-east of West Azerbaijan province and is an intermediate region between the three provinces of East Azerbaijan, West Azerbaijan and Kurdistan. This County with its location in this region has been significantly affected by the positive effects of this privileged position. In general, the County is a large alluvial plain that is surrounded by relatively high mountains, except for the west, and partly northwest

and north (to the Urmia lake and the plane lands of Malekan plain), in other parts of the country (Miyandoab County Master Plan, 2010) (Figure 1).

3.2. Methodology

The present research is exploratory in terms of purpose and is descriptive-analytic in terms of method. In terms of approach, it is a mixture that has a qualitative approach to the forum's review and has a quantitative approach to the Q-factor analysis. The

philosophical framework of this research is a kind of interpretative-proving paradigm, and in terms of orientation, it is an applied research. This research is considered to be a library - field research. The documentary, because theoretical data for the discovery of subjectivities, was obtained from the study of available resources on the factors affecting the expansion of rural poverty, and when, for identifying subjectivities, the data from the contributors to the interview form was collected at the county level and is considered a field. In this study, the Q method was used to study the attitudes about the factors affecting rural poverty expansion in Miyandoab County. With the link between subjectivism and behaviorism and the concept of factor mentality, Stephenson described the Q methodology as a study of human behavior and activity (Danayifard, Hosseini, & Sheikha, 2014). This methodology uses a mental point of

view to build a typology of different observation points and is a powerful tool for the easy understanding of values, tastes, concerns, and individual perspectives. The basic assumption of the Q method is that beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions are subjective and can be shared, measured and compared with others (Steelman & Magurie, 2007). The basic steps of the Q method are as shown in Figure 2. The research discourse community consisted of local administrators (governors, heads of governmental offices, perfect, rural directors and Dehyars) as well as experts and local experts in the Miyandoab County (Table 4). In the methodology of Q, it is not necessary to randomly select a sample from a population-based society. The advantage of this method is that it allows the systematic study of the mindset and examines the feelings and beliefs that people have about a subject (VanExel & Graaf, 2005).




Figure 2: Key Steps for the Q method
(Source: West, 2014, p. 3)

Therefore, a random sampling method (snowball and theoretical) was used to select the statistical sample. Brower (1999) considers the number of contributors in Q methodology related to the number of Q expressions and suggests that the number of contributors must be less than the number of Q's expressions (Danayifard et al., 2014). Therefore, the number of contributors in this study was 28 (in 28 theoretical saturated interviews). The Dehyars and councils were chosen as the community of discourse, who lived in a village and had a residence history of over 20 years in the village and were farmers themselves. The experts were also those who were born in the village and now they were settled in the city or in the same village for various reasons

(employment in governmental and non-governmental departments). These people are at the county level in the field of various rural and agricultural issues, and the villagers in many special cases of sale and pricing of land, election issues, disputes and conflicts (for mediation and problem solving), scientific issues, cultural issues, etc., refer to these people and they are sympathetic. Meanwhile, these people in the village of their place of birth have a special value and respect among the residents (they were introduced to the researchers by referring to the provincial governor and by the rural affairs expert). As previously mentioned, the choice of the community of discourse was based on a theoretical and snowball method and was chosen purposefully.

Table 4. Participating in semi-structured interviews

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Statistical Society	Number	Place
Head of government offices	8	Governor of Miyandoab, head of the Agriculture Jihad Department, the head of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the head of the Natural Resources Office, the Chief of the Office of Water Affairs, Prefects (3 people)
Dehyars & councils	11	The villagers of Ghepchaq, Masjed, Ghorghchi, Baktash, Kuslar, Sofla, lalaklou, Ghatar, Mozafarabad, Malek Abad and HeidarBaghi
Elites and local experts	9	Miyandoab City (3 person), Charborj City (2 person), Barogh City (2 person), Aghdash (1 person) and MalekAbad (1 person)
Total	28	-

The validity of this research was determined by reviewing the theoretical literature and interviewing the participants, and the appropriateness of the phrases and propositions was confirmed by academic professors, experts and experts in this field. In addition, the test coefficient for the 20% of the participants was %926, indicating a high level of reliability. In order to analyze the data of (Q) matrices, we used a person-based exploratory analysis (Stanfenson method).

3. 3. Variables and research indicators

Research variables, using first-hand resources (the views of academic professors, field administrators,

field observations, etc.) and recurrent resources (articles, books, publications, etc.) (Anabestani et al., 2011; Achia, Wangombe, & Khadioli, 2010; Boshag, Taghdisi, & Taghvaei, 2015; Chen et al, 2015; Dedvarkhane et al., 2011; FAO, 2015; Hilary Hoynes & Ann, 2006; Mailumoa et al., 2013; Ogundipe et al., 2016) The research was developed and finally, with the opinion of professors and specialists in this field, 41 propositions were made. The Q cards were prepared and the rating table was made available to the participants (Table 5).

Table 5. Presentations (variables) of the research

(Source: Library Studies of Researchers, 2018)

Propositions
x1= Limited job opportunities (hidden unemployment), x2= Low labor productivity and land, x3= Low production capital, x4= Limited access to land, x5= Limited income transfer, x6= Reduced post-pay power, X7= income fluctuation of villagers, x8= low employment rate, x9= low bargaining power of villagers against brokers and urban marketers, x10= weakness of product insurance, x11= weakness of financial and financial institutions, x12= low level of education X13= Low cultural level of society, x14= Natural population growth, x15= Low sex ratio, x16= Lack of educational and cultural facilities, x17= Increase in migration of villagers, x18= Limit Government funding in rural areas, x19= inadequate rural infrastructure in Miyandoab city, x20= non-targeting of poverty reduction programs, x21= weakness of scientific studies in rural poverty, x22= non-root cause of poverty X23= Inappropriate Distribution of Rural Cooperatives, x24= Purchasing Problems of Agricultural Products, x25= No Integrated Program for Importing and Exporting Agricultural Products, x26= Existence of environmental hazards such as earthquakes, floods, droughts, etc. in the region, x27= lack of surface water and underground water (especially drinking water supply), x28= lack of access to urban services due to its excessive distance, x29= inappropriate land resources, x30= Topography of villages (mountainous, mountainous and plain), x31= Sloping agricultural lands, x32= Drought and water scarcity in Miyandoab city, x33= Natural resources shortage in Miyandoab city, x34= Rangeland degradation By the villagers and the government, x35= limitation of access to health services and home health and dentistry, x36= limitation of access to first class communication paths, x37= restricted access to educational centers, x38= access restriction to recreational and sports centers, x39= Distance and proximity to the city center (villages that are far away from the city center, are far different from the point of view of physical and Economic relative to the villages around the cities), x40= limitation of access to urban transport services, x41= the existence of a place of residence, especially among the elderly, and dissatisfaction with the change.

4. Research Findings

With the process of Q method, "factors affecting the development of rural poverty in Miyandoab County" were investigated. The first step in the analysis is the formation of the data matrix. At this the analytical model and its appropriateness for the research. The KMO criterion was equal to 0.676 (more than the minimum reliable value is 0.05) and

stage, 28 respondents and 41 propositions (variables) formed the matrix of the study. The statistical results were obtained from the implementation of the analytical model and the KMO benchmark and the Bartlett test confirming

the Bartlett value was equal to 999.899 and its significance level was 0.000 (Table 6).

Table 6. Bartlett test at a significant level

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Collection of analysis	KMO	Bartlett	df	sig
Factors Affecting the Development of Rural Poverty	0.676	999.899	378	0.000

To identify the factors, the specific value (the strength and ability of the discovered factors in the expression of subjectivities) and the percentage of variance (factor coverage value from each Q diagram) were calculated, and with the Gipsy graph and the Kaiser Gottmanscale, the factor Ships were determined. The rotation of the factors was done using the mathematical method and the Varimax model. Factor scores were obtained by regression method and the factor array was formed. Then it was interpreted by analogy (inductive-deductive logic). The extracted factors after the period explain

72.89% of the variance of the total variables. That is, 72.89% of the variability is explained in 6 main factors. Therefore, the complexity of the set of variables can be considerably reduced by using these six factors, with a loss of only 27.11% of the variance of variables. It should be noted that after turning Varimax variables, 2 respondents of the research (from local experts and experts) and 4 variables due to low factor load (less than 0.05) and therefore lack of correlation with other variables, Analysis was excluded (Table 6).

Table 7. Main factor loads and the amount of variance explained for each post-period factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Factor name	special amount	Percentage of variance	Cumulative variance
Low economic power and macro policies of the state	7.17	25.64	25.64
Social barriers, limited service and investment insufficiency	3.88	13.86	39.50
Environmental hazards and the level of education and awareness	2.87	10.27	49.78
The weak sources of sustainable earnings and marketing mechanisms	2.48	8.86	58.64
Natural sources of inappropriate production and limited spatial flows	2.21	7.91	66.55
Vulnerability of income sources and the weakness of support institutions (insurance, etc.)	1.77	6.33	72.89

- Factor analysis

The first factor: the specific value of this factor is 17.7, which explained 25.64% of the variance. In this factor, 10 charts (shared view) were loaded. The viewpoints of 3 people officials from the offices, 5 people of Dehyars and 2 people of local experts were loaded on this factor (Table 7).

The overall interpretation of the analogy logic showed that the priority Q option for rural poverty extension in the Miyandoab County is mainly

related to the "economic and political" factors. Identified factors from the group's comments showed that the eight options (Quotes) Q have earned more than one factor and are the most influential in expanding rural poverty. The accumulation of these propositions in one factor means that there is a meaningful relationship between economic and political indicators. However, the development of appropriate policies and policies by the state provides for the improvement of economic power.

Table 8. Charts (variables) loaded in the first factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Respondents	Factor load	Respondents	Factor load
Responder Number 1: (Local Certified)	0.821	Responder Number 23: (Responsible)	0.549
Responder Number 3: (Dehyar)	0.888	Responder Number 25: (Dehyar)	0.830
Responder Number 5: (Dehyar)	0.585	Responder 26: (Rural Expert)	0.803
Responder 9: (Dehyar)	0.762	Responder Number 27: (Responsible)	0.803
Responder Number 20: (Responsible)	0.757	Responder Number 28: (Dehyar)	0.749

From the perspective of rural managers and experts, the industry and services sector in the agricultural sector have not been expanded, and most of the villages in this county are active in agriculture. Nowadays, the agricultural sector in this county has gone through a decline due to various reasons such as water resources constraints and does not have the capability to absorb all existing labor force, which has reduced job opportunities especially in agriculture. Also, agriculture, due to its seasonal nature, has spread this hidden unemployment in villages, which has led to a decline in income and retention power among the people. Also, the intense administrative bureaucracy and the difficulty in obtaining bank capital investment have led to a very low level of production capital. The lack of rural infrastructure for investing and creating employment

is another major factor in the spread of poverty. In addition to economic infrastructures, political factors such as the lack of rooting of officials with the phenomenon of poverty, the lack of consistent programming in the import and export of agricultural products and the lack of attention to the productions of villagers, the degradation of pastures, and most importantly the problems guaranteed purchase of agricultural products such as wheat. As the villagers' products are purchased at a very cheap rate and there is no guarantee of a farmer's money receipt in this area, as a result, urban spammers will penetrate the villages and transfer the minimum income to the villagers, reduce income and bring along the rural poverty. Therefore, this factor can be called the "low economic power and macro policies of the state" (Table 8).

Table 9. Common statements with high factor rating in the first factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load	Variable	Factor load
Occupational opportunities (hidden unemployment)	1.74	Non-root cause of poverty	1.35
Low production capital	1.62	Purchasing problems for agricultural products	1.17
Reducing postponement and risk aversion	1.039	The lack of a program in importing and exporting agricultural products	1.47
Inadequate rural infrastructure	1.07	Destroying pastures by people and government	1.26

Second factor: The specific value of this factor is 3.88, which explains 13.86% of the variance. In this factor, six charts (variables) were loaded, of which

two were responsible and 2 people were experts or local experts and 2 people were Dehyars (Table 9).

Table 10. Charts (variables) loaded in the second factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Respondents	Factor load	Respondents	Factor load
Responder Number 6: (Local Expert)	0/759	Responder Number 14: (Local Certified)	0/657
Responder Number 11: (Responsible)	0/607	Responder Number 19: (Dehyar)	0/519
Responder Number 13: (Dehyar)	0/717	Responder Number 24: (Responsible)	0/563

The priority Q option in this factor for the expansion of rural poverty is mainly related to economic and social factors. The identified factors from the

group's comments showed that the six options for Q have earned more than one factor, and in the Expansion of rural poverty in the Miyandoab

County, this group has the most impact. In terms of this group point of view, the increase in the number of immigrants of villages, especially seasonal migration of rural youth to major and industrial cities such as Tehran, Tabriz, Shiraz, Ahvaz, Southern Port Cities and ... has been the main factor in increasing poverty in the region. Similarly, the low level of employment in this area due to the declining agricultural sector and the absence of industrial factories and the weakness of the finance and financial institutions due to the lack of a circle of powers, financial and political power and the

limitation of government investment in the rural areas of the Miyandoab County are effective in the fear of returning capital in this area. In addition, the low "educational and cultural facilities" for the promotion of modern and mechanized agriculture, which due to lack of water in the County is a suitable strategy for agricultural development, and limited access to recreation and sports centers from other factors of the spread of poverty in this range is counted. Thus, the propositions of this factor can be called "social barriers, limited service, and limited investment" (Table 10).

Table 11. Common statements with high factor rating in the second factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load	Variable	Factor load
Lack of employment and lack of entrepreneurship	1.72	Increased migration of villagers (seasonal migration)	2.67
Weaknesses of financial and financial institutions	1.20	Investment Restriction in Rural Areas	1.67
Lack of educational and cultural facilities	1.18	Restricted access to recreational and sports centers	1.13

Third factor: The specific value of this factor is 2.87%, which explains 10.27% of the variance. In

this factor, four charts include 1 Islamic Council, 1 Dehyar and 2 villagers loaded (Table 11).

Table 12. Charts (variables) loaded in the third factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Respondents	Factor load	Respondents	Factor load
Responder Number 10: (Islamic Council)	0.543	Responder Number 17: (Responsible)	0.819
Responder Number 16: (responsible)	0.531	Responder Number 22: (Dehyar)	0.838

The formation of an array of factors from the propositions of this diagram shows that the weaknesses in social culture and natural growth of the population and the problem of drought and poverty are among the factors of the spread of poverty. However, the low level of literacy and social culture of family caretakers and the lack of consent to change and create non-profit businesses

and natural population growth on the one hand and the emergence of environmental hazards such as floods, especially in the spring and late summer, severe winds and storms and problems, the supply of drinking water and agriculture, on the other hand, are the most important factors in the spread of poverty in this region. Therefore, this factor can be called "environmental hazards and the level of education and awareness" (Table 12).

Table 13. Joint statements with high factor rating in the third factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load
Low level of literacy in society (social culture)	1.004
Natural population growth	1.002
There are environmental hazards such as earthquakes, floods, storms and ... in the region	1.30
Lack of surface water and underground resources (especially for drinking water and agriculture)	1.18

Fourth factor: The specific value of this factor is 2.48, which explains 8.86% of the variance. In this

factor, 2 charts are loaded (1 expert and 1 Dehyar) (Table 13).

Table 14. Charts (variables) loaded in factor four

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Respondents	Factor load	Respondents	Factor load
Responder Number 2: (Local expert)	0.867	Responder Number 21 (Dehyar)	0.893

The formation of an array of factors from the propositions of this graph shows that limited income and poverty reduction programs and the occurrence of drought and low water are among the factors influencing rural poverty Expansion. In this group point of view, the reduction in incomes in rural poverty has greatly affected the studied area. The reason for the limited income of the villagers is the lack of bargaining power of the villagers against the brokers and urban marketers who buy agricultural products below their actual price and deprive villagers from more income. Other causes of poverty increase are not targeted by poverty

reduction programs by government agencies, because programs are designed from top to bottom, and these programs cannot be combined with culture and environment. Encountered and solve their problems. Another factor in the spread of poverty is the occurrence of drought in the County, which has intensified since 2003, causing a decrease in the number of agricultural lands. If the water resources of the sub-valleys of the County have declined in the last decade, the dryness of the Lake Urmia is proof of this claim. Therefore, this factor can be called "weak of sustainable income sources and marketing mechanisms" (Table 14).

Table 15. Joint statements with high factor rating in factor four

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load
Reduce the income of the villagers	2.23
The low chasing power of the villagers against urban brokers and marketers	1.05
Not targeted poverty reduction programs	1.04
Drought and water scarcity in the city of Miyandoab	1.79

Fifth factor: The specific factor of factor 5 is 2.21 which explains 7.91% of the variance. In this factor,

3 charts (2 experts and 1 Dehyar) are loaded (Table 15).

Table 16. Charts (variables) loaded in Fifth factor

(Source: Research findings, 2018)

Respondents	Factor load	Respondents	Factor load
Responder Number 4: (Local expert)	0.805	Responder Number 12 (Dehyar)	0.702
Responder Number 8: (Local expert)	0.793	-	-

The formation of an array of factors from the propositions of this chart shows that the lack of natural resources and access to the factors affecting the development of rural poverty are considered. From this group viewpoint, the variations in the lack of natural resources such as water, soil, and agricultural land, the natural attractions of tourism, and ... in the Miyandoab County, had a great influence on the development of rural poverty. Also, with the drying of the water of the lake and the outflow of salt domes and the transfer of salt to arable land by wind and storm, grazing in the rangeland by trap, unsuitable plowing and

bad weather, the use of inappropriate chemical fertilizers and ..., caused Loss of soil quality and inappropriate land and soil resources. This has greatly affected the productivity of agricultural production and, as income declines, has exacerbated the expansion of poverty. Similarly, restrictions on the access to space and space for health services, and the home of health and dentistry and transportation and the surrounding cities are among other important factors in the spread of poverty. Therefore, this factor can be called the "inappropriate natural resources for production and limited spatial flows" factors (Table 16).

Table 17. Common statements with high factor rating in Fifth factor

Source: (Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load	Variable	Factor load
Inappropriate land and soil resources	1.46	Restricted access to health services	1.48
Lack of natural resources in the city	1.92	Limitation of access to urban transport services	1.36

Sixth factor: The special value of this factor is 1.77 which explains 6.33% of the variance. In this factor 1, the Q graph (respondent number 15 (responsible)) was loaded with factor load of 0.741. The formation of an array of factors from the propositions of this Q diagram shows that the economic weakness of villagers is one of the factors affecting the development of rural poverty in this factor. From the perspective of this individual, the variation in labor productivity and land productivity in rural development has been greatly affected by the

variables loaded on this factor. However, economic factors such as low labor and land productivity, limited land availability, fluctuating rural incomes, and the weakness of agricultural insurance due to lack of awareness among farmers are one of the most important factors in the spread of rural poverty in the Miyandoab County. Therefore, this factor can be called the "vulnerability of income sources and the weakness of support institutions (insurance and ...)" (Table 17).

Table 18. Joint statements with high factor rating in factor six

Source: (Research findings, 2018)

Variable	Factor load	Variable	Factor load
Low labor and land productivity	1.30	The weakness of the insurance of agricultural products	1.59
Limited access to land	1.84	The fluctuating income of the villagers	1.63

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Scholars have described various factors for the spread of rural poverty in different parts of the world, especially developing countries, and they are considered to be the fruit of many factors, including; the inability to manage and political weakness, the geographical dispersion of villages and their access limitations to facilities, poor capital and infrastructure, weakness of the economic infrastructure, the inequality of the value of the agricultural economy against the industrial and service economy, the lack of investment capital and the strengthening of the foundations of sustainable economics, the weakness of rural bargaining power against urban speculators and marketers, shortage of qualified and skilled medical personnel, type of occupation, level of literacy, high family size, inappropriate health, education, food and housing, and so on. The results of the present study, on identifying the factors affecting rural poverty expansion in the Miyandoab County, showed that the most important factors that have caused the spread and expansion of poverty in rural settlements of the study area are: 1) low economic potential and macroeconomic policies of the state, (2) social barriers, limited service and investment, (3) environmental hazards and the level of education and awareness, (4) weak sustainable income sources and marketing mechanisms, (5) inappropriate production resources and limited spatial flows, and (6) vulnerability of income resource and weakness of support institutions (insurance and ...).

Among these, the "low economic power and macro policies of the government" factor with a specific amount of 7.17 and a 25.64% variance were identified as the most important factors affecting the spread and expansion of rural poverty in the Miyandoab County. As a result, the agricultural sector (Farming, horticulture, livestock farming, beekeeping, fish farming, etc.) as the most important source of income for the people of this county due to the limited water resources and drought (since 2003) and the seasonal nature of that hidden unemployment in the countryside has led to a decline in employment, income, and retention power among the people. There is also a severe administrative bureaucracy and difficult guarantees for obtaining banking facilities for the villagers who intend to invest, which has led to a very low level of investment in the manufacturing sector (especially rural industries). In addition to economic infrastructures, political factors such as the lack of a root-face of officials with the phenomenon of poverty, the lack of systematic and coherent programs in the import and export of agricultural products and lack of attention to the basic products and handicrafts produced by the villagers, The degradation of the pastures and more important than all the problems of guaranteed purchase agricultural products such as wheat and grapes are among the most important factors in the distribution of poverty in the county. If the products of the villagers at a very cheap rate were bought by urban and rural landlords months prior to the time of exploitation,

there would be no guarantee of the receipt of money in this field for the farmers, and as a result, the brokers and marketers bought the agricultural products of the villages which would reduce the income level of the villagers and bring rural poverty to the villagers. Also, the increase of immigration rate of villagers, especially seasonal migrations of rural youth to big and industrial cities such as Tehran, Tabriz, Shiraz, Ahvaz, southern port cities and ... are one of the most important factors in increasing poverty in this region. Similarly, the low level of employment in this area, due to the declining agricultural sector and the absence of industrial factories, and the weakness of financial and financial institutions due to the lack of a circle of powers and financial and political power and the constraints of government investment in rural areas in the Miandoab county (due to the fear of returning capital), it is considered as one of the most important factors in the development of rural poverty. Similarly, non-targeted programs and policies for reducing poverty by government bodies and the occurrence of drought and depression in the city are other important factors in rural poverty

expansion in Miyandoab County. In general, the results of this study are in line with the results of other studies, i.e. Yazdani Gharatepeh (2014), Boshagh, Taghdisi, & Taghvaei, (2016), Barbier (2015), Imai, Gaiha, & Thapa, (2015). According to the results of the research, considering the results of the research, it is recommended to be considered that rural economic diversification, in the framework of industrialization and development of the services and agriculture sector with a new approach, development of small rural businesses, changing the pattern of cultivation in the lands leading to Lake Urmia And cultivating resistant species such as saffron and pistachios, Developing Economic Infrastructure in Rural Areas and the development of poverty alleviation policies at the county level and ... by the authorities and indigenous peoples.

Acknowledgments: The current paper is extracted from the doctoral dissertation of the third author (Mohammad Valaei) in the Department of Geography & Rural Planning, Faculty of Planning and Environmental Sciences, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran.

References

1. Abdollahi, A., Valaei, M., & Anvari, A. (2013). Assessing the impact of social capital on reducing rural poverty (Case: Ghepchaq Village). *Journal of Rural Economy and Rural Development*, 2(4), 152-133. [In Persian]
2. Achia, T.N.O., Wangombe, A., & Khadioli, N. (2010). A logistic regression model to identify key determinants of poverty using demographic and health survey data. *Journal of European Social Sciences*, 13(1), 38-45.
3. Alkire, S., & Seth, S. (2015). Multidimensional poverty reduction in India between 1999 and 2006: Where and how? *World Dev*, 72, 93-108.
4. Arif, G. M., & Shujaat, F. (2011). Dynamics of rural poverty in Pakistan: Evidence from three waves of the panel survey. *Pakistan Institute of Development Economics Islamabad*, 53(2), 1-31.
5. Arshadi, A., & Karimi, A. (2014). Determining the absolute poverty status in Iran from the First Development Plan to the Fourth Development Plan. *Journal of Strategic and Magnetic Policies*, 1(1), 42-23. [In Persian].
6. Barbier, E. B. (2015). Climate change impacts on rural poverty in low-elevation coastal zones, *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science*, 165 (5), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2015.05.035>
7. Bergh, A., & Nilsson, T. (2014). Is globalization reducing absolute poverty?. *World Development*, 62, 42-61.
8. Binam, J. N., Oduol, J., Olarinde, L., Diagne, A., & Adekunle, A. (2011). Determinants and prevalence of rural poverty in West, East and Southern African Countries, *Modern Economy*, 02(03), 308-323. DOI: 10.4236/me.2011.23034
9. Boshagh, M. R., Taghdisi, A., & Taghvaei, M. (2015). Providing a model for explaining poverty in rural areas (Case: Cahar and Mahal Bakhtyari). *Journal of Research and Rural Planning*, 4(3), 11. [In Persian].
10. Chen, X.W., Peia, Z.Y., Chen, A. L., Wang, F., Shen, K., Qiao, F., & Zhoub, L. (2015). Spatial distribution patterns and influencing factors of poverty—A case study on key country from national contiguous special poverty stricken areas in china. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 26, 82 - 90.

11. Christiaensen, L., Joachim, D., Weerdt, T., Yasuyuki. (2013). *Urbanization and Poverty Reduction, The Role of Rural Diversification and Secondary Towns*. The World Bank Africa Region, Office of the Chief Economist, Public Disclosure Authorized
12. Danayeifard, H., Hosseini, S. Y., & Sheikha, R. (2013). *Q methodology: Theoretical foundations and framework for research*. Tehran: Saffar Publications. [In Persian].
13. Dedvarkhaneh, F., Salmni, M., Farhadi, S., & Zaras, Z. (2011). Good governance is a strategy for reducing rural poverty. *Quarterly of New Attitudes in Human Geography*, 3(4), 103-120. [In Persian].
14. Eftekhari, S.F., Karami, A., & Mahdi, N. (2012). Study of poverty status in rural areas of Kohgiluyeh and Boyer-Ahmad Province. *Agricultural Economics*, 1(21), 204-179. [In Persian].
15. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2015). *FAO's Strategic Objective 3*, <http://www.fao.org>.
16. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2018). *Spurring Economic Growth through Agricultural Investment*. www.fao.org.
17. Gregory, D. (2009). *The dictionary of human geography* (5th ed.). Place of publication: A John Wiley & Sons Publication.
18. Grivani, F., Ahmadi Shadmehri, M. T., & Fallahi, M. AS. (2013). The study of poverty factors of rural households in North Khorasan. *Journal of Village and Development*, 16(3), 125-145. [In Persian].
19. Hilary, W., Hoynes, M. E., & Ann, H. S. (2006). Poverty in America: Trends and explanations, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(1), 47- 68.
20. Imai, K. S., Gaiha, R., & Thapa, G. (2015). Does non-farm sector employment reduce rural poverty and vulnerability? Evidence from Vietnam and India. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 36, 47-61. doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2015.01.001
21. International Labour Office, (ILO). (2015). *Global evidence on inequities in rural health protection: new data on rural deficits in health coverage for 174 countries*. In: Scheil-Adlung, Xenia (Ed.), Extension of Social Security Series, 47, 1-69
22. Khandouzi, S. A., Shahsavari, S., & Almkhahe, A. (2015). Assessment of poverty reduction policy in five Islamic Republic of Iran development plans. *Development Strategies*, 46 (21), 114-94. [In Persian]
23. Khodadad Kasheh, F., & Soliymanjad, A.A. (2013). Estimation of the poverty line and its changes in rural areas of Isfahan Province. *Quarterly Journal of Geographic Research*, 27(2), 18160-18136. [In Persian]
24. Krishna, A. (2011). Characteristics and patterns of intergenerational poverty traps and escapes in rural north India. *CPRC Working Paper*, 30 (5), 4-37. doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2012.00591.x
25. Lemmi, A., Gianni, B. (2006). *Fuzzy set Approach to. Multidimensional Poverty Measurement*. USA: Springer Science Business Media.
26. Liu, Y., Liu, J., & Zhou, Y. (2017). Spatio-temporal patterns of rural poverty in China and targeted poverty alleviation strategies. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 52, 66-75. doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.04.002
27. Liu, Y., Zhou, Y., & Liu, J. (2016). Regional differentiation characteristics of rural poverty and its targeted poverty alleviation strategy in China. *B. Chin. Acad. Sci*, 31(3), 269-278. doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.04.002.
28. Mailumo, S., Ben, A., & Omolehin, R. (2013). Analysis of poverty environmental degradation nexus among arable crop farmers in Plateau State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(8), 68-81.
29. Mark Henry, P. (1995). *Poverty, Progress and Development*. Translation by Massoud Mohammadi, Tehran; International Political Studies Office. [In Persian].
30. McCulloch, N., & Calandrino, M. (2003). Vulnerability and chronic poverty in rural Sichuan. *World Dev.*, 31(3), 611-628
31. Mohammadi Yeganeh, B., Cheragheh, M., & Yazdani, Z. (2014). Analysis of factors affecting spatial distribution of poverty in rural areas, with emphasis on case-based economic and social properties of Mahmoudabad Village, Shahindezh County. *Journal of Geography and Urban-Regional Spatial*, 4 (13), 96-83. [In Persian].
32. Moteiei Langeroodi, S. H. (2013). *Rural Planning With Emphasis on Iran*. Mashhad: Publications University of Mashhad. [In Persian].

33. Ogundipe, A., Oduntan, E. A., Adebayo, & Olagunju, K. (2016). Agricultural Productivity, Poverty Reduction and Inclusive Growth in Africa: Linkages and Pathways, *Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, 18 (1), 1-15. DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2017/32427
34. Panahi, F., & Malik Mohammadi, S. (2013). Effects of agricultural water management on poverty livelihoods in rural areas of Iran. *Quarterly Journal of Village and Development*, 16(4), 17-1. [In Persian].
35. Pourtaheri, M., RuknaDinEftekhari, A.R., & Hosseini, N. (2011). The role of cultural heritage in the quality of life of rural residents. *Quarterly Geographic Space*, 11(33), 83-100. [In Persian].
36. Razavi, H. (2003). *Village, poverty, development*. Tehran: Village and Development Publications. [In Persian].
37. Rezvani, M. R. (2011). *Planning of rural development in Iran* (4 edition). Tehran: Gomes Publishing House. [In Persian].
38. Rice, K., & Webster, F. (2017). Care interrupted: Poverty, in-migration, and primary care in rural resource towns. *Social Science & Medicine*, 191(4), 77- 83. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.08.044
39. Sadeghi, H., & Davoudi, A. (2011). The impact of government expenditures on the rural poverty rate in Iran. *Journal of Economic Research and Policy*, 19 (58), 126-107. [In Persian].
40. Sanfo, S., & Gérard, F. (2012). Public policies for rural poverty alleviation: The case of agricultural households in the Plateau Central area of Burkina Faso. *Agricultural Systems*, 110, 1–9. doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2012.02.006
41. Sharifinia, Z., Moshiri, S. R., & Hosseini, A.E. (2010). The role of rural poverty on sustainable development (Case: Zabol County slope section). *Geographical Quarterly*, 7 (26), 15-29. [In Persian].
42. Shirvaniyan, E.R., & Najafi, B. (2011). Investigating the role of social capital on prosperity and reducing rural poverty (Case study: Droodzan district irrigation and drainage network). *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 5 (3), 25-53. [In Persian].
43. Srinvas, H., (2007). *Reforming Agricultural Development Banks* , CGAP and Working group on Agricultural Development Srinivas, 40-41.
44. Steelman, T. A., & Maguire, L. A. (2007). Understanding participant perspectives: Q methodology in national forest management. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18(3), 361-388.
45. Taleb, M., Peri, S., & Mohammadi, S. (2010). A meta-analysis on poverty studies in the Iranian village community. *Rural Development Press*, 2(3). 23-40. [In Persian].
46. Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: a Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*. California: University of California (U. S. A).
47. UN, H. (2010). *High Food Prices and the Food Crisis-Experiences and Lessons Learned*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of The United Nations, Rome.
48. VanExel, J., & De Graaf, G. (2005). *Q methodology: A sneak preview*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit, Dept. of Public Administration & Organisation Science, Faculty of Social Sciences
49. Yazdani Gharatepeh, Z. (2014). *Analysis of the factors affecting the spatial distribution of poverty in rural areas, with an emphasis on the structure of local economy (Case: Mahmoud Abad Village)* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Zanjan, Zanjan, Iran. [In Persian].
50. Zahedi Mazandarani, M. G. (2005). Rural poverty, trend and measurement in Iran. *Journal of Social Welfare*, 4(17), 286-322. [In Persian].



بررسی و تحلیل عوامل مؤثر بر گسترش فقر روستایی در شهرستان میاندوآب با تکنیک Q

میرستار صدر موسوی^۱ - محسن آقایی هیر^۲ - محمد ولایی^۳

۱- استاد جغرافیا و برنامه‌ریزی روستایی، دانشگاه تبریز، تبریز، ایران

۲- استادیار جغرافیا و برنامه‌ریزی روستایی، دانشگاه تبریز، تبریز، ایران

۳- دانشجویی دکتری جغرافیا و برنامه‌ریزی روستایی، دانشگاه تبریز، تبریز، ایران

تاریخ پذیرش: ۲۰ دی ۱۳۹۷

تاریخ دریافت: ۶ خرداد ۱۳۹۷

چکیده مبسوط

۱- مقدمه

فقر در نواحی روستایی در اثر عوامل اقتصادی، اجتماعی، فرهنگی، سیاسی، تاریخی و در نهایت در اثر عدم توسعه روستایی شکل گرفته و در طول تاریخ بشری پیامدهای نامطلوبی را در این جوامع ایجاد نموده است. بنابراین، بین فقر و زندگی روستائی ارتباط تنگاتنگی وجود دارد، زیرا بیش از سه چهارم فقرا در مناطق روستائی زندگی می‌کنند. از آنجا که هرگونه سیاست‌گذاری موفق (در راستای توسعه روستائی) مستلزم شناخت این پدیده است، لذا اطلاع از میزان گستردگی فقر حاکم بر جامعه و عوامل مؤثر بر آن از مسائل مهم در تدوین برنامه‌های کاهش فقر به‌شمار می‌رود. در همین راستا، شهرستان میاندوآب در حاشیه جنوب‌شرقی دریاچه ارومیه و در منطقه بسیار حساس اکولوژیک که طی سال‌های اخیر به شدت تحت تأثیر خشک شدن آب این دریاچه قرار گرفته و بحران کم‌آبی و کاهش شدید راندمان تولیدات کشاورزی در منطقه مورد مطالعه اتفاق افتاده است. این عامل منجر به کاهش درآمد، اشتغال، سرمایه‌گذاری، بهره‌وری نیروی کار و اراضی کشاورزی و بالاخره افزایش تعداد فقر و فقرا در روستاها شده است. لذا ریشه‌یابی عوامل مؤثر بر گسترش فقر روستائی و در نظر گرفتن این عوامل در برنامه‌های تدوینی لازم و ضروری به نظر می‌رسد. به همین جهت، هدف اصلی تحقیق حاضر بررسی و شناخت عوامل گسترش و ریشه‌یابی فقر در سکونتگاه‌های روستائی شهرستان میاندوآب می‌باشد و تلاش دارد به این سؤال پاسخ دهد: مهمترین عوامل مؤثر بر تشدید و گسترش فقر روستائی در شهرستان میاندوآب کدامند؟

۲- روش شناسی

پژوهش حاضر از حیث هدف اکتشافی و از نظر روش توصیفی-تحلیلی و از نظر رویکرد ترکیبی است که در مرحله بررسی تالار گفتمان کیو (Q) رویکرد کیفی و در مرحله تحلیل عاملی کیو رویکرد کمی دارد. چارچوب فلسفی از نوع پارادایم تفسیری-اثبات‌گرایی است و از حیث مکانی، پژوهشی کتابخانه‌ای - میدانی محسوب می‌شود. جامعه گفتمان نیز شامل مدیران روستائی (فرمانداری، رئیس ادارات دولتی، بخشدار، دهیارها و شوراهای اسلامی)، کارشناسان و خبرگان محلی شهرستان میاندوآب می‌باشند. جامعه گفتمان از طریق نمونه‌گیری هدفمند (گلوله برفی) معین شد و مجموعه کیو ۴۱ گویه‌ای را ۲۸ نفر از جامعه آماری مرتب کردند. روایی این پژوهش با مرور ادبیات نظری و مصاحبه با مشارکت‌کنندگان تعیین شد و سنجیت عبارات و گزاره‌ها توسط اساتید دانشگاهی، کارشناسان و خبرگان در این زمینه تأیید شد. به‌علاوه ضریب آزمون برای ۲۰ درصد شرکت‌کنندگان ۰/۹۲۶ درصد به دست آمد که نشانگر سطح بالای پایایی است. جهت تجزیه و تحلیل داده‌ها و اطلاعات از تحلیل عاملی استفسون بر مبنای فرد استفاده شد.

۳- یافته‌های تحقیق

با فرایند روش کیو «عوامل مؤثر بر گسترش فقر روستائی در شهرستان میاندوآب» مورد بررسی قرار گرفت. نتایج آماری حاصل از اجرای مدل تحلیل عاملی به روش استفسون و معیار KMO و آزمون بارتلت تأیید کننده مدل تحلیل عاملی و تناسب آن برای پژوهش بود.

* نویسنده مسئول:

محمد ولایی

آدرس: گروه جغرافیا و برنامه‌ریزی روستائی، دانشکده برنامه‌ریزی و علوم محیطی، دانشگاه تبریز، تبریز، ایران.

Email: Valaei1365@gmail.com

www.SID.ir

بخش کشاورزی رشد و گسترش نیافته و غالب مردم روستاهای این شهرستان در بخش کشاورزی (زراعت، باغداری، دامداری، پرورش زنبور عسل، پرورش ماهی و ...) مشغول فعالیت هستند. ولی امروزه، بخش کشاورزی در این شهرستان به دلیل محدودیت منابع آب و بروز خشکسالی (از سال ۱۳۸۲ شدت گرفته)، پایین بودن میزان بهره‌روی، محدودیت اشتغال‌زایی، درآمد کم و غیره روند رو به زوالی را در پیش گرفته و توان جذب همه نیروی کار موجود در روستاها را ندارد. این امر موجب کاهش فرصت‌های شغلی به‌ویژه در بخش کشاورزی گردیده و موجب گسترش و توزیع فقر روستایی شده است. لذا، مهمترین عواملی که موجب پخش و گسترش پدیده فقر در سکونتگاه‌های روستایی محدوده مورد مطالعه گردیده، عبارتند از: (۱) ضعف زیر ساخت‌های اقتصادی و سیاست‌گذاری دولت، (۲) افزایش مهاجرت فصلی و محدودیت سرمایه‌گذاری و اشتغال، (۳) ضعف فرهنگ اجتماعی و مخاطرات محیطی، (۴) بروز خشکسالی و کاهش درآمد، (۵) محدودیت‌های طبیعی و دسترسی فضایی و (۶) ضعف بنیان اقتصادی روستاییان. همانطوری که گذشت، در بین این عوامل، «ضعف زیرساخت‌های اقتصادی و سیاست‌گذاری دولت» با مقدار ویژه ۷/۱۷ و درصد واریانس ۲۵/۶۴ به عنوان مهمترین عامل مؤثر بر گسترش و پخش فقر روستایی در شهرستان میاندوآب شناخته شده است.

کلمات کلیدی: فقر روستایی، عوامل فقر، روش Q، شهرستان میاندوآب.

تشکر و قدرانی

پژوهش حاضر برگرفته از رساله دکتری نویسنده سوم (محمد ولایی)، گروه جغرافیا و برنامه‌ریزی روستایی، دانشکده برنامه‌ریزی و علوم محیطی، دانشگاه تبریز، تبریز، ایران است.

معیار KMO برابر با ۰/۶۷۶ (بیشتر از حداقل مقدار قابل اطمینان ۰/۰۵) و مقدار بارتلت برابر ۹۹۹/۸۹۹ و سطح معناداری آن ۰/۰۰۰ محاسبه شده است. نتایج تحلیل عاملی بعد از دوران عامل‌ها حکایت از ۶ عامل اصلی گسترش فقر در این محدوده دارد. به طوری که، مجموعاً عامل‌ها ۷۲/۸۹ درصد واریانس کل متغیرها را تبیین می‌کنند، یعنی ۷۲/۸۹ درصد از تغییرپذیری در ۶ عامل اصلی توضیح داده شده است. بنابراین به طور معنی‌داری می‌توان پیچیدگی مجموعه متغیرها را با استفاده از این ۶ عامل، با از دست دادن فقط ۲۷/۱۱ درصد از واریانس متغیرها کاهش داد. در بین این عامل‌ها عامل اول «ضعف زیرساخت‌های اقتصادی و سیاست‌گذاری دولت» با مقدار ویژه ۷/۱۷ و در صد واریانس ۲۵/۶۴ در صد واریانس مهمترین عامل شناسایی شده است. چنانچه، تدوین برنامه‌ها و سیاست‌های مناسب از طرف دولت زمینه بهبود توان‌های اقتصادی را مهیا می‌سازد. از دیدگاه مدیران و کارشناسان روستایی، بخش صنعت و خدمات همپای بخش کشاورزی در این شهرستان گسترش نیافته و غالب مردم روستاهای این شهرستان در بخش کشاورزی مشغول فعالیت هستند. امروزه، بخش کشاورزی در این شهرستان به دلایل مختلف از جمله محدودیت منابع آب روند رو به زوالی را در پیش گرفته و توان جذب همه نیروی کار موجود را ندارد و این امر موجب کاهش فرصت‌های شغلی به‌ویژه در بخش کشاورزی و گسترش فقر روستایی شده است و عامل «ضعف بنیان اقتصادی روستاییان» با مقدار ویژه ۱/۷۷ و درصد واریانس ۶/۳۳ به عنوان کم‌اثرترین عامل در توزیع و گسترش فقر در محدوده مورد مطالعه شناسایی شده است.

۴- بحث و نتیجه گیری

نتایج تحقیق در زمینه شناخت عوامل مؤثر بر گسترش فقر روستایی در شهرستان میاندوآب نشان داد که، بخش صنعت و خدمات، همپای

ارجاع: صدر موسوی، م. س.، آقایی هیر، م. و ولایی، م. (۱۳۹۸). بررسی و تحلیل عوامل مؤثر بر گسترش فقر روستایی در شهرستان میاندوآب با تکنیک Q. *مجله پژوهش و برنامه‌ریزی روستایی*، ۸(۳)، ۲۷-۴۴.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22067/jrpp.v5i4.73055>

Surf and download all data from SID.ir: www.SID.ir

Translate via STRS.ir: www.STRS.ir

Follow our scientific posts via our Blog: www.sid.ir/blog

Use our educational service (Courses, Workshops, Videos and etc.) via Workshop: www.sid.ir/workshop