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# THE SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE FOR THE FOOD CONSUMPTION ACTIVITY SURVEY OF 1981-82 

by
Dr. Afaf Abdel Aziz Mohamed
and
Dr. Mohamed Abdel Razik M. El-Shennawy

The principle purpose of this activity is to depict, as accurately as possible, consumption patterns of rural landholders' households which rely on their own farm production and/or purchased commodities to fill their needs. A multi-staged stratified random sample was chosen for this purpose. Financial and manpower limitations dictated limitation of the sample size to 249.

## Selection of the Larger Sample

Two previous studies, Egypt, Major Constraints to Increasing Agricultural Productivity (U.S.D.A.) and the Farm Management Survey of 1977, were utilized In delineating agricultural zones for the study. In the Major Constraints Study, Egypt was classified into 14 agricultural zones based on cropping patterns, physical properties of the soil and geography. In the Farm Management Survey zones including new lands were excluded and the old land was reclassified into 18 agricultural zones. In this study the land area of Egypt was reclassified into five zones. Criteria used in the reclassification were the cropping patterns and the geographic distribution of the villages. The geographic distribution of the 56 villages surveyed in the Farm Management Survey and the proportion of the area in each zone to the total agricultural area of Egypt are apparent from Table 1. The Farm Management Survey provided detailed data on the landholding structure according to holding classes at the village level; especially for the classes of interest in this study. In'a

TABLE 1. The Distribution of Villages ( 56 villages) in the Farm Management Survey Sample Among the 18 Agricultural Zones and the Relative Weight of Each Zone

| Zone Number ${ }^{a}$ | Number of Districts in Each Zone | Number of Villages in Each Zone | Total Holding Area in Feddans | Percentage of Holding Area to Total for 56 Villages | Number of Villages Selected |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 | 162 | 276,174 | 4.69 | 8 |
| 2 | 1 | 18 | 84,137 | 1.43 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 232 | 22,583 | 0.38 | 2 |
| 4 | 7 | 292 | 280,456 | 4.76 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 18 | 66,824 | 1.13 | 1 |
| 6 | 3 | 57 | 236,408 | 4.01 | 2 |
| 7 | 9 | 393 | 457,358 | 7.78 | 3 |
| 8 | 21 | 56 | 1,332,661 | 22.63 | 10 |
| 9 | 5 | 192 | 315,157 | 5.35 | 3 |
| 10 | 6 | 248 | 262:863 | 4.46 | 2 |
| 11 | 8 | 164 | 200,958 | 3.41 | 5 |
| 12 | 5 | 161 | 361,485 | 6.14 | 3 |
| 13 | 32 | 997 | 1,247,804 | 21.19 | 6 |
| 14 | 6 | 149 | 173,990 | 2.96 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 20 | 36.507 | 0.62 | 1 |
| 16 | 4 | 117 | 174,248 | 2.96 | 1 |
| 17 | 1 | 30 | 49,868 | 0.86 | 2 |
| 18 | 8 | 137 | 308',754 | 5.24 | 2 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Zones delineated for Farm Management Survey of 1977.
sense then, the sample for the study is a subsample of that used for the Farm Management Survey. The five major zones used in this study were (1) The Rice Zone, (2) The Delta Traditional Crop Zone, (3) The Fruit and Vegetable Zone, (4) The Middle Egypt Traditional Crop Zone, and finally, (5) The Sugar Cane Zone.

## First Zone - The Rice Zone

This zone is in the northern part of the Delta. The dominant cultivated crop is rice which comprised 27.12 percent of the total cropped area and about 50.24 percent of the total holding area in 1977. Berseem was next, comprising 18.8 percent of the total cropped area. 1 This zone included 14 villages (from the Farm Management Survey Sample which included 56 villages) from 12 districts. There are six governorates in the zone (Table 2 and map).

## Second Zone - The Zone of Traditional Crops in the Delta

This zone is located in the mid-delta area. Traditional crops are cultivated in proportionate areas with no dominant crops. Major crops are maize (16.2 percent of the surveyed area in 1977) cotton (13.9 percent), rice (13.5 percent), Berseem (13.4 percent) and wheat (13.2 percent) (Table 2). This zone included 14 villages from the Farm Management Survey sample located in ten districts as indicated on the map.

Third Zone - The Fruit and Vegetable Zone
This zone includes Qualubia, Giza, and the villages near Cairo and Alexandria. The major cultivated crops in this zone are vegetables and fruit

[^0]TABLE 2. Principal Zones and the Percentage of Crops Relative to Cropped Area and Holding Area in Each Zone


TABLE 2 (Continued)

|  Zone <br> Crops  | Fourth Zone |  |  | Fifth Zone |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Traditional Crops |  |  | Sugarcane |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { (feddans) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percentage of Cropped Area | Percentage of Holding Area | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { (feddans) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percentage of Cropped Area | Percentage of Holding Area |
| Wheat | 3,201 | 15.30 | 22.19 | 4,506 | 20.13 | 35.44 |
| Beans | 861 | 4.11 | 5.97 | 328 | 1.47 | 2.58 |
| Berseea | 2,321 | 11.09 | 16.09 | 878 | 3.92 | . 91 |
| Barley | 337 | 1.61 | 2.34 | 286 | 1.28 | 2.50 |
| Rice | 293 | 1.40 | 2.03 | -- | -- | -- |
| Zea. Maize | 2,062 | 9.85 | 14.29 | 3,307 | 14.78 | 26.01 |
| Sorghua | 863 | 4.12 | 5.98 | 2,592 | 11.58 | 20.39 |
| Vegetables | 1,776 | 8.49 | 12.31 | 611 | 2.73 | 4.81 |
| Sugar Canc | 35 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 2,885 | 12.84 | 22.61 |
| Cotton | 3,263 | 15.59 | 22.62 | 995 | 4.45 | 7.83 |
| Fruit Orchards | 738 | 3.53 | 5.12 | 262 | 1.17 | 2.0 |
| Total Crop Area | 20,925 |  |  | 22,381 |  |  |
| Total Holding Area | 14,428 |  |  | 12,715 |  |  |


trees which were 34.34 percent of the cropped area, or 63.09 percent of the total holding area in 1977, as indicated in Table 2. This zone included 11 villages surveyed in the Farm Management Survey in ten districts (as shown on the map).

Fourth Zone - The Traditional Crop Zone in Mid-Egypt
This zone is located in Middle Egypt. This is a traditional crop zone where the cropping percentages were: cotton 15.59 percent, wheat 15.23 percent, berseem 11.09 percent, and maize 9.8 percent of the total crop area in the zone as shown in Table 2.

This zone included seven villages from the Farm Management Survey sample which were located in seven districts as shown on the map.

## Fifth Zone - The Sugarcane Zone

This zone is located in Upper Egypt and included ten villages from the Farm Management Survey sample located in nine districts. The dominant cultivated crop is sugarcane cultivated on almost 22.69 percent of total holding area in the zone in 1977, but other cultivated crops have higher percentages than sugarcane in the specific villages selected (Table 2).

## Selection of the Villages

Since the purpose of this study was to ascertain how to improve food consumption among the rural poor, logic dictated selecting the sample from among the rural poor. However, there was no existing sample frame for the landless and the mathematical model for this study requires data concerning farm production and consumption from the landholder's own crops. Therefore, it was decided to largely limit the sample to landholders holding five feddans or less.

It was decided, when selecting sample villages from the different zones, to select principal villages and an alternate back-up in each case to be used if difficulties impeded the use of the principal villages. The weights of the zones and the distribution of the villages selected from each zone (Table 3) were arrived at by using the Farm Management Survey sample data. Only the data on the landholders having five feddans or less was used. The ten villages selected to represent all of the zones were about 18 percent of the 56 villages in the Farm Management Survey sample.

The percentage that the holding area of five feddans or less was to the total area in the village was calculated. The percentages were listed in rank order and using a table of random numbers; villages were selected from each of the zones if their percentage was the next random number on the list.

## Selection of the Landholders

The cooperative in each of the selected villages prepared a list of the names of the landholders in that village. They were then classified into landholding-size classes.

Financial and manpower costs were taken into consideration in defining the sample size. It was agreed that the total number of sample observations would be 249. Their distribution was made on the basis of the proportion of landholders in each holding class in the ten selected villages with the constraint that the number of selected holders in any village not be less than ten, in order to assure representation of the holding classes. The landholders selected were chosen randomly using a table of random numbers. In each case, the household to be surveyed was chosen and an alternate also chosen.

TABLE 3. Weights of Zones, and the Distribution of the Villages Selected From Each Zone

| Zone Type | Total Holding Area of the Zone | Total Holding Area of Five Feddans or Less in the Zone | Weight Ratio (percent) | Number of Villages Selected In Each Zone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone 1 <br> Rice | 61,008 | 36.845 | 43 | 4 |
| Zone 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Traditional Crops Lower Egypt | 23.917 | 15,511 | 18 | 2 |
| Zone 3 <br> Fruit and Vegetables | - 33.655 | 16.674 | 20 | 2 |
| Zone 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Traditional Crops Middle Egypt | 14,428 | 7,467 | 9 | 1 |
| Zone 5 | 12 |  | 10 | 1 |
| SugarCane |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 145,723 | 85', 121 | 100 | 10 |

In addition, 26 households were chosen to be interviewed in detail. They were from two villages chosen at random from the ten villages in the larger sample. One of the villages was in Upper Egypt, one in Lower Egypt. One-half of the landholders in each of the villages and members of their families were interviewed.

## Qualifications

The small size of the sample obviates the results of this study being generalized to be representative of all of Egypt. This is a pilot study. The sample for the Farm Management Survey was a representative sample and this subsample is representative of that larger sample.

TABLE 4. Relative Weight for Each Village in Zone 1 (Rice)

| Governorate | Digtrict | Village | Total Holding Area in the Village | Total Holding Area of 5 Feddans or less | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Relativ } \\ \hline \text { Percentage } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | e Weight Approximate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Accumulative } \\ & \text { Ascending } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Rezarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rafr El Shiek | E1 Hanorel | El Kafr $\mathrm{El}^{\text {S Sharki }}$ | 6,741 | 4070.0 | 11.05 | 11 | 11 |  |
|  | Kaft el Shick | Shenou | 1,417 | 1312.0 | 3.56 | 4 | 15 |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{\text {El }}$ Abbassa | 11,735 | 6294.0 1629.0 | 17.08 | 17 | 32 |  |
|  |  | El Arimon |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |
|  | Poua | Rabrit | 1,980 | 947.0 | 2.57 | 3 | 39 |  |
|  | Desouk | El Safia | 2,781 | 1596.0 | 4.33 | 4 | 43 |  |
| Garbia | E1 Hahala El Robra | El Gabria | 1;872 | 1411.0 | 3.83 | 4 | 47 |  |
| Daniatta | Rafr Saad | Rafr el Hastani | 881 | 4908.0 | 13.32 | 13 | 60 |  |
| Dakahlya | E1 Mahroudia | Bani Ebeed | 8,389 | 5464.0 | 14.83 | 15 | 75 |  |
|  | Dekernis | Manshant E1 Ganal | 4,239 | 2256.0 | 6.12 | 6 | 81 |  |
|  | El Manzala | E1 Gamalia | 4;869 | 3184.0 | 8.64 | 9 | 90 |  |
|  | Aga | Manshast E1 Ekewa | 1,316 | 1308.0 | 3.55 | 4 | 96 |  |
|  | Talka | E1 Manakla | 1,767 | 1758.0 | 4.77 | 5 | 101 |  |
| B1 Behera | E1 Delengat | Racha | 2,030 | 708.0 | 1.92 | 2 | 92 |  |

table 4. Relative Weight for Each Village in Zone 2 (Traditional Cropg - Lower Egypt)

| Governorate | District | Village | Total Holding Area in the Village | Total Holding Area of 5 Feddans or less | Relati Percentage | e Weight Approximate | Accurulative Ascending | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 Monoufia | Sheblen El Kom | Kafr El Shlek | 450 | 444 | 1.86 | 3 | 3 |  |
|  | Guebna | Dashous | 1,700 | 1309 | 8.-- | 8 | 11 |  |
|  | Manouf |  | 234 | 236 | - | 2 | 13 |  |
| E1 Sharkia | Belbast | -_ E1 Dahashna | - | 880 | - | 6 | 19 |  |
|  |  | E1 Shagabna | - | - | - | 4 | 23 |  |
|  | Aba Kebier | Manshat Raduan | - | 930 | - | 6 | 29 |  |
|  |  | Rafr $\mathrm{El}^{\square}$ | 101 | 973 | - | 6 | 35 |  |
|  | Pakour | E1 Samana | 1,774 | 1309 | - | 8 | 43 |  |
|  |  | El Ratavia El Seghra | 3,173 | 1328 | - | 9 | 52 |  |
| * |  | - | 2,158 | 1510 | 1.14 | 10 | 62 |  |
|  | E1 Zazazifk | Rafr Denehia | 1,180 | ' 1132 | 7.30 | 7 | 69 |  |
|  | El Hyamia | El Ekreva | 3,573 | 2174 | 14.02 | 14 | 83 |  |
|  | Rafr Sakr | El Sefiea | 2,589 | 1411 | 9.10 | 9 | 92 |  |
|  | Dlab Negn | Shambard Mankala | 1,395 | 1192 | 7.68 | 8 | 100 |  |
|  |  |  | 23,917 | 15511 | 100.-- | 100 |  |  |

TABLE 4. Relative Height for Each Village in Zone 3 (Vegetables and Fruits)

| Governorate | District | Village | Total Holding Area in the village | Total Holding Area of 5 Peddans or less | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Relativ } \\ \text { Percentage } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ve Weight Approximate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Accumulative } \\ & \text { Ascending. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E1 Kalubia | Kalulb | Balaks | 1,113 | 1;215 | 4.29 | 4 | 7 |  |
|  | Shebln El Ranater | Rafr Taha | 641 | 627 | 3.76 | 4 | 36 |  |
|  | E1 Khanka | Rafr Hazza | 944 | 798 | 4.79 | 5 | 12 |  |
|  | Tookh | Beltan | 1,113 | 1;098 | 6.56 | 7 | 43 |  |
| El Giza | Eababa | Kafr Hakio | 2,757 | 1,525 | 9.15 | 9 | 21 |  |
|  |  | Hahia | 2,494 | 1;871 | 11.22 | 11 | 32 |  |
| Alexandria | Alezandria | Ezab Hobar | 1,696 | 1,094 | 6.56 | 6 | 49 |  |
| E1 Behera | Abd Bl Hatameer <br> Kom Hazada | Koa El Farag Mahalet Ahmed | $\begin{array}{r} 9,634 \\ 992 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,467 \\ 198 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.80 \\ 4.19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 68 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| El Gharbla | Kafr El zayat | El Dalgazoun | 3,612 | 2,308 | 13.84 | 15 | 82 |  |
| El Sharkia | Fakous | E1 Salhia | 8,159 | 2,978 | 17.11 | 18 | 100 |  |
| Total |  |  | 33,655 | 16,674 |  | 100 |  |  |

TABLE 4. Relative Weight for Each village in Zone 4 (Traditional Crops - Middle Egypt)

| Governorate | District | Village | Total Holding Area in the Village | Total Holding Area of 5 Feddans or less | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Relativ } \\ \text { Percentage } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ve Weight Approxinate | Accumulative Ascending | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| el Faiua | Sanours | Bani Omman | 1,881 | 1,045 | 13.99 | 14 | 14 |  |
|  | E1 Betway | E1 Shawashna | 2,860 | 1,436 | 19.23 | 20 | 34 |  |
|  | Tanya | E1 Mazatly | 4,053 | 1,377 | 18.44 | 18 | 52 |  |
| Bani Self. | Smasta E1 Wakf | Mazoura | 2,631 | 1,928 | 25.82 | 26 | 78 |  |
| E1 Minya | Malawy | Kabr hour | 1,660 | 822 | 11.00 | 11 | 89 |  |
|  | Abo Karkas | Asmanl | 1,017 | 703 | 9.41 | 9 | 98 | - |
|  | Bani Mazar | Homada | 326 | 156 | 2.08 | 2 | 100 |  |
| Total |  |  | 14,428 | 7,467 |  | 100 |  |  |

TABLE 4. Relative Weight for Each Village in Zone 5 (Sugar Cane - Upper Egypt)

| Governorate | District | Village | Total Holding Area in the Village | Total Holding Area of 5 Feddans or 1 ess | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Relat } \\ \text { Percentag } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Weight Approxinate | Accumalative Ascending | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assuit | E1 Gusiya | Dier E1 | 1,344 | 1,014 | 11.- | 18 | 12 |  |
|  | Satul Selim | E1 Malmas | 472 | 329 | . 81 | 4 | 16 |  |
| Souhag | Saquth | E1 Haradna | 383 | 314 | _. 64 | 4 | 20 |  |
|  | E1 Yanshah | El Rashalda | 1,059 | 957 | 11.10 | 11 | 31 |  |
|  | Arlad Tork | Awlad Tork Gharb | 1,415 | 1,132 | 13.13 | 13 | 44 |  |
| Kena | Kena | El Toyairat <br> E1 Dier El Sharki | $\begin{array}{r} 1,752 \\ 711 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,262 \\ \quad 499 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14.63 \\ 5.79 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59 \\ & 65 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Gues | Khuzem | 2,552 | 1,081 | 12.53 | 13 | 78 |  |
|  | Abu Tesht | Kem Yaquab | 862 | 772 | 8.95 | 9 | 87 |  |
| Asuan | Koa Oabe | El Sabeel | 2,115 | 1,264 | 14.66 | 15 | 102 |  |
| Total |  |  | 12,715 | 8,624 |  | 102 |  |  |

TABLE 5. Names of Selected villages in the Sample

| Zone | PRINCIPAL |  |  | ALTERNATE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Name of the Village | District | Governorate | Name of the Village | District | Governorate |
| First | Manshaat E1 Gamal | Dekernis | El Dakahlia | El Gageria | El Mahala el Kobra | E1 Gharbia |
|  | Ramha | E1 Delengat | El Behera | El Abassia | Kafr El Shiekh | Kafr E1 Shiekh |
|  | Shenou | Rafr El Sheikh | Kafr El Sheikh | Beni-Ebid | E1 Mahmoudia | E1 Dakahlia |
|  | E1 Arimon | Kafr El Sheikh | Kafr E1 Sheikh | E1 Kafr El Sharki | E1 Harmoul | Kafr E1 Sheikh |
| Second | E1 Solheia | Kafr Sakr | E1 Sharkia | Damhoug | Rewesha | El-Minofia |
|  | Ranteer | Fakous | E1 Sharkia | El Ekhewa | El Hessenia | El Sharkia |
| Third | E1 Salhia | Fakous | E1 Sharkia | Mahalt Ahmed | Kom Hamada | El Behera |
|  | Balaks | Raloub | El Kalubia | Nahia | Embaba | E1 Giza |
| Fourth | Mazoura | Semesta El Wakf | Beni Suef | El Maratly | Tamia | E1 Faium |
| Fifth | E1 Haradna | Sakulta | Souhag | Kom Yaakub | Abu Tesht | Kena |

TABLE 6. Selected Numbers of Holders for Each Village in Sample Villages According to Different Sizes of Holdings



[^0]:    lercentages for all five zones are based on calculations using data gathered in the Farm Management Survey of 1977.

