



Research Article

The Reality of Government Support for Farmers of Protected Vegetables and the Proposal to Improve it in the Governorates of the Central Region

Rasul Hadi Hassun* and Ali Lateef Jasim Al-Mashhadani*

Department of Agricultural Extension and Transfer Technologies, College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad, Iraq.

Abstract | The research aimed to diagnose the reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables in the first place and to present proposals for improving the government support. A random sample of 140 farmers in the governorates was taken. A questionnaire was prepared, including five main areas and was distributed among the farmers. The research results have shown that there is a general weakness in government support. The financial support ranked last among the other support axes, while the Agricultural Extension support axis ranked first. Thus, the research proposed some proposals as an attempt to reform the government support with agricultural producers in general, including the farmers of protected vegetables.

Received | October 02, 2024; **Accepted** | June 22, 2025; **Published** | June 28, 2025

***Correspondence** | Rasul Hadi Hassun and Ali Lateef Jasim Al-Mashhadani, Department of Agricultural Extension and Transfer Technologies, College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences, University of Baghdad, Iraq; **Email:** rassoul.hassoun@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq, ali.lateef@coagri.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Citation | Hassun, R.H. and A.L.J. Al-Mashhadani. 2025. The reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables and the proposal to improve it in the governorates of the central region. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research*, 38(2): 62-71.

DOI | <https://dx.doi.org/10.17582/journal.pjar/2025/38.2.62.71>

Keywords | Government support, Protected vegetables, Greenhouse, Agricultural extension



Copyright: 2025 by the authors. Licensee ResearchersLinks Ltd, England, UK.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Sustainable agricultural development is a comprehensive and continuous process that works to advance the agricultural sector (Mohammed, 2020). It is one of the priorities of the economic development plans of developed and developing countries in improving the agricultural sector and increasing its contribution to the total domestic product, reducing the volume of agricultural imports, and trying to achieve food security and reach self-sufficiency (Hussein *et al.*, 2020), which can be achieved by transferring and disseminating agricultural practices

that allow for the sustainability of agricultural production (Shukr and Hameed, 2021).

Unfortunately, Iraq suffers from a weakness in achieving the aims of sustainable agricultural development in general (Al-Aqeedi, 2020), especially achieving food security and achieving self-sufficiency in vegetable crops, which come second after grain crops in terms of nutrition. As it has great importance in the daily food of people around the world because of its importance for human health, for prevention of chronic diseases such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes and obesity, as well as for the prevention

and alleviation of several micronutrient deficiencies, especially in less developed countries (Keller and Tukuitonga, 2007).

Also, it is characterized by its rapid growth, meeting demand in a short time, and the speed of achieving returns compared to other crops. Thus, according to the constant demand for these crops, they have to be provided throughout the year, which means relying on the technique of protected cultivation along with open cultivation in meeting the Iraqi consumer's need for these crops (Abu-Dahi and Al-Batawi, 2009).

The protected vegetable cultivation is considered one of the agricultural techniques that generate high profits for the agricultural farmer compared to open cultivation (farming), which has been considered one of the patterns of agricultural investment that most countries of the world have taken to increase their agricultural productions (Al-Abdali and Al-Nasr, 2014). It is also considered one of the forms of semi-urban agriculture that helps in achieving sustainability and obtaining an alternative food model (Abdul Wahab and Rizko, 2017). However, it is expensive because of the money it requires to provide raw materials for greenhouses and the money needed to maintain them (Kalidar *et al.*, 2012).

Most Iraqi agricultural farmers suffer from weak technical abilities such as the excessive use of chemical fertilizers and the overuse of water by some farmers (Al-Mashhadani, 2020), as well as their suffering from insufficient funds to finance their agricultural projects, such as protected vegetable cultivation (Dawood, 2012). So, they are forced to request government support, which is the main source for the sustainability of their agricultural activities, especially smallholders' farmers (Hussein, 2017).

Government support is defined as the financial contribution provided by the government that benefits those who receive it (Sultan *et al.*, 2021). As in the case of providing guarantees for loans, or the support may be in the form of a waiver of revenues by the government, such as tax exemptions, or in the form of providing some production requirements or technical support services (Al-Aqabi and Dahash, 2019). The financial support is also defined as financial expenditures (cash payments) afforded by the government to contribute to achieving some development goals, as well as to solve some agricultural problems (Al-Ahbabee and

Al-Ajili, 2021).

Government support also represents a method that helps farmers to increase production, reduce price fluctuations, and ensure a stable income for them (Al-Khazaali, 2009). This can be achieved through agricultural extension support, which is considered one of the most important forms of government support, which helps agricultural farmers to understand and solve their problems by providing them with technical information through various agricultural extension methods, such as extension seminars, training courses, and other extension methods and aids (means) that ensure dissemination effective agricultural techniques for agricultural farmers (Al-Mashhadani *et al.*, 2017; Al-Mashhadani, 2020; Alazy and Al-Mashhadani, 2023).

Greenhouses are considered one of the modern agricultural techniques in Iraq, as they generate abundant agricultural production compared to the open cultivation, which is attributed to many reasons, including the ability of plastic covers to reduce water evaporation, as well as the condensation of evaporated water droplets on the plastic covers, which transform to water that can be reused again, in addition to its contribution to protecting the soil from erosion and protecting the soil from dust storms (Sebur, 2016).

Despite the aforementioned importance of greenhouses in agricultural production in Iraq, their results are still below the required level compared to other countries (Barbaz and Azzi, 2012), especially in vegetable crops (Al-Mashhadani and Naguib, 2015), as a result of the policy of deliberate commodity dumping of vegetable crops (Ghadhban and Jbara, 2019), which was followed in Iraq after 2003 in flooding the Iraqi market with all types of vegetable crops from neighboring countries. This coincided with the government's lack of intervention in controlling import operations according to the needs of the local market (Hussein and Al-Khafaji, 2022), and this led to the reluctance of some agricultural farmers to grow vegetable crops.

The total number of greenhouses in Iraq during the year 2020 reached 63,413 while the number of greenhouses in Jordan reached 84,554 in 2020 (Directorate of Agricultural Information and Statistics, 2020), this is a clear indicator of the weak spread of protected agriculture in Iraq, especially if

we know that the percentage of Jordan's population compared to Iraq's population represents 25%.

Thus, the research problem is represented by the low production of protected vegetable crops, the inability to achieve the self-sufficiency, and the inability to compete with their counterparts of the imported vegetables in quantity, quality and price.

Research objectives

1. Determining the reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables in the following areas:

Agricultural Extension support for farmers of protected vegetables.

- Technical support for farmers of protected vegetables.
 - Financial support for farmers of protected vegetables.
 - Incentive (stimulant) support for farmers of protected vegetables.
 - Equipment (supply) support for farmers of protected vegetables.
2. Submit proposals to improve government support for farmers of protected vegetables based on the results of the first objective.

Research hypothesis

The weakness of government support is one of the most important reasons behind the deterioration of the production process of protected vegetable crops, which contributed to the inability to compete with imported vegetable crops, and led to the weak diffusion of protected agriculture technology (Green Houses) throughout Iraq.

The research importance

The research's importance is tied to the economic, health and environmental significance of the protected cultivation of vegetables.

The current research is considered the first one which addresses all the types of government support for the protected cultivation of vegetables in Iraq.

Materials and Methods

The diagnostic-analytical technique is considered one of the descriptive approach techniques that is used in the research as it the most appropriate technique for achieving the research objectives.

Research population and sample

The research areas included all the governorates in the central region of Iraq, as these governorates were deliberately chosen (Purposive sample) because they are the governorates with the most widespread use of protected cultivation of vegetables, according to the statistics of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Hence, the research population included all farmers working in the protected cultivation of vegetables, totaling 14013 farmers, distributed across five governorates of the central region. A simple random sample of farmers within these governorates was taken, representing 1%, resulting in a final research sample of 140 farmers, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: *Distribution the farmers of protected vegetable cultivation according to the governorates of the central region.*

Governorates	Counts	Percentage	Sample
Baghdad	5435	0.01	54
Babylon	3239	0.01	32
Wasit	1553	0.01	16
Anbar	1701	0.01	17
Diyala	2085	0.01	21
Total	14013	0.01	140

Research tool

To develop a scale for determining the reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables, a set of scientific sources and previous studies were adopted, and the opinions of researchers specializing in Agricultural Extension and Horticulture were considered, as well as agricultural statistics and reports were used. Thus, five research areas were determined:

- Agricultural Extension support for farmers of protected vegetables (7 items).
- Technical support for farmers of protected vegetables (5 items).
- Financial support for farmers of protected vegetables (4 items).
- Incentive (stimulant) support for farmers of protected vegetables (7 items).
- Equipment (supply) support for farmers of protected vegetables (31 items).

The agreement of these items was measured by using a four-level scale (strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree), with scores of

4, 3, 2, and 1, assigned to the scale items, respectively. Hence, the total scale score ranged between 54 and 216 degrees.

Results and Discussion

First: Determining the reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables in the five areas (axes)

The reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables was determined across all the five areas, and the research results have shown that the highest numerical value for farmers' agreement was 163 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 63 degrees, with an average and standard deviation of 68.16 and 22.72 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 2.

Table 2: *Distribution of farmers' responses according to their overall agreement on the five areas of government support.*

Agreement level on the government support	Catego-ries	Cou-nts	%	Aver-age	Min	Max
Low agreement	54-107	96	68.57	85.83	63	107
Medium agreement	108-161	43	30.71	127.42	66	99
High agreement	162-216	1	0.71	163	163	163
Total		140	100	S.D =22.7		
				Average = 68.16		

The research results in Table 2 have shown that more than two-thirds of the farmers responses fall within the low level of agreement of government support, with an average which is higher than the general average. This means that there is great agreement on the weakness of government support in general. It may be due to the weakness of the material and motivational support for farmers of protected vegetables.

Hence, the results of the agreement on the government

Government Support for Farmers of Protected Vegetables

support will be detailed, covering the five areas in some depth and discussing the possible reasons behind their ranking, as follows:

Agricultural extension support for farmers of protected vegetables

The research results have shown that the highest numerical value of farmers' agreement on the axis of Agricultural Extension support was 24 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 9 degrees, with an average and standard deviation of 16.27 and 2.78 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 3.

Table 3: *Distribution the farmers' responses according to the level of agricultural extension support.*

Support level	Catego-ries	Counts	%	Average	Min	Max
Low	7 – 13	19	13.57	11.63	9	13
Medium	14 – 20	108	77.14	16.39	14	20
High	21 – 28	13	9.28	22.07	21	24
Total		140	100	S.D = 2.78		
				Average = 16.27		

The research results in Table 3 have indicated that the most farmers have described Agricultural Extension support as medium. Perhaps this is due to the weakness of implement the periodic follow-up (monitoring) for farmers and the vulnerability to exposure the priority problems in the activities of the Agricultural Extension system.

The validity of these interpretations is confirmed by the research results in Table 4, which has shown that the paragraphs ranked five and half and seventh had weighted average 1.79 and 1.71, respectively, and have mentioned to the weakness in the follow-up for farmers of as well as to exposure the priority problems and present effective solutions in the activities of the Agricultural Extension system.

Table 4: *Distribution the paragraphs of agricultural extension support axis according to the weighted average.*

Paragraphs of agricultural extension support	Weighted average	S.D	Rank
Implement Agricultural Extension activities such as training courses, seminars, etc. related to protected vegetable cultivation	2.52	0.44	1
Giving marketing advices	2.44	0.86	2
Continuous communication between the Agricultural Extension worker and the agricultural producer (farmer)	2.39	0.61	3
The presence of agricultural extension workers specializing in horticulture in the region	2.14	0.54	4
The agricultural extension system provides periodic follow-up for protected vegetable farmers	1.79	0.64	5,5
Suggesting effective solutions to priority problems when implementing agricultural extension activities	1.79	0.70	5,5
Exposure to real or priority problems in agricultural extension activities	1.71	0.83	7

Although the Agricultural Extension carries out activities which are not few (as it has mentioned in the paragraph ranked first in Table 4) in the field of protected vegetable cultivations, these activities do not discuss the real problems of farmers, but rather, these activities deal with secondary and intuitive problems.

Technical support for farmers of protected vegetables The research results have shown that the highest numerical value of farmers' agreement on the axis of technical support was 14 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 6 degrees, with an average and standard deviation of 9.44 and 1.47 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 5.

Table 5: *Distribution the farmers responses according to the level of technical support.*

Support level	Catego-ries	Counts	%	Average	Min	Max
Low	5 – 9	72	51.42	8.31	6	8
Medium	10 – 14	68	48.57	10.63	10	11
High	15 – 20	0	0	-	-	-
Total		140	100	S.D =	1.47	
				Average =	9.44	

The research results in the Table 5 have shown that more than half of farmers have described the technical support as low, and the rest of them have described it as medium.

This may be attributed to the weakness in providing the essential agricultural services which related to the protected vegetable cultivation, such as: lack of providing electric power, poor maintenance services for agricultural machines and equipment, and the weakness in providing sustainable water for agriculture. As shown in the Table 6.

Financial support for farmers of protected vegetables The research results have shown that the highest numerical value of farmers agreement on the axis of financial support was 12 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 4 degrees, with an average

Table 8: *Distribution the paragraphs of the financial support axis according to the weighted average.*

Paragraphs of financial support	weighted average	S.D	Rank
Availability of agricultural loans and advances in general	1.48	0.58	1
Agricultural advances and loans are available in terms of the time of need	1.34	0.58	2
Agricultural loans and advances are sufficient to meet the farmer's needs	1.30	0.62	3
Ease of applying for agricultural loans and advances, as well as the simplicity of the procedures for obtaining them	1.18	0.50	4

and standard deviation of 5.30 and 2.08 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 7.

Table 6: *Distribution the paragraphs of the technical support axis according to the weighted average.*

Paragraphs of technical support	weighted average	S.D	Rank
The existence of periodic prevention campaigns against pests and diseases	2.09	0.71	1
The existence of periodic control campaigns against pests and diseases	2.01	0.67	2
Providing water for agriculture	1.76	0.58	3
Providing maintenance services for agricultural machines and equipment	1.73	0.52	4
Providing electrical energy	1.67	0.39	5

Table 7: *Distribution the farmers' responses according to the level of financial support.*

Support level	Categories	Counts	%	Average	Min	Max
Low	4 – 7	121	86.43	4.60	4	7
Medium	8 – 11	13	9.29	8.68	7	9
High	12 – 16	6	4.29	12	12	12
Total		140	100	S.D = 2.08		
				Average = 5.30		

The research results in the above table have shown that the vast majority of farmers have described the financial support as low.

This may be due to the weakness of financial support in general, because of the difficulty in obtaining loans as a result of the bureaucratic procedures, as well as the insufficiency (shortage) of agricultural loans, as shown in the Table 8.

Some government reports have indicated that the government agencies take complex bureaucratic procedures when paying out or disbursing financial loans to farmers, due to the lack of trust in farmers. This may be attributed to some farmers using agricultural loans to establish non-agricultural projects, such as buying a car, building a house, or using the loan for wedding.

On the other hand, the report of federal board of supreme audit, 2020, has indicated that the farmers' loans are only sufficient for one agricultural season, i.e., to buy seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides, and to buy iron structures and plastic covers from local markets which are often of poor quality. Therefore, most of the production requirements are damaged due to corrosion (erosion) or exposure to weather conditions (Federal Board of Supreme Audit, 2020). This requires purchasing new requirements again after a short period, which increases the cost of protected vegetable cultivations.

Incentive (stimulant) support for farmers of protected vegetables

The research results have shown that the highest numerical value of farmers agreement on the axis of incentive (simulant) support was 20 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 7 degrees, with an average and standard deviation of 10.09 and 2.67 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 9.

Table 9: *Distribution the farmers responses according to the level of incentive support.*

Support level	Categories	Counts	%	Average	Min	Max
Low	4 – 11	114	81.43	8.96	7	11
Medium	12 – 19	25	17.86	14.84	12	16
High	20 – 28	1	0.71	20	20	20
Total		140	100	S.D = 2.67		
				Average= 10.09		

The research results in the above table have shown that the vast majority of farmers have described the level of incentive (stimulant) support as low.

This may be attributed to the lack of implementation of the local product protection law, in addition to the high prices of greenhouse requirements (supplies), as shown in Table 10.

Equipment (supply) support for farmers of protected vegetables

The research results have shown that the highest numerical value of farmers' agreement on the axis of equipment support was 61 degrees, and the lowest numerical value was 1 degree, with an average and standard deviation of 53.91 and 15.55 degrees, respectively. As shown in Table 11.

The research results in the Table 11 have shown that more than two-thirds of farmers have described the equipment support as low, and the rest of them (less than one-third) described it as medium.

This may be due to the high prices of equipment (supplies) provided by government agencies compared to local markets, and the inappropriateness of providing the farmer with equipment in terms of timing, in addition to the poor quality of the prepared equipment (materials), as shown in Table 12.

Table 10: *Distribution the paragraphs of the incentive (stimulant) support axis according to the weighted average.*

Paragraphs of incentive (Stimulant) support	weighted average	S.D	Rank
Conducting agricultural competitions	2.09	0.75	1
Conducting exhibitions to promote local agricultural products	2.06	0.7	2
Supporting the price of local agricultural products	1.70	0.62	3
Using the agricultural calendar when importing vegetable crops from abroad	1.57	0.56	4
Raising the import tax on protected agriculture supplies	1.22	0.39	5
Reducing the prices of greenhouse supplies	1.19	0.4	6
Taking into account the protection of local products	1.16	0.33	7

Table 11: *Distribution the farmers responses according to the level of equipment support.*

Support level	Categories	Counts	%	Average	Min.	Max.
Low	31 – 61	96	68.57	12.41	31	58
Medium	62 – 92	44	31.43	31.67	63	92
High	93 – 124	0	0	-	-	-
Total		140	100	S.D =	15.55	
				Average =	53.91	

Table 12: *Distribution the paragraphs of the equipment support axis according to the weighted average.*

Paragraphs of Equipment Support	weighted average	S.D	Rank
Providing pesticides for the farmer	3.38	0.84	1
Providing plastic covers for the farmer	2.96	0.57	2
Providing chemical fertilizers for the farmer	2.49	0.9	3
Sufficiency of chemical fertilizers provided for the farmer	2.28	0.68	4
Sufficiency of pesticides provided for the farmer	2.23	0.6	5
Suitability of provided chemical fertilizers in terms of quality	2.22	0.73	6
Sufficiency of plastic covers provided for the farmer	2.21	0.69	7
Suitability of provided improved seeds in terms of timing	2.16	0.67	8
Suitability of provided pesticides in terms of timing	2.09	0.73	9
Sufficiency of provided improved seeds	2.04	0.7	10.5
Suitability of provided organic fertilizers in terms of timing	2.04	0.85	10.5
Providing a drip irrigation system for the farmer	1.99	0.37	12
Suitability of provided organic fertilizers in terms of quality	1.84	0.65	13
Providing improved seeds for the farmer	1.81	0.91	14
Suitability of provided improved seeds in terms of quality	1.71	0.81	15
Providing organic fertilizers for the farmer	1.65	0.48	16
Suitability of providing the farmer with a drip irrigation system in terms of quality	1.47	0.64	17
Sufficiency of providing the farmer with a drip irrigation system	1.41	0.56	18
Suitability of provided pesticides in terms of quality	1.40	0.64	19
Sufficiency of provided organic fertilizers	1.34	0.56	20
Suitability of provided improved seeds in terms of price	1.31	0.63	21.5
Suitability of provided chemical fertilizers in terms of price	1.31	0.47	21.5
Suitability of provided pesticides in terms of price	1.30	0.52	23
Sufficiency of provided plastic covers	1.26	0.52	24
Suitability of provided chemical fertilizers in terms of timing	1.23	0.58	25
Suitability of providing the farmer with a drip irrigation system in terms of timing	1.19	0.4	26
Providing fuel for the farmer	1.18	0.54	27
Suitability of providing the farmer with a drip irrigation system in terms of price	1.16	0.37	28
Sufficiency of provided fuel	1.11	0.31	29
Suitability of provided organic fertilizers in terms of price	1.09	0.29	30
Suitability of providing plastic covers in terms of price	1.05	0.22	31

Arrangement the five areas (axes) of government support for farmers of protected vegetables according to the values of the weighted averages

The weighted average values of the five axes of government support ranged between (1.32–2.11) degrees, according to the four-level scale whose weight ranged from (1–4) degrees, as shown in Table 13.

It can be concluded from Table 13 that the axis of Agricultural Extension support has ranked first with a weighted average value of 2.11. This may be due to the protected vegetable farmers' acknowledgment (confession) that the Agricultural Extension and Training Department implemented a number of

agricultural extension activities, but unfortunately, they did not target the priority problems of farmers and did not provide real solutions to them.

Table 13: *Arrangement the five areas (axes) of government support for farmers of protected vegetables according to the values of the weighted averages.*

Government support areas (Axes)	weighted average	Rank
Agricultural extension support axis.	2.11	1
Technical support axis.	1.85	2
Equipment (supply) support axis.	1.74	3
Incentive (stimulant) support axis.	1.57	4
Financial support axis.	1.32	5

The axis of financial support has ranked last with a weighted average of 1.32. This may be attributed to the lack of sufficiency of the agricultural loans and advances as well as the complexity of routine and bureaucratic procedures in lending agricultural loans.

Second: Submit proposals to improve government support for farmers of protected vegetables

Based on the results of the first objective, we propose some things that help to improve the reality of government support for farmers of protected vegetables, which can be generalized to all small projects as follows:

1. Adopting Electronic Agricultural Extension to follow up on the protected vegetable farmers; in order to communicate with them continuously, especially in times of crisis. An electronic application is being prepared and published on electronic stores for mobile phones, which includes written agricultural instructions and some explanatory video clips, in addition to providing a notification service to alert farmer about everything new. This application can be called (Farmer Bro) and includes the following:
 - Integrated Agricultural Extensions instructions on growing protected vegetables, such as: the appropriate amount of seeds, the quantities and types of fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation times, etc.
 - The presence of questions and answers is reinforced or supported by illustrative images of everything related to growing protected vegetables from the beginning of growing vegetables to marketing.
 - Integrated database on vegetable farmers in terms of their numbers, the area of greenhouses, as well as the type of vegetables grown, etc. The data will be updated periodically by a specialized committee in the agricultural division.
2. Using an electronic smart card (Q-Card, MasterCard, etc.) to lend the protected vegetable farmers instead of giving them cash loans. This is done through agricultural banks, and this card must include complete data about the farmer and his existing agricultural system (land area, property type, agricultural activity, machinery type, irrigation method, etc.). The benefits of using an electronic smart card include the following:
 - When disbursing financial loans, the farmer uses this card to purchase the seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, etc. that he needs from all government and private supply centers. These centers are provided with special devices to read the master

card and follow up on the withdrawal operations. Thus, the farmer will not hold any money in his hand, but the money will be transferred to his account in the Agricultural Bank or any other government bank, and thus we have overcome the problem of lack of trust in disbursing loans.

- Overcoming the complex bureaucratic and routine procedures in disbursing loans.
 - Reducing the farmer's interaction with government employees, and thus reducing favoritism and administrative and financial corruption in conducting administrative transactions.
3. The proposed application, called "Farmer Bro" is linked within the smart card to benefit from it in granting and disbursing loans.
 4. The necessity of conducting a periodic follow-up process for farmers to ensure that the agricultural supplies or equipment disbursed (according to the smart card financial lending process) are used by the farmer in protected vegetable cultivation, i.e., ensuring that the farmer has not sold the agricultural equipment in the markets, and he is using the money (the loan money) in other non-agricultural activities.
 5. Making Agricultural Extension videos that talk about the successes of some farmers in the field of protected vegetable cultivation; this is to encourage the rest of the farmers to adopt the protected agriculture technology, and then increase its spread in all Iraqi governorates, and fill the deficit or shortage of vegetable crops at the local level.

Conclusions

The protected vegetable farmers in the central region still need government support in all areas. Weak government support negatively affects the continuity of the agricultural process; it leads to a decrease in the quantity of local production and poor quality, in addition to its high price in local markets compared to imported vegetables. Consequentially, we can accept the research hypothesis, which states "The weakness of government support is one of the most important reasons behind the deterioration of the production process of protected vegetable crops, which contributed to the inability to compete with imported vegetable crops, and led to the weak diffusion of protected agriculture technology (Green Houses) throughout Iraq.

Recommendations

The necessity for the Ministry of Agriculture to take into account the proposals that are mentioned in the current research and find appropriate mechanisms to implement them, whether through the departments affiliated with the Ministry of Agriculture or through cooperation and coordination with other ministries.

The necessity for conducting other research by researchers specialized in Agricultural Extension to determine the reality of government support in the field of other agricultural crops or in the field of animal production, to develop a unified policy and follow an inclusive strategy to reform government support in the field of agriculture.

Acknowledgement

The authors extend their sincere gratitude to the agricultural extension agents in the sampled governorates for their invaluable assistance in data collection.

Novelty Statement

The unique and original aspects of our research try to fill a critical gap in government support by presenting extraordinary and feasible proposals, inspired by reality and built on available capabilities, that will improve government support for protected vegetable farmers in Iraq's Central Region.

Author's Contribution

Rasul Hadi Hassun: Conceived the idea, Wrote abstract, Conclusion, Technical Input at every step, Overall Management of the article, Data collection, Result and discussion, introduction, References.

Ali Lateef Jasim Al-Mashhadani: Wrote abstract, Methodology, Overall Management of the article, SPSS analysis, Result and discussion, and Introduction.

Conflict of interest

The authors have declared no conflict of interest.

References

Abdul-Wahab, K. and N.J. Rizko. 2017. Urban agriculture as one of the ecological applications of the regenerative city. *J. Eng.*, 23(9): 64–81.

<https://doi.org/10.31026/j.eng.2017.09.11>

Abu-Dahi, Y.M. and B.M. Al-Batawi. 2009. Role of potassium sulphate and chloride in npk uptake by cucumber under protected conditions and drip irrigation. *Iraqi J. Agric. Sci.*, 40(6): 118–127.

Al-Abdali, S.A.N. and R.S.M. Al-Nasr. 2014. Using sensitivity analysis in determining the optimal and efficient production plans in greenhouses in association of al-watan under condition of risk and uncertainty. *J. Econ. Admin. Sci.*, 20(80): 324–354.

Al-ahbabee, N.J.M. and A.M.A. Al-Ajili. 2021. Analysis of the impact of agricultural price policy and government support policy on wheat production in Iraq for the period 1993-2019. *Tikrit J. Admin. Econ. Sci.*, 17(53): 382–398.

Al-Aqabi, M.A.R. and F.J. Dahash. 2019. The reality of government support for the agricultural sector for the period from 2004-2016. *Wasit J. Human.*, 15: 683-724.

Al-Aqeedi, R.H.H., 2020. Proposed strategy for integrated sustainable agricultural development in Iraq. Sudan University of Science and Technology, Thesis, iv.

Alazy, T.A.A. and A.L.J. Al-Mashhadani. 2023. Problems facing wheat farmers beneficiaries from supportive awareness program to winter plan for wheat in Salah-Aldeen Governorate. *Iraqi J. Market Res. Consumer Prot.*, 15(2): 127-143. <https://doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc15.2.2023.13>

Al-Khazaali, J.T.A.J., 2009. Price support policy for agricultural products in Iraq with application to sunflower crop in Wasit Governorate. *Al-Ghari J. Econ. Admin. Sci.*, 5(14): 27–46.

Al-Mashhadani, A.L.J., 2020. Scientific practices of rice farmers in the field of preserving agricultural environment from pollution in some southern and central provinces of the Iraq republic. *Plant Arch.*, 20(1): 2095–2103.

Al-Mashhadani, A.L.J., Z.H. Magd and A.E.H.A. Keshta. 2017. Levels of use and importance of extension methods and aids in the process of dissemination of agricultural technologies in the republic of Iraq. *IOSR J. Agric. Vet. Sci.*, 10(5): 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.9790/2380-1005020106>

Al-Mashhadani, M.A.L.S. and S.T. Naguib. 2015. Rural women's knowledge for rural greenhouse agriculture projects implemented

- by the department of agricultural extension and training in the province of Babylon. Iraqi J. Agric. Sci., 46(54): 870–875.
- Barbaz, D.S. and J.M. Azzi. 2012. Efficiency of projects performance of greenhouses in the governor of Karbala in 2009-2010. Iraqi J. Agric. Sci., 43(4): 70–74.
- Dawood, H.S., 2012. The short-term agricultural lending of access to the optimal production volume for wheat farmers in Nineveh Governorate. Rafidain Agric. J., 40(4): 142–149. <https://doi.org/10.33899/magrj.2012.69172>
- Directorate of Agricultural Information and Statistics, 2020. Annual statistical report, Jordan, pp. 1-52.
- Federal Board of Supreme Audit, 2020. Specialized performance audit results on plant and animal activity from the agricultural initiative projects in the Karkh Agriculture Directorate, the Rusafa Agriculture Directorate, and the branches of the Agricultural Bank in Baghdad Governorate for the period from (2008 - 2020), Republic of Iraq, pp. 1-16.
- Ghadhban, L.H. and O.K. Jbara. 2019. Impact of product dumping on the agricultural sector in Iraq (2009-2017). Iraqi J. Agric. Sci., 50(5): 1228–1236. <https://doi.org/10.36103/ijas.v50i5.788>
- Hussein, A.A., 2017. Obstacles to sustainable agricultural development in Iraq solutions and treatments. J. Econ. Admin. Sci., 23(95): 345–366.
- Hussein, M.B., K.K.B. Al-Kanani and R.H. Hassun. 2020. The reality of agricultural policies and their role in achieving sustainable agricultural development in Iraq. J. Econ. Admin. Sci., 26(117): 327–346.
- Hussein, W.A. and M.A.J. Al-Khafaji. 2022. The role of commodity dumping in encouraging the Iraqi consumer to purchase unnecessary goods. Iraqi J. Market Res. Consumer Prot., 14(2): 1–11. [https://doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc14.2.2022.\(1\)](https://doi.org/10.28936/jmracpc14.2.2022.(1))
- Kalidar, Q.Q., A.H. Dabbash and A.J. Mohammed. 2012. Measuring the economic viability of protected cultivation of vegetables in plastic and spending compared with seasonal agriculture for the same vegetables in the province of Baghdad 2005. Al-Qadisiyah J. Admin. Econ. Sci., 14(2): 64–77.
- Keller, I. and C. Tukuitonga. 2007. The WHO/FAO fruit and vegetable promotion initiative. ISHS acta horticulturae 744: I international symposium on human health effects of fruits and vegetables, pp. 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2007.744.1>
- Mohammed, O.H.M., 2020. The possibility of achieving sustainable agricultural development in Iraq. J. Econ. Admin. Sci., 26(121): 369–382.
- Sebur, R.J., 2016. The spatial analysis for greenhouses in Province Baghdad. J. Coll. Educ. Women, 27(3): 1115–1131.
- Shukr, A.S. and B.H. Hameed. 2021. An economic analysis of the relationship between economic growth and the environment: In Iraq for the period 2000-2017. Iraqi J. Agric. Sci., 52(3): 640–646. <https://doi.org/10.36103/ijas.v52i3.1354>
- Sultan, W.I., A.H. Ali and M.A. Ahmad. 2021. An economic study of effect of government subsidies on production of main grain crops (wheat, barley, rice) in Iraq during 1995-2015, 15(50): 213–246.