The Role Played by the Jordanian Working Women to Preserve the Local Environment

Ayman Suliman Mazahreh, Heba Hammad,
Mohamad Said Al-Damanhouri and Hind Kaled Jamil Alsarayreh
Princess Alia University College, Al-Balqa University, Amman 941941, 11194, Jordan

Abstract: This research is conducted to answer the question of: to what degree the Jordanian working women use the environmental practices in accordance with the variables of the research such as: age, educational qualification, marital status, work field and the place of living. Five hypothesis are tested. The sample of the study consisted of one hundred and eighty one of wording women. The research instrument consisted of seventy four items to measure the women's environmental practices. The instrument was designed using likart five scale. Validity value of the instrument on chronbach alpha was 0.74 and was considered a good value for the purpose of the study. To test the hypothesis of the study, t-test was used for the variables of the place of living, the maritual status and the work field. It was found that there was no statistical significance differences of women practices due to the place of living on all fields of the study except for water and noise. In addition, the total environmental practices were found too not of statistical significance. There were clear differences in women's practices due to the maritual status and the fields of water, chemical cleanliness and environmental practices. There were not clear differences regarding the other fields of the study. There were not clear differences of the practices of the working women in all the fields of the study and the general environmental practices due to the field of work. Only, the differences were statistically significant in the field of the chemical cleanliness (0.008) in favor of the women working in the public sector more than those working in the private sector. The one way analysis ANOVA was used for the research hypothesis related to the variables of age and the educational qualification. It showed statistical significance at ($\infty = 0.05$) in all the fields of the study and the environmental practices in general due to age. It was found that those between the age of 20-29 performed generally better. Regarding the educational qualifications, there were no statistical significant differences regarding the different fields (home garbage, water, energy, nutrition, air, noise). However, there was statistical significant difference in the fields of chemical cleanliness and environmental practices 0.000-0.019, respectively in favor of the holders of the master degree.

Key words: Working women, environment, maritual status, ANOVA, education

INTRODUCTION

Women are the partners of men in this life and it is due to their complementary role, the cooperation, harmony and their sharing in carrying out the responsibility, humanity continues to exist upon this earth.

It is clear that the woman plays a significant and effective role to preserve the natural environment and make it rich enough for human life. She helps to change the ways of people to interact with nature, use the natural resources properly and preserve cleanliness and reduce home garbage, since she has carried the burden of bringing up the coming generations.

Children are always tied to their mothers and thus they always grasp the educational and the psychology aspects of their lives form their mothers; this is why it is necessairy to focus on the modification of the mothers' behavioral patterns to be in accordance with the economical consumption of the natural resources to help and increase the effective growth of the society.

New environmental morality becomes the center of concerns of human society in order to protect environment and control the rate of pollution. This is due to the changing nature of human life and the continuous growth of the industrial products (Atash, 2007). The world is so anxious to implement the basics of the new morality to preserve this environment and its natural resources to be the ground upon which the continuous development of humanity is based (Hosseinpoor et al., 2005). This is always shaded by the umbrella of the global thinking to serve humanity and the national implementation (Schultz and Oskamp, 1996). The responsibility of preserving environment can be

---

Corresponding Author: Ayman Suliman Mazahreh, Princess Alia University College, Al-Balqa University, Amman 941941, Jordan 11194, Jordan

considered an individualistic as well as communal (shared) responsibility with the sense that it is a global and international responsibility. This sharing responsibility can be grounded on the public awareness and understanding of the interactive nature of the environment its input, output, issues and problems.

This environmental awareness implies that the human being has to have the environmental knowledge as a means and not as an end, to enhance the individual with the intellectuality, consciousness and responsible behaviors (Hoerisch, 2002). The environmental education is the process by which human beings are educated to interact and to be in harmony with its different constituents and systems. The goal is to guide human behaviors and attitudes to ward preserving natural resources and helping their increase (Schultz and Oskamp, 1996). This responsibility of woman as the partner of man and half of the society is not newly born; in fact it is historical since the beginning of humanity and carrying the burden of educating generation. Part of the woman's leading role is enlightening generations. Thus helping women to develop their skills will be part of any procedurers applied within nations to protect the natural environment (McMillan *et al.*, 2004).

The question of the study: What is the degree of the women's environmental practices in Jordan according to the variables of the study: the place of living, age, educational qualification, marital status and work field?

The hypothesies of the study:
- There are no statistical significant differences in the degrees of the environmental practices of the working women due to the place of living
- There are no statistical significant differences in the degrees of the environmental practices of the working women due to their age
- There are on statistical significant differences in the degrees of the environmental practices of the working women due to her educational qualification
- There are no statistical significant differences in the degrees of the environmental practices of the working women due to their maritual status
- There are no statistical significant differences in the degrees of the environmental practices of the working women due to their field of work

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The sample of the study: The sample of the study consisted of one hundred and eighty one of the working women. Their distribution according to the variables of the study is presented in Table 1. The number of the

Table 1: Distribution of the subjects according to the variables

Variables	No.	Percent
Place of living		
City	118	65.2
Village	63	34.8
Total	181	100.0
Age (years)		
20-29	26	14.4
30-39	64	35.4
40-49	79	43.6
50 and more	12	6.6
Educational qualification		
College diploma	43	23.8
B.A	117	64.6
M.A and more	21	11.6
Total	181	100.0
Maritual status		
Unmarried	36	19.9
Married	145	80.1
Total	181	100.0
Work field		
Private sector	35	19.3
Public sector	146	80.7
Total	181	100.0

working women living in the city was 118, whereas those living in the village was sixty three. The number of the married women was 145, whereas the unmarried were thirty six women. The number of the women working in the public sector was 146, whereas those working in the private sector was thirty six.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the subjects of the study according to the variables of the study; the place of living, age, educational qualification, maritual status and field of work.

The instrument of the research: The instrument consisted of sevent four items to measure the environmental practices of women. They covered seven fields of the study i.e., house garbage = 12 items, water = 15 items; noise = 6 items, chemical cleanliness = 12 items; nutrition = 11 items; air = 10 items and energy = 8 items. They were designed using liker 5 scale. The positive item takes 5 points while the negative takes one point.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always

Every item covered a certain environmental practice related to the areas of investigation within this study. The instrument was validated by four University in structures of Amman Arab University for graduate studies. Some items were modified.

Others cancelled so the final version of the instrument ended up to be 74 items.

- Validity value of cronbach alph was (0.0741)
- This is as good value for research proposes

Reliability statistic: Table 2 shows the validity on the instrument on cronbach Alpha.

The results of the research: To answer the question of the study and the hypothesis related to the place of living, marital status, field of work test was used on the independent samples. The results are presented in Table 3.

First the place of living: Table 3 shows the mean scores of the individual's practices, the standard deviation on the seven areas of the scale according to the place of living. The Table 3 shows that the practices of women are close in the different areas of the research except for water and noise. This shows that the practices of women living in the urban areas out do those of the women living in the rural areas.

However, it shows the opposite in the area of noise. The total performance of the working women in the urban and rural areas is close.

Table 4 shows four test of the independent samples of the variable of the place of living:

The Table 4 shows that the differences in women's practices are statistically in significant except for water and noise, which are 0.002-0.030, respectively. The total differences of the general environmental practices are statistically insignificant.

Second: Marital status variable: Table 5 shows the mean scores of the individual's practices, the standard deviation on the seven areas of the scale according to the marital status variable.

The Table 5 shows that the practices of the working women according to the marital status are clearly different in the are a of water, chemical cleanliness and the general environmental practices in favor of the unmarried ones and in the area of noise in favor of the married ones. However, there are no clear differences in the other areas of research.

Table 6 shows the independent samples test of the marital status variable.

Table 6 also shows that the differences of the women's practices according to the variable of marital status are statistically significant in the investigated areas

Table 2: Reliability statistic

Cronbach's alpha	Paragraph numbers
0.741	74

Table 3: Mean scores of the individual's practices

Topics	Place of living	No.	Means±SD
Home garbage	City	118	2.9654±0.45752
	Village	63	2.9167±0.59002
Water	City	118	2.6768±0.54010
	Village	63	2.4508±0.21140
Noise	City	118	3.4025±0.60440
	Village	63	3.6190±0.69201
Cleanliness chemicals	City	118	2.6808±0.44861
	Village	63	2.5608±0.49915
Nutrition	City	118	2.7296±0.44129
	Village	63	2.6349±0.28909
Air	City	118	2.8703±0.54134
	Village	63	2.9317±0.53876
Energy	City	118	1.7119±0.65014
	Village	63	1.8591±0.46797
Environmental practices	City	118	2.7128±0.30604
	Village	63	2.6673±0.20571

Table 4: Test of the independent samples of the variable

	Levine's test for equality variances		t-test for equality of means		
Topics	F-value	Sig.	t-value	df	Level of Sig.
Home garbage					
Equal variances assumed	11.260	0.001	0.616	179.000	0.539
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	0.570	102.594	0.570
Water					
Equal variances assumed	26.296	0.000	3.191	179.000	0.002
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	40.008	167.719	0.000
Noise					
Equal variances assumed	4.716	0.031	- 2.181	179.000	0.030
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-20.093	112.865	0.039
Cleanliness lines chemicals					
Equal variances assumed	8.427	0.004	1.647	179.000	0.101
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.594	115.612	0.114
Nutrition					
Equal variances assumed	0.561	0.455	1.535	179.000	0.127
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.735	171.535	0.085
Air					
Equal variances assumed	3.284	0.072	-0.728	179.000	0.467
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-0.729	127.258	0.467
Energy					
Equal variances assumed	0.066	0.798	-1.590	179.000	0.114
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-1.753	163.571	0.082
General environmental practices					
Equal variances assumed	5.474	0.020	10.058	179.000	0.292
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.188	169.604	0.237

Table 5: Mean scores and standard deviation on the seven areas of the scale according to the maritual status variable

Topics	State	Number	Mean±SD
Home garbage	Unmarried	36	2.9769±0.49063
	Married	145	2.9414±0.51174
Water	Unmarried	36	2.9352±0.54894
	Married	145	2.5145±0.40267
Noise	Unmarried	36	3.2176±0.42877
	Married	145	3.5425±0.67122
Cleanliness chemicals	Unmarried	36	2.9213±0.43459
	Married	145	2.5690±0.45180
Nutrition	Unmarried	36	2.7399±0.41184
	Married	145	2.6859±0.39364
Air	Unmarried	36	3.0417±0.46560
	Married	145	2.8545±0.55176
Energy	Unmarried	36	1.8611±0.32013
	Married	145	1.7388±0.64498
Environmental practices	Unmarried	36	2.8318±0.24950
	Married	145	2.6635±0.27221

Table 7: Mean scores and standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale according to the field of work

Topics	Work field	Number	Means±SD
Home garbage	Private sector	35	2.8238±0.29133
	Public sector	146	2.9783±0.54210
Water	Private sector	35	2.5581±0.28973
	Public sector	146	2.6078±0.49880
Noise	Private sector	35	3.4571±0.69351
	Public sector	146	3.4829±0.63237
Cleanliness chemicals	Private sector	35	2.4524±0.41533
	Public sector	146	2.6838±0.47129
Nutrition	Private sector	35	2.7844±0.45083
	Public sector	146	2.6756±0.38137
Air	Private sector	35	2.8771±0.37345
	Public sector	146	2.8952±0.57347
Energy	Private sector	35	1.6321±0.45368
	Public sector	146	1.7945±0.62245
Environmental practices	Private sector	35	2.6336±0.25575
	Public sector	146	2.7121±0.27877

Table 6: Independent samples test of the maritual status variable

Topics	F-value	Sig.	t-value	df	Level of Sig.
Home garbage					
Equal variances assumed	0.000	0.984	0.375	179	0.708
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	0.385	55.476	0.702
Water					
Equal variances assumed	12.654	0.000	5.192	179	0.000
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	4.319	44.782	0.000
Noise					
Equal variances assumed	11.732	0.001	-2.765	179	0.006
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-3.585	83.073	0.001
Dean lines chemicals					
Equal variances assumed	0.674	0.413	4.219	179	0.000
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	4.314	55.335	0.000
Nutrition					
Equal variances assumed	1.645	0.201	0.730	179	0.466
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	0.710	52.028	0.481
Air					
Equal variances assumed	0.129	0.720	1.875	179	0.062
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	2.077	61.834	0.042
Energy					
Equal variances assumed	5.098	0.025	1.103	179	0.272
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.618	113.161	0.108
General environmental practices					
Equal variances assumed	0.312	0.577	3.375	179	0.001
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	3.557	57.523	0.001

Levine's test for equality variances
t-test for equality of means

Table 8: Independent samples test in the area related to the field of work

Topics	F-value	Sig.	t-value	df	Level of Sig.
Home garbage					
Equal variances assumed	25.123	0.000	-1.628	179	0.105
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-2.319	98.031	0.022
Water					
Equal variances assumed	4.853	0.029	-0.566	179	0.572
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-0.775	88.950	0.440
Noise					
Equal variances assumed	1.153	0.284	-0.212	179	0.823
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-0.200	48.453	0.842
Dean lines chemicals					
Equal variances assumed	2.066	0.152	-2.666	179	0.008
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-2.881	56.957	0.006
Nutrition					
Equal variances assumed	0.034	0.853	1.462	179	0.145
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	1.319	46.346	0.194
Air					
Equal variances assumed	3.777	0.054	-0.177	179	0.859
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-0.229	77.499	0.820
Energy					
Equal variances assumed	5.178	0.024	-1.452	179	0.148
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-1.758	68.345	0.083
General environmental practices					
Equal variances assumed	1.878	0.172	-1.520	179	0.130
Equal variances not assumed	-	-	-1.603	55.080	0.115

Levine's test for equality variances
t-test for equality of means

of water, noisy, earliness and the general environmental practices. The are 0.000-0.006-0.000.0.001, respectively. The other differences are statistically insignificant.

Third the field of work variable: Table 7 shows the mean scores of the individual's practices and the standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale according to the field of work. However, there are differences in the arena of chemical cleanliness in favor of the women working in the public sector over the private sector. Table 8 shows the results of independent samples test in the area related to the field of work.

The Table 8 shows that there are no statistical significant differences in the investigated areas and on the environmental practices except for home cleanliness where the level of significance is 0.008 in favor of the women working in the private secotor.

The mean score of the practices of women working in the public sector in this areas is 2.68 and those working in the private sector is 2.45. However, practices in the other areas and the environmental practices are close.

As for the hypothesis related to the variables of age and the educational qualification, the one way analysis ANOVA is used. The results are shown in the Table 9-11.

Table 9: Mean scores and standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale according to the variable of age

Topics	Age (years)	Number	Means±SD
Home garbage	20-29	26	3.0577±0.29979
	30-39	64	2.7409±0.34186
	40-49	79	3.1698±0.53467
	50 and more	12	2.3611±0.53811
	Total	181	2.9484±0.50647
Water	20-29	26	3.0000±0.47329
	30-39	64	2.5385±0.38422
	40-49	79	2.5511±0.47462
	50 and more	12	2.3556±0.33313
	Total	181	2.5982±0.46547
Noise	20-29	26	3.3590±0.45630
	30-39	64	3.1068±0.39100
	40-49	79	3.7743±0.72454
	50 and more	12	3.7639±0.36555
	Total	181	3.4779±0.64272
Cleanliness chemicals	20-29	26	2.6667±0.69881
	30-39	64	2.6641±0.41013
	40-49	79	2.6002±0.44365
	50 and more	12	2.7014±0.33040
	Total	181	2.6390±0.46895
Nutrition	20-29	26	2.5245±0.10697
	30-39	64	2.7216±0.42048
	40-49	79	2.7537±0.43554
	50 and more	12	2.5606±0.27364
	Total	181	2.6966±0.39675
Air	20-29	26	3.1115±0.39327
	30-39	64	2.9703±0.57146
	40-49	79	2.8114±0.53804
	50 and more	12	2.5250±0.38642
	Total	181	2.8917±0.53974
Energy	20-29	26	1.7692±0.35301
	30-39	64	1.8730±0.48463
	40-49	79	1.7595±0.69128
	50 and more	12	1.1875±0.60184
	Total	181	1.7631±0.59592
Environmental practices	20-29	26	2.7957±0.26285
	30-39	64	2.6514±0.19823
	40-49	79	2.7383±0.31966
	50 and more	12	2.4538±0.15445
	Total	181	2.6970±0.27555

Table 10: Analysis in the seven investigated areas of the scale according to the variable of age

Topics	Total of squares	df	Square means	F-value	Level of Sig.
Home garbage					
Between gropes	11.079	3	3.693	18.627	0.000
In Gropes	35.093	177	0.198		
Total	46.172	180			
Water					
Between gropes	5.307	3	1.769	9.294	0.000
In Gropes	33.692	177	0.190		
Total	38.999	180			
Nois					
Between gropes	17.103	3	5.701	17.625	0.000
In Gropes	57.253	177	0.323		
Total	74.356	180			
Cleanliness chemicals					
Between gropes	0.226	3	0.075	0.338	0.798
In Gropes	39.358	177	0.222		
Total	39.584	180			
Nutrition					
Between gropes	1.29	3	0.430	2.815	0.041
In Gropes	27.044	177	0.153		
Total	28.334	180			
Air					
Between gropes	3.775	3	1.258	4.577	0.004
In Gropes	48.662	177	0.275		
Total	52.438	180			
Energy					
Between gropes	4.751	3	1.584	4.738	0.003
In Gropes	59.171	177	0.334		
Total	63.922	180			
Environmental practices					
Between gropes	1.231	3	0.410	5.839	0.001
In Gropes	12.436	177	0.070		
Total	13.667	180			

Table 9 shows the mean scores of the individuals and the standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale according to the variable of age.

Table 10 shows the results of the one way analysis in the seven investigated areas of the scale according to the variable of age.

Table 9 and 10 show that the differences in practices according to the variable of age are clear and statistically significant at (∞ = 0.05) in all the investigated areas except for the chemical deadliness. In addition, the general environmental practices are statistically significant. Studying the different comparative results of the different investigated areas according to the age variable as shown in the Table 11. Table 11 also shows the results of multiple comparisons LSD of the investigated areas according to the age multiple comparisons. It is noticed that the performance of the age group (20-29) is better than the performance of the other age.

groups with statistical significant difference in the area of water and better than the age group 30-39 and the age group 50 and more, in the area of home garbage and environmental practices.

On the other hand, the performance of the age group 30-39 is better than the performance, lf the age group 20-29 in the area of nutrition and better than the age group 50 and more nights areas of air, energy and environmental practices.

The results of the age group 40-49 are better than the age groups 30-39 and 50 and more in the areas of home garbage and better than age groups of 20-29 and 30-39 in the areas of noise in addition to being better than the age group 20-29 in the area of nutrition and better than the age group 50 and more in the area of environmental practices.

The age group 50 and more is better than the age groups 20-29 and 30-39 in the area of noise.

To find out, the degree of the environmental practices in accordance with the educational qualeficatim, the results are presented in the Table 12 and 13.

Table 12 shows the mean scores of the Individual's performance and the standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale in accordance to the educational qualification.

Table 11: Multiple comparisons LSD of the investigated areas according to the age multiple comparisons

Topics	Age (years)	Age (years)	Mean of differences	SE	Level of significance
Home garbage	20-29	30-39	0.31681(*)	0.10355	0.003
		40-49	-0.11214	0.10067	0.267
		50 and more	0.69658(*)	0.15539	0.000
	30-39	20-29	-0.31681(*)	0.10355	0.003
		40-49	-0.42895(*)	0.07488	0.000
		50 and more	0.37977(*)	0.14007	0.007
Water	20-29	30-39	0.46146(*)	0.10147	0.000
		40-49	0.44895(*)	0.09864	0.000
		50 and more	0.64444(*)	0.15226	0.000
	30-39	20-29	-0.46146(*)	0.10147	0.000
		40-49	-0.01251	0.07337	0.865
		50 and more	0.18299	0.13725	0.184
Noise	20-29	30-39	0.25220	0.13227	0.058
		40-49	-0.41529(*)	0.12859	0.001
		50 and more	-0.40491(*)	0.19848	0.043
	30-39	20-29	-0.25220	0.13227	0.058
		40-49	-0.66749(*)	0.09565	0.000
		50 and more	-0.65712(*)	0.17891	0.000
Cleanliness	20-29	30-39	0.00260	0.10967	0.981
chemicals		40-49	0.06646	0.10662	0.534
		50 and more	-0.03472	0.16457	0.833
	30-39	20-29	-0.00260	0.10967	0.981
		40-49	0.06385	0.07930	0.422
		50 and more	-0.03733	0.14834	0.802
Nutrition	20-29	30-39	-0.19712(*)	0.09091	0.031
		40-49	-0.22926(*)	0.08838	0.010
		50 and more	-0.03613	0.13642	0.791
	30-39	20-29	0.19712(*)	0.09091	0.031
		40-49	-0.03215	0.06574	0.625
		50 and more	0.16098	0.12296	0.192
Air	20-29	30-39	0.14123	0.12194	0.248
		40-49	0.30015(*)	0.11855	0.012
		50 and more	0.58654(*)	0.18299	0.002
	30-39	20-29	-0.14123	0.12194	0.248
		40-49	0.15892	0.08818	0.073
		50 and more	0.44531(*)	0.16494	0.008
Energy	20-29	30-39	-0.10382	0.13447	0.441
		40-49	0.00974	0.13073	0.941
		50 and more	0.58173(*)	0.20178	0.004
	30-39	20-29	0.10382	0.13447	0.441
		40-49	0.11355	0.09724	0.244
		50 and more	0.68555(*)	0.18188	0.000
Environmental	20-29	30-39	0.14434(*)	0.06164	0.020
practices		40-49	0.05746	0.05993	0.339
		50 and more	0.34191(*)	0.09250	0.000
	30-39	20-29	-0.14434(*)	0.06164	0.020
		40-49	-0.08689	0.04458	0.053
		50 and more	0.19756(*)	0.08338	0.019

Table 13 shows the results of ANOVA one way analysis in the seven areas of the scale in accordance with the educational qualificatim.

The Table 12 and 13 show that there are no statistical significance of the performance of women due to theis educational qualification in the six areas of the study (house garbage, water, energy, nutrition, air, moise). However, it is statistically significant at ($\infty = 0.05$) in the areas of chemicals and environmental practices since it is (0.000-0.019) in favor of those having a degree above the master degree in the two areas.

The mean scores for those having a master degree and above is 3.0159 in the area of chemicals while the mean scores of those having a college diploma and B.A are 2.7578-2.5278, respectively. In addition the mean scores of those having M.A and above is 2.8089 in the area of environmental practices and hey are 2.7536-2.6560, respectively.

Studying the table of multiple comparisons of the different areas in accordance with educational qualificatim shows that the differences in the areas of chemicals and environmental practices are statistically significant in relation to women having a master degree and more from those having respectively college diploma and a B.A (bachelor degree).

However, those who have a college diploma respectively outdid those have B.A in the two areas.

Table 12: Mean scores and standard deviation in the seven areas of the scale in accordance to the educational qualification

Topic	Qualification	Number	Means±SD
Home garbage	College Diploma	43	3.0446±0.61650
	B.A	117	2.9067±0.45894
	M.A and more	21	2.9841±0.50732
	Total	181	2.9484±0.50647
Water	College Diploma	43	2.6527±0.65329
	B.A	117	2.5840±0.41372
	M.A and more	21	2.5651±0.22864
	Total	181	2.5982±0.46547
Noise	College Diploma	43	3.5465±0.63447
	B.A	117	3.4544±0.67474
	M.A and more	21	3.4683±0.46732
	Total	181	3.4779±0.64272
Cleanliness chemicals	College Diploma	43	2.7578±0.41976
	B.A	117	2.5278±0.45735
	M.A and more	21	3.0159±0.37971
	Total	181	2.6390±0.46895
Nutrition	College Diploma	43	2.7780±0.53757
	B.A	117	2.6659±0.35688
	M.A and more	21	2.7013±0.22662
	Total	181	2.6966±0.39675
Air	College Diploma	43	2.8698±0.66923
	B.A	117	2.8701±0.49188
	M.A and more	21	3.0571±0.49555
	Total	181	2.8917±0.53974
Energy	College Diploma	43	1.7267±0.84306
	B.A	117	1.7276±0.47898
	M.A and more	21	2.0357±0.53348
	Total	181	1.7631±0.59592
Environmental practices	College Diploma	43	2.7536±0.41699
	B.A	117	2.6560±0.20616
	M.A and more	21	2.8089±0.20451
	Total	181	2.6970±0.27555

Table 13: The results of ANOVA one way analysis in the seven areas of the scale in accordance with the educational qualificatim

Topics	Total of squares	df	Square means	F-value	Level of Sig.
Home garbage					
Between gropes	0.628	2	0.314	1.227	0.296
In gropes	45.543	178	0.256	-	-
Total	46.172	180	-	-	-
Water					
Between gropes	0.174	2	0.087	0.399	0.671
In gropes	38.825	178	0.218	-	-
Total	38.999	180	-	-	-
Noise					
Between gropes	0.269	2	0.134	0.323	0.724
In gropes	74.087	178	0.416	-	-
Total	74.356	180	-	-	-
Cleanliness chemicals					
Between gropes	5.036	2	2.518	12.975	0.000
In gropes	34.548	178	0.194	-	-
Total	39.584	180	-	-	-
Nutrition					
Between gropes	0.396	2	0.198	1.261	0.286
In gropes	27.938	178	0.157	-	-
Total	28.334	180	-	-	-
Air					
Between gropes	0.650	2	0.325	1.117	0.329
In gropes	51.787	178	0.291	-	-
Total	52.438	180	-	-	-
Energy					
Between gropes	1.765	2	0.883	2.528	0.083
In gropes	62.157	178	0.349	-	-
Total	63.922	180	-	-	-
Environmental practices					
Between gropes	0.597	2	0.298	4.065	0.019
In gropes	13.070	178	0.073	-	-
Total	13.667	180	-	-	-

Table 14: Multiple comparisons in the areas according to the educational qualification

Topic	Qualification	Mean	SE	Level of Sig.
Home garbage	College Diploma B.A	0.13788	0.09021	0.128
	M.A and above	0.06045	0.13466	0.654
	College Diploma B.A	-0.13788	0.09021	0.128
	M.A and above	-0.07743	0.11988	0.519
	College Diploma B.A	-0.06045	0.13466	0.654
	M.A and above	0.07743	0.11988	0.519
Water	College Diploma B.A	0.06867	0.08329	0.411
	M.A and above	0.08763	0.12433	0.482
	College Diploma B.A	-0.06867	0.08329	0.411
	M.A and above	0.01897	0.11068	0.864
	College Diploma B.A	-0.08763	0.12433	0.482
	M.A and above	-0.01897	0.11068	0.864
Noise	College Diploma B.A	0.09210	0.11505	0.425
	M.A and above	0.07826	0.17175	0.649
	College Diploma B.A	-0.09210	0.11505	0.425
	M.A and above	-0.01384	0.15290	0.928
	College Diploma B.A	-0.07826	0.17175	0.649
	M.A and above	0.01384	0.15290	0.928
Cleanliness chemicals	College Diploma B.A	0.22997(*)	0.07857	0.004
	M.A and above	-0.25812(*)	0.11729	0.029
	College Diploma B.A	-0.22997(*)	0.07857	0.004
	M.A and above	-0.48810(*)	0.10441	0.000
	College Diploma B.A	0.25812(*)	0.11729	0.029
	M.A and above	0.48810(*)	0.10441	0.000
Nutrition	College Diploma B.A	0.11212	0.07065	0.114
	M.A and above	0.07671	0.10547	0.468
	College Diploma B.A	-0.11212	0.07065	0.144
	M.A and above	-0.03541	0.09389	0.707
	College Diploma B.A	-0.07671	0.10547	0.468
	M.A and above	0.03541	0.09389	0.707
Air	College Diploma B.A	-0.00032	0.09619	0.997
	M.A and above	-0.18738	0.14360	0.194
	College Diploma B.A	0.00032	0.09619	0.997
	M.A and above	-0.18706	0.12783	0.145
	College Diploma B.A	0.18738	0.14360	0.194
	M.A and above	0.18706	0.12783	0.145
Energy	College Diploma B.A	-0.00082	0.10538	0.994
	M.A and above	-0.30897	0.15732	0.051
	College Diploma B.A	0.00082	0.10538	0.994
	M.A and above	-0.30815(*)	0.14005	0.029
	College Diploma B.A	0.30897	0.15732	0.051
	M.A and above	0.30815(*)	0.14005	0.029
Environmental practices	College Diploma B.A	-0.05527	0.04832	0.045
	M.A and above	-0.09757(*)	0.07214	0.445
	College Diploma B.A	-0.15284(*)	0.04832	0.045
	M.A and above	0.05527	0.06422	0.018
	College Diploma B.A	0.15284	0.07214	0.445
	M.A and above	-	0.06422	0.018

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

The differences in the other areas are close and have no statistical significance.

Table 14 shows the results of the multiple comparisons in the areas according to the educational qualification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To answer the question of the research, t-test was used to examine the differences of the working women practices according to the place of living, maritual status

and the field of work. The results related to the place of living showed that the practices of women on most of the areas were close expect the area of water and noise for they reached on the level of significance to 0.002-0.030, respectively.

However, it wasn't statistically significant in the general environmental practices. It was noticed also that the performance of women living in the city was better in the area of water and women living in the village were better in the area of noise. This closeness of the performance of working women whether urban or rural is due to the availability of environmental awarness provides through the mass media, or through the socialization at work, where the different types of friendship and the different rich environments work as supporters to women environments awareness regardless of the statistical signifieant differences in the area of water.

The results related to the martial status showed the performance of the working women in the areas of water, chemical deadliness and the environmental practices in the following order; 0.000, 0.006, 0.000 and 0.001.

These differences were dear in favor of the unmarried women. This might be due to the less number of the family members and their concerns regarding using chemicals with on side effects in comparison with the married. However, the difference was in favor on the married women in the area of mouse because she cares about her children creating a calming environment for them.

There weren't clear differences in the other areas for the working women are characterize by good awareness and educating they enhance using different resources.

In relation to the work field, it was clear that there weren't clear differences of the practices of women in the seven areas and the environmental practices in general except for the chemical cleanliness an chemicals.

The statistical significant value was 0.008, in favor of the women working in the public and the private sectors which might be due to the increased number of women working in the public sector over that of the private sector which contributes to differentiating the topes of education women usually get.

To answer the question related to the degree of the environmental practices in accordance with age and the educational qualification the one way ANOVA was used. The results revealed statistical significant differences at ($\infty = 0.05$) in most of the areas and the general educational practices except for chemicals and cleanliness.

The results of the different multiple comparisons revealed that the performance of the age group 20-29 is better than of the other age groups with statistical significance in the areas of water, house gar bagel, air and environmental practices. The age group 30-39

showed the best performance in the area of energy. The age group of 40-49 showed the best performance in the areas of noise and nutrition. That led to the conclusion that the younger age group was the best group in performing the different environmental practices, which showed the greater tendency of this group to learn and experience what the growth needs of this age imposes on them. All of that encourages educating and training them in the early years of their growth to get better results.

Regarding the educational qualification, result revealed no statistical significant differences in all areas except for the chemicals and environmental practices where differences were statistically significant at ($\infty = 0.05$). Their values were 0.000-0.019, respectively in favor of those M.A holders and above.

The results of the multiple comparisons showed that the differences at the areas of and environmental practices were statistically significant in favor of the women having a degree above master. They stowed better performance than college diploma and B.A holders. Women showed close performance in the other areas with insignificant statistical differences due to the level of education. This shows that the educational qualification has a significant effect on the increase of the environmental awareness of women, which means that education is like mass media national community and the other social institutes that co-operate to increase the degree of the environmental practices of women.

CONCLUSION

The role of the social institutions both public and private and the other co-operation must be enhanced to encourage and help the Jordanian women and empower her to have a leading role in guiding the behavior of youth to preserve their environment and protect it from pollution.

This is very necessary to concentrate on the effective role of women to educate the coming generation to preserve their different resources. This needs educating and raising the level of the environmental awareness of women by facilitating the environmental knowledge and increase the effectiveness of the different mass media means.

Visual, auditors and readable to develop the correct knowledge of health. Thus more research in this regard is needed.

REFERENCES

Atash, F., 2007. The deterioration of urban environments in developing countries: Mitigating the air pollution crisis in Tehran. Iran, 24: 399-409.

Hoerisch, H., 2002. A comparative study on environmental awareness and environmentally beneficial behavior in India. http://www.cmsindia.org/cmsenviscentre/researchstudy/beneficial.pdf.

Hosseinpoor, A.R., M.H. Forouzanfar, M. Yunesian, F. Asghari, K.H. Naieni and D. Farhood, 2005. Air pollution and hospitalization due to angina pectoris in Tehran, Iran: A time-series study. Environ. Res., 99: 126-131.

McMillan, E.E., T. Wright and K. Beazley, 2004. Impact of a university-level environmental studies class on students values. J. Environ. Educ., 35: 19-27.

Schultz, P.W. and S. Oskamp, 1996. Effort as a moderator of the attitude-behavior relationship: General environmental concern and recycling. Social Psychol. Q., 59: 375-383.