Agricultural Journal 7 (2): 160-164, 2012

ISSN: 1816-9155

© Medwell Journals, 2012

Attitudes of Women Headed of Households to Deal With the Packaging of Ready-to-Eat Food in Jordan

Ayman Suliman Mazahreh
Department of Applied Sciences, Princes Alia University College,
Al-Balqa Applied University, P.O. Box 941941, 11194 Amman, Jordan

Abstract: The study investigates and reveals the attitudes of women headed households concerning the packaging of ready-to-eat foods in Jordan. To achieve the objective of the study, 204 women headed of households were selected to be the sample of this study selected from Amman and Jerash governorates (101 and 103, respectively). The attitudes of the sample were measured via 34 items attitudes scale which was prepared by the researcher. The average performance of the covered members of the study was 128.28 and 128.87 for Amman and Jerash governorates, respectively. The overall attitudes towards higher packaging of ready-to-eat foods as the average of all educational levels (128.58) and the value is high. A t-test was also carried out to measure the study variables age, years of study, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status of women headed households. A variance analysis of average performance was made on the same variables and results of differences in average performance indicate that there is no differences in attitudes depending on the residential area, the status of the study and also it was not depending on the different age groups of women sample or educational level or according to the median income. While the results of variance indicated that there is a significant differences were among women according to number of years of marriage and those differences were for the benefit of a class (6-10) years on the category (1-5) years at the level of significance (0.042) and for the benefit of category (11-15) years son the category (1-5) at the level of significance (0.004) and those differences for the benefit of families with the number of individuals (6-10) on the number (11-15) at the level of significance (0.022).

Key words: Attitudes, headed households, packaging of ready-to-eat foods, years of marriage, income level, Jorden

INTRODUCTION

Now-a-days where the life is at fast pace with the time which is very valuable to every person, ready-to-eat foods plays an important role in everyone's daily life. The long term ready-to-eat food means simple, fast and convenient food which is easy and fast to be prepared besides being hygienic, free from microbial contamination and also convenient to eat. Unlike the previous days where man used to have his food lavishly and slowly, currently old habits have changed the habits to foods which are simple and easy to digest.

Hence, the existence of these foods fulfilled all the needs of modern human. Preparing food with instant mixes has become a way of life and no doubt, they are going to be an integral part of food habit in future. Canned foods, convenience foods, fast foods, frozen foods, instant products, dried foods and preserved foods, etc., all this comes in the context of ready-to-eat foods, (Usha, 2007). Personal eating styles are influenced by age, personal health, ethnicity and family food attitudes.

Awareness and attitudes are the key factors that influence food purchases. Monitoring these factors over time will provide a comprehensive understanding of the current consumer trends knowing the latest trends is a prerequisite to success.

Attitudes are important elements influencing the individual behavior and motivations. They will affect him through the adoption process towards a specific and important things that lead to the formation and composition of the trends of individuals to satisfy needs and desires, personal experiences, personal factors, society and family. The trends have a set of properties and most important of them are educated, connected with feelings and emotions, subject to change and characterized by relative stability (Mazahreh et al., 2010). Ramasamy et al. (2005) indicated that buying behavior is vastly influenced by awareness and attitude towards the product. Commercial advertisements over television was said to be the most important source of information followed by displays in retail outlets. Consumers do build opinion about a brand on the basis of which various

product features play an important role in decision making process. A large number of respondents laid emphasis on quality and felt that price is an important factor while the others attached importance to image of manufacturer. Ready-to-eat meals are defined as foods whose ingredients are pre-assembled into the final product, require minimal or no cook time in order to fulfill heating or mixing directions and are intended to be consumed as packaged (Ellen and Hugo, 2011). Consumers can aim to reduce the environmental impacts on different levels of decision making (Jungbluth *et al.*, 2000). These range from choice of packages for a product, preference for certain labels, choice on ingredients for a meal and vegetarian diets to general consideration concerning household budgets (Jungbluth *et al.*, 2011).

Packaging makes the products look really tempting and at the same time provides optimal protection. The importance of packaging that it enables the consumer to identify the item easily through information found on the outer shell. In addition to the components of the item and its weight, size and methods of use and other useful information for the consumer. Also facilitates to the consumer item download, transfer and use (Manalili et al., 2011). Despite the rapid expansion in higher education and increasing awareness of the Jordanian society and its openness to developed societies but there is a decline in the levels of awareness about product packaging from consumers so the goal of this research to know; trends of women headed of households in some cities of Jordan (Amman, Jerash) to deal with the packaging of ready-to-eat foods.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study sample: The study sample consisted of 204 heads of families and the targeting of women headed households at random and the analysis was carried out on the questionnaires. Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample according to age, educational level, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status of women headed households.

Methods and procedures: By reference to the literature and previous studies related to the subject of study and then identifying the development of packaging on the dimensions that measure aspects of the information, respects the moral and scientific purposes to achieve research objectives. The presentation tool study on a group of arbitrators of university professors and professionals of whom (9) arbitrators to ensure the

Table 1: The classification of members of the study in relation to age, educational level, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status of women headed households

Variables Frequency Percentage Age group (years) 19-26 20 9.8 27-34 57 27.9 35-42 57 27.9 43-50 46 22.5 51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 1	neaded househo	olas	
19-26 20 9.8 27-34 57 27.9 35-42 57 27.9 35-42 57 27.9 43-50 46 22.5 51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level	Variables	Frequency	Percentage
27-34 57 27.9 35-42 57 27.9 43-50 46 22.5 51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 1 < secondary	Age group (years)		
35-42 57 27.9 43-50 46 22.5 51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 1 < secondary	19-26	20	9.8
43-50 46 22.5 51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 1 1 secondary 14 6.9 2 secoundart 37 18.1 3 diploma 55 27.0 4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 > 1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 <	27-34	57	27.9
51-58 18 8.8 59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 100.0 L secondary 14 6.9 2 secoundart 37 18.1 3 diploma 55 27.0 4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8	35-42	57	27.9
59-66 6 2.9 Total 204 100.0 Education level 1 1 < secondary 14 6.9 2 secoundart 37 18.1 3 diploma 55 27.0 4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 2 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 12.3 11-15 25 12.3 16.2 6-10 31 29 25.0 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21.2 25 12.3 16-20 30 22 10.8 31.43 16.7 26.3 20.2 16.8 20.2	43-50	46	22.5
Total 204 100.0 Education level 1 < secondary	51-58	18	8.8
Education level 1 < secondary	59-66	6	2.9
1< secondary	Total	204	100.0
2 secoundart 37 18.1 3 diploma 55 27.0 4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 ≥1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Education level		
3 diploma 55 27.0 4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of househo	1< secondary	14	6.9
4 BA 72 35.3 5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDS 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 ≥1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 32 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	2 secoundart	37	18.1
5 graduated 26 12.7 Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 10 4.9 200-400 40 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash	3 diploma	55	27.0
Total 204 100.0 Income level JDs 10 4.9 200-400 40 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 58 28.4 901-1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 20	4 BA	72	
Income level JDs 200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 1-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work	5 graduated	26	12.7
200-400 10 4.9 401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Years of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7	Total	204	100.0
401-600 41 20.1 601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 ≥1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Years of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Income level JDs		
601-900 65 31.9 901-1200 58 28.4 >1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	200-400	10	4.9
901-1200 58 28.4 ≥1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	401-600	41	20.1
>1200 30 14.7 Total 204 100.0 Years of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	601-900	65	31.9
Total 204 100.0 Years of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	901-1200	58	28.4
Vears of marriage (years) 1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	>1200	30	14.7
1-5 32 15.7 6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Total	204	100.0
6-10 51 25.0 11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Years of marriage (year	rs)	
11-15 25 12.3 16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	1-5	32	15.7
16-20 30 14.7 21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	6-10	51	25.0
21-25 34 16.7 26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	11-15	25	12.3
26-30 22 10.8 31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	16-20	30	14.7
31-43 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	21-25	34	16.7
Total 204 100.0 Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	26-30	22	10.8
Family size individuals 1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	31-43	10	4.9
1-5 106 52.0 6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Total	204	100.0
6-10 88 43.1 11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Family size individuals		
11-15 10 4.9 Total 204 100.0 Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	1-5	106	52.0
Total 204 100.0 Residential area 49.5 Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	6-10	88	43.1
Residential area Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	11-15	10	4.9
Amman 101 49.5 Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Total	204	100.0
Jarash 103 50.5 Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Residential area		
Total 204 100.0 Employment status of heads of household Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Amman	101	49.5
Employment status of heads of householdWork12862.7Not work7637.3	Jarash	103	50.5
Work 128 62.7 Not work 76 37.3	Total	204	100.0
Not work 76 37.3		neads of household	
	Work		62.7
<u>Total</u> 204 100.0	Not work	76	37.3
	Total	204	100.0

appropriateness of the tool and the comprehensiveness of paragraphs and asked them to arbitration the safety of the drafting of scientific and linguistic said any proposed modifications. Its validity significances were extracted using Cronbach's alpha for each domain and for the scale as a whole reaching the scaler eligibility coefficient (0.85) to be members of the study, the average performance on this measure of evidence indicative of attitudes female-headed households to deal with the packaging of ready-to-eat food in Jordan.

To answer the research question: What are the attitudes of the members of the study of women headed households to deal with the packaging of ready-to-eat

Table 2: Classification of individuals based on their average performance on the paragraphs to get to know their attitudes

Type of classification	Range of degree	Degrees
Weak attitude	1.00-2.333	34-79
Medium attitude	2.34-3.740	79-127
High attitude	5.00-3.750	128-170

foods in Jordan? In relation to age, educational level, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status to the women headed of households?

t-test: The t-test was conducted for the variables age, educational level, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status of women headed of households and the analysis of variance was conducted for the average performance for the variables age, educational level, income level, years of marriage, number of family members, residential area and employment status of women headed households.

Attitudes: Individuals attitudes were classified according to the average performance of the paragraphs of each area according to the classification of five where he was dividing the length of the ladder answer (5 - 1 = 4) on the number of required classes (5) so along the same category 4/5 = 0.8, so that individuals can be classified based on average performance on paragraphs to get to know their attitudes according to Table 2.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Individuals' attitudes were classified according to the average performance on the paragraphs according to Table 2. A t-test for independent variable of the trends of women headed households depending on region results (Table 3). The results revealed that the average attitudes of women headed households was 128.28 and 128.87 for Amman and Jerash governorates, respectively had a trend that was high and there was no significant differences in attitudes according to the residential area (0.839) p>0.05.

This mean there are no significant differences between them depending on the region's housing, this may explained by the use of one curriculum and the presence of well trained teachers in all schools in the governorates of Jordan so researchers must work well to maintain this high level and seek hard to developed trend to become very high. And a t-test for the samples depending on the status of the work as the trends of the ladies working in is high average (129.83) and the women's non working moderately average (126.47) but these differences were statistically no significant as the

Table 3: A t-test for independent variable of the trends of women headed households

Region	No.	Mean±SD	Sig.
Sum Amman	101	128.28±13.491	0.839
Jarash	103	128.87±15.659	-

 Table 4: Employment status of heads of household

 Valid
 No.
 Mean±SD
 Sig.

 Work
 128
 129.83±14.872
 0.780

 Not work
 76
 126.47±13.954

Table 5: A single analysis of variance according to the average age of women				
Average age	Mean±SD	No.	Sig.	
19-26	128.15±10.994	20	-	
27-34	131.88±17.999	57	-	
35-42	127.05±10.393	57	0.459	
43-50	127.96±13.962	46	-	
51-58	126.78±13.379	18	-	
59-66	123.33±28.033	6	-	
Total	128.58±14.593	204	-	

value of the level of (0.780) p>0.05. This can be explained by knowing that working women more commonly use ready-to-eat food which means they were relatively more experienced with dealing of packaged food as shown in Table 4. A single analysis of variance according to the average age of women was carried out on the sample results as shown in Table 5.

The results showed that the average age of women headed households also did not have any significant differences depending on the analysis of variance between the different age groups for women where the sample reached the level of (0.459) p>0.05, a value that is no significant. The value of the average trends of women in the age group 19-26 (128.15) and is a high degree and the class of 27-34 (131.88) is also a high degree. While the average of the age groups of 35-42 and 43-50 and 51-58 and 59-66 from where she was, respectively 127.05, 127.96, 126.78, 123.33. This result is logical as researchers expected increasing of women headed households experience with ready-to-eat food in general with age.

The analysis of variance mono depending on the school year for the women's study sample show that the average trends in women's educational level of the 1st (less than 2nd) and the 3rd (diploma) and 5th (graduate) was high and the degree (133.50, 130.56 and 129.92, respectively) while the average educational level for women's 2nd (secondary) and 4th (BA) where the total, respectively (127.00 and 126.43). Clear from those results that the cultural courses for environmental education, nutrition and health in the levels of undergraduate bachelor's very limited said were t non-existent, so the study recommends that allocates public courses in higher education concerned with culture environmental and nutritional health as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Test to chek public courses in higher education concerned with

tulule, e	arviroriinentar and nuuruoi	iai nealui	
Education level	Mean±SD	No.	Sig.
1	133.50±26.515	14	-
2	127.00±13.102	37	0.307
3	130.56±14.940	55	-
4	126.43±11.832	72	-
5	129.92±13.985	26	-
Total	128.58±14.593	204	-

Table 7: Test to check degree among women depending on the trends of income

III COIII			
Income JD	Mean±SD	No.	Sig.
200-400	126.20±21.390	10	0.379
401-600	131.02±14.499	41	-
601-900	130.09±15.183	65	-
901-1200	127.36±14.753	58	-
UB-1200	125.10±9.5500	30	-
Total	128.58±14.593	204	-

Table 8: Differences among women according to number of years of marriage Years of marriage Mean±SD No. 1-5 124.72±12.431 32 131.25±13.353 51 6-10 0.00511-15 135.60±19.279 25 16-20 121.03±10.601 30 34 21-25 129 35±15 882 129.55±10.523 26-30 22 31-43 127.60±17.834 10 Total 128.58±14.593 204

It also did not show the results of analysis of variance depending on the level of education significant differences reaching the level of (0.307) p>0.05 and is no statistically significant. Over all expressed those women trends to wards high packaging items as the average of all educational levels (128.58) and the value was high. And a single analysis of variance according to income shows that women with in come between (401-600) JD and (601-900) JD have shown high trends as they hit their performance on the average resolution (131.02-130.09), respectively were also moderately for women with an average income of 200-400, 901-1200, >1200 with an average, respectively; 126.20, 127.36 and 125.10 as shown in Table 7. Table 7 shows that there was no significant differences among women according to the average income as the value of the level of (0.379) p>0.05 and the value no statistically significant, although there is differences degree among women depending on the trends of income. A single analysis of variance according to the number years of marriage were set out in Table 8 have shown high trends toward packaging items years as 6-10, 11-15, 21-25 and 26-30 years, reaching an average performance on resolution, respectively; 131.25, 135.60, 129.35 and 129.55. While the attitudes of middle-class (1-5) years of marriages as the average performance of 124.72 and a category (16-20) 121.03 and an average performance of the category (31-43) with an average performance of 127.60. The results of analysis of variance

Table 9: Multiple comparisons dependent variable

Marge years (I)	le comparisons de Marge years (J)	Mean difference (I-J)	SE	Sig. (a)
1-5	6-10	-6.536(*)	3.189	0.042
	11-15	-10.881(*)	3.775	0.004
	16-20	3.685	3.594	0.306
	21-25	-4.634	3.483	0.185
	26-30	-4.827	3.917	0.219
	31-43	-2.881	5.123	0.574
6-10	1-5	6.536(*)	3.189	0.042
	11-15	-4.345	3.453	0.210
	16-20	10.222(*)	3.254	0.002
	21-25	1.902	3.131	0.544
	26-30	1.709	3.607	0.636
	31-43	3.655	4.891	0.456
11-15	1-5	10.881(*)	3.775	0.004
	6-10	4.345	3.453	0.210
	16-20	14.567(*)	3.830	0.000
	21-25	6.247	3.726	0.095
	26-30	6.055	4.134	0.145
	31-43	8.000	5.291	0.132
16-20	1-5	-3.685	3.594	0.306
	6-10	-10.222(*)	3.254	0.002
	11-15	-14.567(*)	3.830	0.000
	21-25	-8.320(*)	3.542	0.020
	26-30	-8.512(*)	3.969	0.033
	31-43	-6.567	5.164	0.205
21-25	1-5	4.634	3.483	0.185
	6-10	-1.902	3.131	0.544
	11-15	-6.247	3.726	0.095
	16-20	8.320(*)	3.542	0.020
	26-30	-0.193	3.869	0.960
	31-43	1.753	5.087	0.731
26-30	1-5	4.827	3.917	0.219
	6-10	-1.709	3.607	0.636
	11-15	-6.055	4.134	0.145
	16-20	8.512(*)	3.969	0.033
	21-25	0.193	3.869	0.960
	31-43	1.945	5.393	0.719
31-43	1-5	2.881	5.123	0.574
	6-10	-3.655	4.891	0.456
	11-15	-8.000	5.291	0.132
	16-20	6.567	5.164	0.205
	21-25	-1.753	5.087	0.731
	26-30	-1.945	5.393	0.719

Based on estimated marginal means; *the mean difference is significant at the $0.05\ \mathrm{level}$

indicated that differences among women according to number of years of marriage was statistically significant as was (0.005) p<0.05 and the value is significant which confirms that the differences between attitudes towards women in the packing of ready to eat food varies according to number of years of marriage as was shown in Table 8. Posteriori comparisons to Scheffe were shown by the Table 9 that the differences were for the benefit of a class (6-10) on the category (1-5) at the level of significance (0.042) and for category (11-15) on the category (1-5) at the level of significance (0.004). And for the benefit of category (16-20) on the category (6-10) at the level of significance (0.002). For the benefit of category (11-15), marge years on the category (16-20) at the level of significance (0.000). For the benefit of category (21-25) on the category (16-20) at the level of

Table 10: A single analysis of variance depending on the number of family members showed that women with families and have trends as high as the average performance on the resolution

Family size	Mean±SD	No.	Sig.
1-5	127.97±14.240	106	-
6-10	130.60±14.715	88	0.018
11-15	117.20±12.497	10	-
Total	128.58±14.593	204	-

Table 11: Differences for the benefit of families with the number of individuals on the number of women headed households

Family	Family			
number (I)	number (J)	Mean difference (I-J)	SE	Sig.
1-5	6-10	-2.63	2.073	0.448
	11-15	10.77	4.755	0.079
6-10	1-5	2.63	2.073	0.448
	11-15	13.40(*)	4.797	0.022
11-15	1-5	-10.77	4.755	0.079
	6-10	-13.40(*)	4.797	0.022

significance (0.020). For the benefit of class (26-30) on the category (16-20) at the level of significance (0.033). The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. And a single analysis of variance depending on the number of family members showed that women with families (6-10) and (1-5) have trends as high as the average performance on the resolution (130.60-127.971), respectively while women with the number of individuals (11-15) have an average performance trends on the medium-resolution (117.20) as shown in Table 10. These differences were significante at the level of significance (0.018) in the test and the analysis of variance shown in Table 11.

Multiple comparisons: Dependent variable: Sum: Scheffe based on observed means. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. Posteriori Scheffe comparisons showed that the differences for the benefit of families with the number of individuals (6-10) on the number of women headed households (11-15) were at the level of significance (0.022).

CONCLUSION

Activating the role of visual media and broadcast and print and government institutions, private and cooperative societies to encourage the development of a sense of responsibility and solidarity among all groups of society to be the basis for a system to ensure the creation and development of culture of dealing with the packages foods and raise awareness of these things to all segments of society.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Attitudes of women headed households dealing with ready-to-eat foods packages must be raised through the establishment of specialized women's associations and activating its role through the promotion of collective initiatives to deal with the packages ready-to-eat food. And the awareness should be transferred outside of educational institutions. In the community by educating them and the establishment of workshops and field activities and information campaigns and the formation of leadership teams for the women headed households. And helping Jordanian women and enable them to playan important rolein guiding the behavior of children to deal with the packages of ready-to-eat foods.

Further research is needed in the areas of support for the important role of women in dealing with the packages of ready-to-eat foods her family and her community.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was conducted in the sapatical year awarded a full-time scientific researcher from Al-Balqa Applied University which was at the University of Jerash Jordan.

REFERENCES

Ellen, G. and M.Q. Hugo, 2011. Cost comparison of readymade meals versus packaged-food component meals. http://hdl.handle.net/1811/48857.

Jungbluth, N., O. Tietje and R. Scholz, 2000. Food purchases: Impacts from the consumers' point of view investigated with a modular LCA. Int. J. LCA., 5: 134-142.

Jungbluth, N., S. Busser and R. Frischknecht, 2011. Environmentally friendly food consumption: What does this mean? http://www.lcm2011.org/papers.html?file=tl_files/pdf/poster/day1/Jungbluth-Environmentally_friendly_food_consumption-546_b.pdf.

Manalili, N.M., A.M. Dorado and R. van Otterdijk, 2011.

Appropriate Food Packaging Solutions for Developing Countries. Scientific Publication, FAO, Rome.

Mazahreh, S.A., H. Hammad and H. Abu-Jaber, 2010. The Attitudes of instructors and faculty members about the quality of technical education programs in community colleges. J. Soc. Sci., 3: 880-886.

Ramasamy, K., G. Kalaivanan and S. Sukumar, 2005. Consumer behavior towards instant food products. Ind. J. Market., 35: 24-25.

Usha, V., 2007. A study on buying behavior of consumers towards instant food products in Kolar. M. Sc. Thesis, Dharwad University of Agricultural Sciences.