

:

*

1997

()

(2004-1990)

- -

()

:

.1

.(1997-1968)

1967

.2008/5/11

2006/12/14

*

(1998-1992)

.2

.1997

(2000) -1

1997

.()

-
-

:
.1

(2004-1990)

(1999) .2

.2

.3

:
.1

(1992) .3

-1990)

.(2004

.2

.(2004-1990)

-1990)

(2004-1998)

(1996

1997

:

:

(Tweeten, Luther Rolando and Bechir Rassas, 1988) .4

1987

:

:

:

(Likert Scale)
(1,2,3,4,5)

/

)
(

Descriptive Statistical

.1
Measures

ONE-WAY ANOVA

.2
(F- Test)

)
(

(188)

(20)

(10)

(26)

()

(%95)

(1)

" :

(1)

.(1999) "

0.87	
0.92	
0.95	

:

-

.(2004)

.3

-

.(2004)

.(1976) "

-

(1990-1979)

(26)

:

(10.3)

(4.8)

(0.9)

(1.4)

.(2005

)

.(Hermann, 1966)

-

-

.(1976

)

)

.(2004

-

:

(

)

-

1985

.(2004

)

(

)

:

)

()

.(1991

.(1991

)

1985

(1991) 1989

-

(1997-1968)

)

(2000

- (1990) (600) 1986

1997/4/21

(1998-1992)

(1999)

(-1971)

.4

(1991)

-

(1980 -)

(Watson and Holman, 1980)

(1991)

-1986)

(

)

(1999

(2000)

-

250

400

(2005)

:

(2)

.1

(1996-1990)

.2

(2004-1998)

(19)

.3

(9)

(3.4)

(4.3)

(2.7)

(3)

.4

(21)

(17)

(2)

()

% (2004-1998)	% (1996-1990)	(2004-1998)	(1996-1990)	
73.7	78.7	8.77	18.92	
82.0	94.1	3.45	4.36	
41.6	10.3	21.33	17.09	
116.1	214.4	2.71	3.01	

: *

(f)

()

:

:

(2)

:H0

$$.(\mu_2 \geq \mu_1)$$

:

$$.(\mu_2 < \mu_1) H1$$

:

$$. 7:n_1$$

$$: \mu_1$$

$$. 7:n_2$$

$$: \mu_2$$

(3)

)

()

(

(3)

t

H1	%5	2.48 = 1.94 = 6 =	t' t' t'
H1	%5	2.48 = 1.94 = 6 =	t' t' t'
H0	%5	-2.52 = 1.94 = 6 =	t' t' t'
H1	%5	2.62 = 1.94 = 6 =	t' t' t'

(3)

$$t = ((w_2 * t'_2) + (w_1 * t'_1)) / (w_2 + w_1)$$

$$t = (x_1 - x_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2) / \text{root of } (S_1^2/n_1 + S_2^2/n_2)$$

$$w_1 = S_1^2/n_1 \quad t'_1 = n_1 - 1, 1 - \alpha$$

$$w_2 = S_2^2/n_2 \quad t'_2 = n_2 - 1, 1 - \alpha$$

$$= x_1 \quad : S_1^2$$

$$: S_2^2 \quad 6 : n_1$$

$$6 : n_2$$

$$= x_2$$

$$.05 = \alpha$$

)

(

(Likert Scale)

(5) ()

()

(3)

$$= 2 / (\quad + \quad) =$$

(3)

$$.3 = 2 / (1 + 5)$$

.5

(3)

(SPSS)

(4)

/

(4)

5.9	11	29-18	
31.4	59	39-30	
50.0	94	49-40	
12.8	24	50	
18.1	34		
70.7	133		
9.0	17		
2.1	4		
12.8	24		
43.6	82		
25.0	47		
9.6	18		
8.5	16		
0.5	1		
71.3	134		
1.6	3		
25.5	48		
1.6	3		
87.2	164		
0.5	1		
12.2	23		
98.4	185		
1.1	2		
9.0	17		
25.0	47		
11.7	22		
54.3	102		
17.6	33		
80.9	152		
1.1	2	3	

77.1	145		
13.3	25		
6.9	13		
1.6	3		
34.74			
4251.07			

(1.334)

()

.(5)

(3.89 4.04 4.02)
(0.816 0.933 0.933)

"
.(0.709)

(4.57)

(2.87)

.(1.389)

(2.39)

(5)

0.709	4.57	
0.898	4.04	
0.933	4.02	
0.816	3.89	
1.232	3.37	
1.348	3.15	
1.389	2.87	
1.147	2.62	
1.181	2.47	
1.334	2.39	

()

(6)

(2)

%45.6	(1996-1990)
%65.5	(2004-1998)

(2006) :

(t)

(7)

:

$\mu_2 \geq \mu_1 : H_0$

:

$\mu_2 < \mu_1 : H_1$

μ_2

μ_1

()

(7)

(t)

t'		-2.52 = T 1.94 = T 6=
	H0	%5

(6)

(%65.5)

(%45.6)

(0.723)

(3.77)

(121) (1.397)

(%64.4) (8)

(129)

(%68.6)

(8) (4.42)

(8)

0.537	4.66	
0.638	4.56	
0.734	4.54	
0.776	4.45	
0.672	4.45	
0.723	4.42	
0.725	4.38	
0.726	4.29	
0.936	4.23	
0.725	4.20	
0.639	4.20	
1.492	3.93	
1.048	3.90	
0.977	3.88	
0.873	3.85	
1.057	3.81	
1.397	3.77	
1.131	3.70	
1.113	3.41	
1.267	3.24	
1.389	2.87	
1.248	2.73	
1.174	2.58	
1.167	2.53	
1.334	2.48	
1.096	1.96	

	.3		(3.77)
		.(1.397)	
		(3.24)	
(3.41)		.(1.267)	
	.(1.113)		
:			-
			-
			.1
			.2
			.3
.(3)			.4
			.1
/			.2
	(%64.4)		
			.1
	(%68.6)		
.(9)			.2
	(9)		

64.4	121		
68.6	129		
39.4	74		
89.9	169		

37.8	71		
89.4	168		
40.4	76		
95.7	180		
35.1	66		
54.3	102		
6.4	12		
35.1	66		
65.6	120		
85.6	161		
53.4	100		
97.9	184		
14.4	27		
18.1	34		

(10)

(ANOVA)

0.84	0.36	0.37	1.08	
0.73	0.44	0.66	0.54	
0.52	0.81	0.32	1.19	
0.16	1.66	0.06	2.33	
0.55	0.60	0.47	0.75	
0.06	3.55	0.13	2.25	
0.44	0.60	0.12	2.43	
0.95	0.12	0.02	3.5	
0.32	1.15	0.00	8.32	

.6

(10)

" "

(10)

(3.50) " " (0.05)

(11)

(10)

(12)

*-1.26	*-1.76		
0.506			

(11)

3			
-1.7*	-0.95		
-0.74			
			3

(11)

.7

3

:H0

:H1

3

(10)

(5)

(3)

(13)

(8.32) " "

(0.05)

T-test

			Z	Z
0.714	187	0.001	1.96	3.48

(12)

(12)

: T-
 (30) test
 z (0.05) t
 (0.001)
 .(13) z
 :

.8

.1

:H0

()

:H1

.2

(5)

.3

(3)

.4

(14)

T-test

.5

			Z	Z
0.524	187	0.005	1.96	3.53

.6

T-test
(0.005)

z (0.05)

.(14)

z

.7

.12

.8

()

.9

.9

.13

.11

2004

()

1990

2003

)

(

1992

1987

(1987-1973)

1999

2002

2001

2000

1993

:

1976

()

	2006
2004	1999
2005	1990
Hermann, Southworth and Bruce Ejohton. 1967. <i>Agricultural Development and Economic Growth</i> .	
Tweeten , Luther Rolando and Beachir Rassas. 1988. <i>Analysis of Selected Agricultural Policies Affecting Production and Marketing of Fruit and Vegetables in Jordan</i> , Agricultural Policy Analysis Project.	1991
Watson, Donald and Holman, Marry. 2001. <i>Price Theory</i> .	1999

The Impact of Price Floating of Agricultural Crops on the Amounts of Vegetables and Loans' Service in Southern Shounah (Field Study)

Wasfi Al-Odwan and Buthaina Al-Muhtaseb

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the effect of price floating of agricultural products, which has been applied in Jordan since 1997 on both the size of agricultural production of a selected group of vegetables (tomatoes, eggplant, marrow and cucumber) and on agricultural debt service in Southern Shounah area in Jordan.

This study is of further significance in terms of time and place; as this is the first time where floating impact on a vital agricultural area is discussed. Further, it covers a longer period of time (1990-2004), also it included a new dimension, not discussed before, which is the impact on agricultural debt service. Furthermore, the methodology was not restricted to the descriptive analysis approach based on formal data, but extended to the field research approach, as questionnaires were prepared for this purpose and distributed among all producers and indebted farmers of the mentioned vegetables.

The study indicated that the results of analyzing official data were consistent, in general, with the opinions of the population study members. A positive effect was found for price floating in terms of the increase in the eggplant, cucumber and marrow production, while the surplus (tomato) production was decreased as has been planned. The impact was also positive when it came to loans; as the farmers' abilities to repay their loans were greater after floating. And thus, the study recommends to pursue applying the policy of price floating.

Keywords: Price Floating of Vegetables, Agricultural Loan Service, Southern Shounah Area in Jordan.

* Faculty of Business, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Received on 14/12/1006 and Accepted for Publication on 11/5/2008.