

*

.%27

(6009)

stepwise regression

:

155

(2002

2020 / /

(2001 World Bank)

Krinner et al. (1999) / / 300-150

700

.(World Resources Institute, 1993) / /

2001³ 1200

.(Frederick,1993) / /3 1000

1647 .(2002)

2020³

%244

/3 1287 2020

.(2002)

2020

/³ 360

1998 %30

.(World Bank, 2001) 2020 %51

) 2002 / / 126.5

*

:

-1

.2005/7/13

2004/12/26

Pashardes et al. (2001) -2

-3

Krinner et al. (1999)

%13

Herath et al. (2001) %19

(log-log Model)

Rietveld et al. (1997)

Burtless and Hausman Model

0.08 (0.34-

1.2-

Frederick (1993)

.0.08

/ 50

Cristina and Arlene (1998)

log-log Model

/ 650

/ /3 500

)

(

Al- Weshah (1992)

1996

Aaron (1993)

/ 12

(2004)

- (.(F) - (.(t) - (.(R²)

-1

³ 8331 2002-1937 0.15-
³ 17797 .065
 .%32 (1)

-1

0.43 0.2 (1997)
 .037 6009

-2

2002-1994

³ 937.08 -3
 .(2) (1) (%4.112)

-4

%26.89 ³ 237.2 Q_d=f (H,V,I,O)
 .(1) (2) %1.87 = I . = V . = H

1994 %23.75 = Q_d
 = O

.2002 %30.78

Stepwise Regression

%77.07

(1)
(2002-1937)

	(fm)	(f)	
0.015	1	1	3000-2001
0.031	3	2	4000-3001
0.047	6	3	5000-4001
0.123	14	8	6000-5001
0.092	20	6	7000-6001
0.123	28	8	8000-7001
0.200	41	13	9000-8001
0.123	49	8	10000-9001
0.138	58	9	11000-10001
0.062	62	4	12000-11001
0.015	63	1	13000-12001
0.015	64	1	14000-13001
0.015	65	1	-14001
1.00	65	65	

(2002-1980)

(2)

R ²	F		
0.194	1.686	$\text{Ln } Q_d = 7.014 - 0.04112t$ (39.351) (-1.298)	1
0.516	7.462	$\text{Ln } Q_d = 5.414 + 0.0187 t$ (241.737) (2.732)	2
0.359	3.587	$\text{Ln } Q_d = 3.388 + 0.02895 t$ (39.392) (1.894)	3
0.816	31.033	$\text{Ln } Q_d = 6.479 - 0.03176 t$ (201.907) (-5.571)	4
0.841	84.389	$Q_s = 11.467 + 0.04777 P$ (0.539) (9.186)	5
0.142	1.985	$Q_s = 256.503 - 0.004664 R$ (9.948) (-1.409)	6

(%) (t)

(3)) $\text{Ln } Q_d = 2002-1994 () = t :$
 () $= P (3) = Q_s :$
 (3) $= R$

	³ 0.128				
		3	34.49	2002-1994	
				%4.14	
7		%2.895			
		(1)		(3)	
(3)	2	-1994			
		%66.33	³ .	622	2002
	³ 4.05		(4)	%3.176	
					(1)
			(5)		
(3)		3			2002-1985
			(6)		(1)
				³	
				³	0.004664
	³ 2.189				
		³	19.8	2001-1998	
		³ 2.508			
³ 0.111			%6.8		³ 16.2
(3)	4		³	22.2	
					%9.3
	³ 0.0771	³ 1.023	³ 0.734		(3)
		(5)			
				77.6	
		(4)	(1)		/3 15.293

(3)
 β^3 2001-1998

		2001	2000	1999	1998	
0.074	17.57	17.126	16.577	18.827	17.75	1
0.068	16.302	15.618	16.093	17.027	16.47	
0.078	18.686	19.283	18.116	19.254	18.09	
0.082	19.581	19.261	19.615	19.567	19.88	
0.090	21.345	20.651	21.472	20.968	22.29	
0.089	21.254	21.464	20.870	20.091	22.59	
0.092	22.035	22.915	21.639	21.035	22.55	
0.093	22.164	22.829	22.509	21.706	21.61	
0.088	21.084	21.731	21.108	20.668	20.83	
0.087	20.739	21.462	20.130	20.373	20.99	1
0.080	18.960	18.805	18.820	19.044	19.17	2
0.078	18.590	17.882	18.407	18.792	19.28	2
1.00	238.24	239.028	235.355	237.352	241.501	

(2001)

(4)

R^2	F		
0.106	714.549	$Q_d = 5.075 + 0.128 I$ (26.731) (4.722)	1
0.260	161.847	$Q_d = 45.580 - 4.05 H$ (20.633) (-12.722)	2
0.192	271.765	$Q_d = -3.091 + 2.189 V + 2.508 H + 0.111 I$ (-1.606) (20.749) (3.272) (15.000)	3
0.198	85.052	$Q_d = -12.975 + 0.734 V + 1.023 H + 0.07711 I$ (-4.0115) (14.477) (3.636) (5.745)	4
0.667	349.395	$Q_d = -6.3656 + 1.920 V + 1.354 H + 0.116 I$ (-1.757) (22.788) (3.072) (18.195)	5

%5 (t)

$() = H \cdot () = I \cdot (3) = Q_d$
 $() = I^3 = Q_d I$
 $() / = V$

.(3) .() = Qd .³ 1.920 -
 .() =H -
³ 0.116 -
³ 1.354 -

(7) .(4) 5

20 %1 %0.278 3 (5)
 %1 %0.967
³ 250-101
 %1 %0.568
 %1 3 20 :
 %0.026 = I .() =V
³ 250-101 .()
 .(3) = Qd
 .() =H

(8)

(4) 3 (Qd) (6)
³ 20 %1 %0.099 :
 %0.893 -
³ 250-101 .(V) -
 .(I) -
 %1 %0.749 .(H) -
 %0.089 3 20 :
³ 250-101 = I .() =V

(5)

	R ²	F	
Qd=12.741 -1.641 H + 0.239 V + (6.274E-3) I (46.037) (-38.180) (24.585) (13.929)	0.633	996.446	
Qd= 20.813 - 3.204 H + 0.279 V (20.716) (-17.432) (5.370)	0.636	165.255	
Qd= 9.101 -1.025 H + 0.220 V +(7.973E-3) I (22.900) (-19.406) (11.475) (10.254)	.600	320.884	
Qd = 14.156 -2.160 H + 0.330 V (20.998) (-16.567) (11.014)	0.717	211.760	
Qd = 12.669 - 1.673 H + 0.192 V + 0.218 I (30.944) (-25.692) (17.491) (9.571)	0.631	378.880	
Qd= 17.311 -3.366 H + 0.357 V + (6.142E-3) I (10.927) (-9.928) (6.428) (2.868)	0.704	72.912	
Qd= 13.612 + 0.925 V - 2.989 H + (8.552E-3) I (7.483) (9.462) (-8.037) (2.483)	0.598	69.307	
Qd= 9.787 + 1.404 H + (8.209E-3) I + 0.371 V (13.277) (-11.383) (7.487) (5.328)	0.630	113.554	
Qd= 38.625 - 7.892 H (15.673) (-11.385)	0.550	129.615	
Qd = 9.990 -1.362 H + 0.363 V + (6.548E-3) I (15.466) (-14.209) (8.229) (6.578)	0.703	167.016	
Qd = 7.719 + (7.858E-3) I + 0.598 V - 1.590 H (5.965) (5.580) (9.538) (-5.421)	0.686	84.300	
Qd= 5.880 + 0.01155 I + 0.400 V - 0.881 H (7.904) (8.584) (12.948) (-8.589)	0.688	182.556	

%5

(t)

(6)

	R2	F	
Qd=2.565 + 0.132 V - 0.129H (7.170) (29.168) (-4.263)	0.859	430.965	
Qd=4.398 + 0.192 V - 0.341 H (8.709) (16.320) (-6.855)	0.778	163.073	
Qd=0.954 + 0.110 V (8.076) (17.337)	0.932	300.569	
Qd=3.728 + 0.220 V - 0.256 H (5.668) (12.722) (-4.140)	0.610	92.448	
Qd=3.304 + 0.08014 V + 0.0854 I - 0.179 H (14.680) (-8.864) (14.263) (24.506)	0.838	323.502	
Qd=4.508 + 0.170 V - 0.304 H (18.649) (18.637) (-11.969)	0.704	225.122	
Qd=3.477 + 0.195 V - 0.235 H (9.646) (17.505) (-6.222)	0.723	182.281	
Qd=3.688 + 0.149 V - 0.211 H (7.769) (12.135) (-4.773)	0.688	89.165	
Qd=4.914 + 0.186 V - 0.359 H (18.496) (13.162) (-11.697)	0.636	154.705	
Qd=2.848 + 0.159 V - 0.149 H (5.414) (5.810) (-3.173)	0.813	212.27	
Qd=3.117 + 0.190 V - 0.194 H + (3.055E-3) I (10.098) (14.249) (-6.349) (2.577)	0.607	83.995	
Qd=0.509 + 0.169 V (3.129) (10.917)	0.778	119.183	

%5

(t)

(7)

		(³)
0.568	0.278	(20-0)
0.338	0.570	(40-21)
0.124	0.842	(70-41)
0.077	0.903	(100-71)
0.026	0.967	(250-101)

(8)

/

		³
0.749	0.099	(20-0)
0.604	0.273	(40-21)
0.331	0.602	(70-41)
0.229	0.724	(100-71)
0.089	0.893	(250-101)

(9)

/

		³
3.164	0.403	(20-0)
1.597	0.699	(40-21)
0.513	0.903	(70-41)
0.308	0.942	(100-71)
0.101	0.981	(250-101)

³ 40 1 (9) 4 4
 %1
³ 20 %3.164
 %0.101 %1
³ 205-101 %0.403
 %0.981 ³ 20
³ 250-101

Manila Case, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada.

Frederick, Frey. 1993. International Water Resources Association, the Political *Context of Conflict and Cooperation over International River Basins*, U.S.A.

Herath M. Gunatilake, Chennat Gopalakrishnan and Inoka Chandrasena. 2001. The Economics of Household Demand for Water: The Case of Kandy Municipality, Sri-Lanka, *Water Resources Development*, 17 (3): 277-288.

Krinner, W., Lallana, C. and Estrela, T., CEDEX Nixon S. and Zabel, T. 1999. Sustainable Water Use in Europe, Environmental Assessment Report No.1 Institute of Hydrology. European Communities.

Pashardes Panos, Phoebe Koundouri and Soteroula Hajispyrou. 2001. Household Demand and Welfare Implications for Water Pricing in Cyprus, Department of Economics, Publisher University of Cyprus.

Rietveld Piet, Jan Rouwendal and Bertzwardt. 1997. Estimating Water Demand in urban Indonesia: A Maximum Likelihood Approach to Block Rate Pricing Data, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam Land bouwuniversiteit Wageningen, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands.

World Bank. 2001. The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Water Sector Review Update, Main Report, Report No. 21946-JO.

	2004		
	.267-259	2	31
		1997	
		2002 -1980	
		2001-1995	
		2002	
		2002-1991	
		2003-1997	
	-1998)	2002-1998	(2002
		2002-2000	
	Aaron, Wolf. 1993. International Water Resources Association, <i>Water International</i> , 18: 5-17.		
	Al-Weshah, Radwan Al-Mubarak. 1992. International Water Resources Association, <i>Water International</i> , 17: 124-132.		
	Cristina C. David and Arlene B. Inocenio, Sep. 1998. <i>Understanding Household Demand for Water: The Metro</i>		

Effects of Some Variables on Household Water Demand in Jordan

*Abdul Fattah Al-Kadi and Wafa Al-Jouhari**

ABSTRACT

The water demand in Jordan is more than the available supply. Water demand for household consumption was estimated to be 27% out of the water uses.

This study aimed to determine the effects of some variables on the household water consumption in Jordan.

A 6009 selected households were used for the estimation, the “Stepwise Regression” analysis model was selected as a proper specification for the analysis.

The study proved that the household demand for water is increasing while water supply is decreasing. This means that the increasing demand in the household water is at the expense of agriculture.

The study resulted in finding the most important factors affecting the household water consumption, these factors were the income the household size, and the bill value.

Consumption per capita increases as bill value and income increase whereas it decreases with the size of the household.

The expenditure elasticity for water was estimated to be less than one but it increased with the increasing water consumption, while the income elasticity was estimated to be less than one but decreased with the increasing water consumption. Some other factors affecting household water supply were identified such as the population growth and the rainfall deficit.

Keywords: Per Capita Consumption of Water, Water Supply, Expenditure Elasticity of Water, Income Elasticity of Water.

* Faculty of Agricultural Sciences, University of Jordan. Received on 1/12/2004 and Accepted for Publication on /1/2006.