Effect of Education on Tendency to Water Use Efficiency in Housewives of Zarrin Dasht
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ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Zarrin Dasht is one of the low rainy areas of Fars province, which has faced repeated droughts in recent years. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of education on the tendency towards water use efficiency in housewives of Zarrin Dasht.

Materials and Methods: In this semi-experimental study, 130 patients (65 cases and 65 controls) were selected from housewives of Zarrin Dasht by cluster random sampling from four health centers. Data collection instrument was a standard, two-part questionnaire (demographic data and water saving tendency) that was a water saving standard. Data were analyzed by SPSS version 24 software.

Results: The results of this study showed that the intervention was effective on the tendency of housewives to water use efficiency. There was a significant difference between the above variables before and after the intervention in the intervention group, and the relationship between age and occupation, and tendency to water use efficiency was statistically significant.

Conclusion: Considering that education has a positive effect on women's tendency to water use efficiency, so providing water management education to housewives can lead to modification of consumption pattern.
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In this semi-experimental study of pretest-posttest type was carried out from December to March 2013. A sample consisting of 130 housewives in Zarrin Dasht were selected by random cluster sampling from four urban and rural health centers of Hajiabad, Khasvih, Dabiran, and Shahrpir. The samples were selected based on the population covered by each center and using lottery of the household health records number, and then were divided into two groups of 65 person. To prevent contamination of samples, after lottery, samples in neighborhoods or kinship with the control group were removed and replaced. Then, by calling the individuals by telephone and obtaining their consent to participate in the study, necessary coordination were made to participate in the ongoing research process. The data collection instrument was a two-part water use efficiency questionnaire, which was used in a similar study 3. Validity of the questionnaire was confirmed by experts on health education, environmental health engineering, human ecology and geography, and its reliability obtained 0.87 using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The questionnaire consisted of demographic variables (age, occupation, educational level, economic status, number of family members, and housing situation)
and 12 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale (I absolutely agree, I agree, No idea, I disagree, I absolutely disagree). Five choices for each item were scored from one to five, so each person attained a total score of 12-60 points on the 12 items. The inclusion criteria were housewives living in Zarrin Dasht and attending the program until the end of the study. Exclusion criteria were lack of participation in the educational program or lack of completely filling out the questionnaire. At baseline of the study, the conditions were explained for the women, and finally, those who were willing to participate in the study were included. In pre-test, the questionnaire was administered as self-report in both groups and filled out by two trained investigators in the above-mentioned health centers. The completion time of each questionnaire lasted 10-15 minutes. Then, based on the obtained information, two hours education sessions were provided for the housewives by the environmental health expert in the health center of the city. Two months after the last session, post-test was performed. Prior to the study, explanations were given about the research objectives and the voluntary participation as well as the confidentiality of the information obtained from the individuals. Data were entered into the SPSS version 24, and due to the normal distribution of data on water use efficiency, analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation and percentage), paired t-test, independent t-test, and chi-square. The significance level in this research was considered 0.05.

**Results**

The mean age of women was $36.42 \pm 15.53$ and 44.61% were in the range of 15-30 years old. Among women, 50.76% were housewives. The majority were tenants (47.69%) and had secondary education certificate (27.69%). 56.15% of the people lived in a 3-5 individual family. There was no significant difference in demographic variables between two groups (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Frequency distribution of demographic variables in total and their comparison between case and control groups

| Variable            | Status     | Total | Case | Control | P-value |
|---------------------|------------|-------|------|---------|---------|
|                     | Number     | Number| Percentage | Number | Percentage |           |
| Age                 |            |       |       |         |         |           |
|                     | 15-30      | 58    | 29   | 44.6    | 29      | 44.6      | 0.07      |
|                     | 31-45      | 31    | 10   | 15.4    | 21      | 32.3      |
|                     | 46-60      | 24    | 15   | 23.1    | 9       | 13.8      |
|                     | > 60       | 17    | 11   | 16.9    | 6       | 9.2       |
| Occupation          |            |       |       |         |         | 0.82      |
|                     | Housewife  | 66    | 35   | 53.8    | 31      | 47.7      |
|                     | Clerk      | 24    | 10   | 15.4    | 14      | 21.5      |
|                     | Self-employed | 14 | 7    | 10.8    | 7       | 10.8      |
|                     | Retired    | 26    | 13   | 20      | 13      | 20        |
| Education level     |            |       |       |         |         | 0.86      |
|                     | Elementary school | 20 | 11   | 16.9    | 9       | 13.8      |
|                     | Guidance school | 36 | 20   | 30.8    | 16      | 24.6      |
|                     | High school | 25    | 12   | 18.5    | 13      | 20        |
|                     | High school diploma | 28 | 13   | 20      | 15      | 23.1      |
|                     | Academic   | 21    | 9    | 13.8    | 12      | 18.5      |
| Economic status     |            |       |       |         |         | 0.75      |
|                     | Good       | 28    | 13   | 12.3    | 15      | 23.1      |
|                     | Average    | 84    | 44   | 67.7    | 40      | 61.5      |
|                     | Poor       | 18    | 8    | 12.3    | 10      | 15.4      |
| Number of family members | < 3 | 23    | 13   | 20      | 10      | 15.4      | 0.46      |
|                     | 4-5        | 73    | 36   | 55.4    | 37      | 56.9      |
|                     | 6-7        | 15    | 5    | 7.7     | 10      | 15.4      |
|                     | > 7        | 19    | 11   | 16.9    | 8       | 12.3      |
| Housing status      |            |       |       |         |         | 0.87      |
|                     | Owner      | 48    | 24   | 16.9    | 24      | 36.9      |
|                     | Rental     | 62    | 30   | 46.2    | 32      | 49.2      |
|                     | Living with family (parents, etc.) | 20 | 11 | 16.9 | 9 | 13.8 |
As Table 2 shows, the intervention is effective on the tendency of housewives to water use efficiency. Paired t-test showed a significant difference in the above variables before and after the intervention in the case group, while in the control group, there was no significant difference between the case and control groups before and after the intervention.

**Table 2**: Comparison of mean and standard deviation of the studied variables in case and control groups before and after intervention

| Variable                      | Group     | Mean | SD  | Pre-test | Mean | SD  | Post-test | p-value |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------|-----|----------|------|-----|-----------|---------|
| Tendency to water use efficiency | Case      | 36   | 4.93| 48.86    | 4.20 |     |           |         |
|                               | Control   | 35.69| 5.01| 36.01    | 4.50 |     |           |         |

There was no statistically significant difference between the mean and standard deviation of the tendency to water use efficiency in housewives in two groups of case and control with respect to demographic variables before intervention (Table 3).

**Table 3**: Comparison of mean and standard deviation of tendency to water use efficiency in housewives in case and control groups based on demographic variables before intervention

| Variable          | Status          | Case Mean | SD  | Control Mean | SD  |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Age               | 15-30           | 36        | 4.93| 35.86        | 4.20|
|                   | 31-45           | 35.54     | 5.21| 36.01        | 4.50|
|                   | 46-60           | 36        | 4.93| 55.86        | 4.20|
|                   | > 60            | 35.54     | 5.21| 36.01        | 4.50|
| p-value           |                 | 0.12      |     | 0.11         |     |
| Occupation        | Housewife       | 37.30     | 4.37| 35.56        | 4.20|
|                   | Clerk           | 35.47     | 4.07| 35.01        | 4.21|
|                   | Self-employed   | 36.903    | 6.50| 35.86        | 5.20|
|                   | Retired         | 4.11      |     | 36.21        | 4.87|
| p-value           |                 | 0.09      |     | 0.81         |     |
| Education level   | Elementary school| 34.01    | 4.21| 35.65        | 5.20|
|                   | Guidance school | 36.86     | 6.20| 35.01        | 4.41|
|                   | High school     | 35.14     | 5.24| 36.84        | 4.93|
|                   | High school diploma| 35.07  | 4.07| 35.54        | 5.21|
|                   | Academic        | 36.84     | 5.21| 36            | 4.93|
| p-value           |                 | 0.86      |     | 0.13         |     |
| Economic status   | Good            | 38.21     | 5.21| 32.84        | 6.21|
|                   | Average         | 38.86     | 5.28| 32.14        | 5.90|
|                   | Poor            | 38.21     | 4.04| 32.36        | 4.87|
| p-value           |                 | 0.75      |     | 0.65         |     |
| Number of family members | > 3             | 35.74     | 4.32| 36.94        | 4.12|
|                   | 4-5             | 35.01     | 5.50| 35.51        | 4.70|
|                   | 6-7             | 35.86     | 4.96| 34.86        | 4.25|
|                   | > 7             | 35.62     | 5.50| 35.12        | 5.11|
| p-value           |                 | 0.69      |     | 0.46         |     |
| Housing status    | Owner           | 34.01     | 6.50| 37.51        | 4.70|
|                   | Rental          | 34.76     | 4.91| 34.86        | 4.25|
|                   | Living with family (parents, etc.) | 34.62 | 4.40| 32.16        | 4.96|
| p-value           |                 | 0.87      |     | 0.07         |     |
There was a statistically significant difference between the mean and standard deviation of the tendency to water use efficiency in housewives in case group with respect to age \((P = 0.03)\) and occupation \((P = 0.03)\) after intervention (Table 4).

Table 4: Comparison of mean and standard deviation of tendency to water use efficiency in housewives in case and control groups based on demographic variables after intervention.

| Variable          | Status          | Case Mean | SD | Control Mean | SD |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|----|--------------|----|
| Age               | 15-30           | 48.86     | 4.20 | 36           | 4.93 |
|                   | 31-45           | 59.51     | 5.51 | 35.87        | 5.07 |
|                   | 46-60           | 47.32     | 6.61 | 55.36        | 4.67 |
|                   | > 60            | 39.39     | 4.48 | 35.54        | 5.21 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.02      |     | 0.20         |     |
| Occupation        | Housewife       | 60.30     | 10.37 | 35.74    | 4.32 |
|                   | Clerk           | 53.47     | 9.07  | 36.01    | 5.50 |
|                   | Self-employed   | 51.90     | 10.63 | 35.86    | 5.96 |
|                   | Retired         | 57.50     | 10.11 | 34.62    | 5.17 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.04      |     | 0.09     |     |
| Education level   | Elementary school | 48.86    | 4.20  | 35.74    | 4.32 |
|                   | Guidance school | 44.51     | 5.01  | 35.64    | 4.84 |
|                   | High school     | 47.32     | 6.61  | 37.01    | 5.50 |
|                   | High school diploma | 45.18 | 84.48 | 35.86 | 4.96 |
|                   | Academic        | 45.17     | 84.5  | 33.62    | 5.70 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.69      |     | 0.11     |     |
| Economic status   | Good            | 50.86     | 4.20  | 38.64    | 4.84 |
|                   | Average         | 46.51     | 5.18  | 37.47    | 5.08 |
|                   | Poor            | 47.32     | 6.01  | 35.86    | 4.91 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.54      |     | 0.14     |     |
| Number of family members | < 3    | 48.86    | 6.20  | 35.65    | 4.32 |
|                   | 4-5             | 46.51     | 5.11  | 35.71    | 5.17 |
|                   | 6-7             | 47.32     | 6.61  | 35.86    | 4.87 |
|                   | > 7             | 48.39     | 4.88  | 36.62    | 5.50 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.87      |     | 0.15     |     |
| Housing status    | Owner           | 46.51     | 4.11  | 34.24    | 6.18 |
|                   | Rental          | 49.32     | 6.61  | 34.86    | 4.41 |
|                   | Living with family (parents, etc.) | 45.39 | 4.19   | 34.62    | 4.40 |
|                   | p-value         | 0.27      |     | 0.21     |     |

Discussion

Water, God's unique blessing, is a representation of beauty and refreshing, a manifestation of purity and clarity, and in fact, the main reason for universe to continue to exist. The water crisis in Iran is one of the challenges and problems caused by water scarcity and misuse of water resources. Water use efficiency is the best solution to deal with this crisis. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of education on the tendency towards water use efficiency in housewives of Zarrin Dasht.

The results of this study showed that education had a significant effect on the tendency of the case group to water use efficiency, which is consistent with the results of the studies of Bazdar, Ahmadi, Kalantari, Ifegbesan, De Young, Schultz, but inconsistent with the results of the peasant, Mini, Katircioğlu, Abrahamese. Maintaining and preserving existing water resources and learning the efficient use culture is one of the important and essential issues for any society, because first, demand for water resources is increasing day by day, and secondly, due to lack...
of full knowledge about the way in which it is used correctly, valuable water resources are wasted and polluted. Education is one way to raise awareness of people. Informing women as water use managers at home can help create an efficient use culture and transfer this skill and culture to their children as future generations to alleviate the water crisis. Certain measures such as consumption management education, informing housewives about the process of exploitation to treatment and distribution of water, and providing information on the per capita consumption of our nation compared to other countries, even those countries with a population far more than ours can be helpful in making women more sensitive to the water crisis and creating a more sophisticated attitude toward this vital resource. The results of this study showed that there was a significant difference between age and tendency to water use efficiency after intervention, which is consistent with the studies of Aghili, Kalantari, and Ramsey, were consistent with these results, but inconsistent with the study of Ahmadi. The average tendency of women in the study to water use efficiency in the age range of 30-45 years old was higher than that in other age groups, which may be due to the fact that this age range is the era of human sophistication as he also has physical and mental capacity, therefore the best performance and lifestyle is also expected of people in this age. The results of this study showed a significant relationship between individual occupation and the tendency toward water use efficiency after the intervention, which was consistent with the results of Kalantari, but inconsistent with Ahmadi's study. In this study, housewives tended to use water more efficiently. Because housewives had enough time to do home routines, including washing and drinking water, patiently and more opportunities to attend social events and education sessions held by various institutions, they appear to be more sensitive to the efficient use of water. In addition, more attention by housewives may also be due to the economical aspect of water use efficiency. The limitations of the present study include financial resources and the difficulty of coordinating the presence of housewives in educational sessions. It is suggested that a similar study be conducted on the education of the efficient water use pattern in the age group of students who are most capable population to learn and change their habits and behaviors.

Conclusion

Considering that awareness, general knowledge, perception of the problem and attitude about water have a significant relationship with efficient water use and housewives, as water use managers at home and educators of future generations of community members, play an important role in promoting the development of efficient water consumption patterns in the studied community, the primary objective of the authorities should be perform awareness-raising campaigns about the water resource crisis and its various consequences in this group. Holding lecture sessions, workshops and meetings in respective departments, such as the Water and Wastewater Office, the Municipality, the Governor's Office, the cultural centers, the Environment Office, etc., can increase housewives' information about water scarcity and reduce water waste in urban and residential areas.
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