The Extent of Application of the Economic Indicators to Achieve the Sustainable Development in Jordanian Industries

Dr. Belal H Al-Shurman
Jordan

Abstract

The objective of this research was to compare the extent and need of both domestic and international companies are achieving economy, as one of sustainable development dimensions in Jordan. Quantitative method was adopted to answer the research question. The researcher developed a questionnaire. Seventy two managers (forty six domestic managers and twenty six international managers) completed the questionnaire from both domestic and international companies of the Al Hassan Industrial Estate (HIE). The finding of this research will assist companies of the Al Hassan Industrial Estate (HIE) to improve and integrate sustainable development strategies in their operations. Also, companies and their stakeholders need to evaluate their actions and experiences to develop programs and plans of actions to improve sustainable development.

Keywords: sustainable Development, Industrial Estates Corporation, Economy, Jordan.

Introduction

According to the research study conducted by Lee (2000) have illustrated that sustainable development is knowingly a humanly concept, which is adoption of new technologies and doing business in new ways. This has a direct impact on the betterment of human lives economically, environmentally and socially. Sustainable development enable the organizations to operate without compromising on the future abilities by improving the quality of life and avail the opportunities available in the market. Moreover, the study conducted by Mihelecic et al., (2003) have defined sustainability as the design made by the humans and the industrial systems to provide security to the human beings related to the natural resources available in the market. This can enhance the life of the individuals by availing the economic opportunities in the market to have an effect on the social conditions, health of the humans and the environment.

Organizations have to adopt sustainable development in their business in the following elements of the business that is productivity, opportunities equality, sustainability and empowerment. There are certain principles on the basis of which sustainability has to be developed in activities of domestic and international organizations. It is the principle responsibility of the firms that they must not undermine the development the environmental needs of present and future which might have a negative impact on the performance of the organization. Organizations should ensure that all the resources are used in the most efficient and effective manner with lesser amount of wastage. The international or domestic companies should play their part in bringing sustainability in the country by eradicating poverty and reducing disparities in the living standards of people living in different parts of Jordan. The regulatory authorities in Jordan have played a vital role in creating sustainability by promoting an international economic system for the domestic and multinational companies; so that they can contribute towards a progressive Jordanian economy. Sustainable development practices have been an important process for the organizations to identify the challenges that might occur in the future and might have a negative impact on the performance of the organization. According to the study of Veleva & Ellenbecker (2001) there are several indicators through which organizations either domestic or international can achieve sustainable development in their business.

There are some economic indicators which can play an important role in bringing sustainability in their business. These indicators are: business and finance required for operating the business successfully. Moreover, indicators such as employees, customers, development expenditure, production operations and suppliers plays an important role in bringing sustainability in the business of the organizations either operating in the domestic or international markets of the world.

The sustainable development refers to economic development that is planned and implemented taking into account the protection of the environment and sustainability. Benchmark of sustainability is the maximum goods gained from the environment. Sustainable development requires development of productive structures of the economy while creating infrastructure for a sensitive attitude towards the natural environment and ecological problems (as defined in traditional sciences like geography) (Smit, & Pilifosova, 2003; Redclift, 2002).

Economist Viewpoint towards Sustainable Development

Medovoi (2010), in comprehending the approach of economists toward the sustainable development, figures out a technical movement in the categorization of what is defined as their assets by the economists. He observes that now, the economists see the society not like the producer, rather like the capital (Medovoi, 2010). Rather than considering the natural resources as their capital, they place their emphasis on making investments in changing the social conduct toward consumerism. Economists in the organization of green cooperation, in changing the human conduct toward the consumption and conservation of natural resources, ascertain their prospect stipulations of those natural resources, which would inevitably produce increased capital. This is in opposition with the former viewpoint which depended on mass consumption for the attainment of maximized profit that clearly has a dreary future, provided that our natural resources are becoming increasingly scant.

Nevertheless, some flaws have been noticed and pointed out in this viewpoint as he comes across the fact that this approach is based by the economists under the supposition that there would be an economic increase in case humankind presumes this role of their anthropogenic measures and that the capitalist who acted this way would be on a better side over their competition. Apart from this, he points out the ethical implication of categorizing the human beings and their ecosystem as assets. Fundamentally, as viewed by the capitalists, anything which produces fiscal increase is asset. This standpoint signals that the discussion on sustainability is a type of “neo liberalism”, which converts nature and human beings into assets. According to Medovoi, this standpoint forms a solution based on the market to the destructiveness of capitalism. This implies that, in case the corporeal resources of nature accessible to humans flourish, the produces capital would also flourish. This expression places us into the sphere of disposition as in the context of securing the world by means of sustainable development as we move toward deeming regarding the human beings and nature as loonies and toonies (Medovoi, 2010).

Strong and Weak Sustainability

According to one interpretation of the concept of sustainable development, the stock of natural capital must not wane over time. The case, however, that the stock of natural capital must be kept constant is "rigid" and in many cases unrealistic. This assumption is more in the case of renewable natural resources and less or not at all in the case of non-renewable natural resources (McNeill, 2000). The concepts of strong sustainability (strong sustainability) and weak sustainability (weak sustainability) are used to differentiate between these two cases (Ayres, van den Berrgh & Gowdy, 2001). Under strong sustainability perfect substitution between different types of capital is not a valid assumption. Some elements of the stock of natural capital cannot be substituted by man-made capital (except in very limited basis). Some of the functions and services of ecosystems is vital for human survival; it services life support and cannot be substituted (Ekins et al., 2003; Ott, 2003; Málovics, Csigéné, & Kraus, 2008).

According to the weak sustainability need not be distinguished environment for a more specific treatment. It's just another kind of capital. Moreover, what is necessary for sustainable development is the transfer of a total stock of capital, not less than what exists now (Gowdy & O'Hara, 1997). The weak sustainability implies that a certain element of natural capital can be substituted by other types of capital, whether natural or anthropogenic (Cabeza Gutés, 1996). According to the development of patient viability can be considered viable if and when the total capital remains constant. This is therefore the stable capital rule of weak sustainability. The weak sustainability therefore based on perfect substitutability between different forms of capital (Pearce, & Atkinson, 1993).

Based on the above occurred four approaches of sustainable development (Turner et al, 2003):

- The very strong sustainability whereby not substitutability between different forms of capital,
- The strong sustainability whereby allowed partly substitutability between capital
- The patient viability in authorizing the fungibility of funds to certain non-easily-identifiable boundaries,
- The very weak sustainability whereby allowed full fungibility of capital.

The approach to sustainable development is the so-called "three-pillar approach" (economic efficiency, environmental protection, social justice), which requires the integration of economic, social and environmental policies. Sustainable development is taken into account as an overlying principle is recognized that the development can be considered sustainable if and only if the result obtained from the use of the stock of capital, ie the "welfare" remains stable or increases over time (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2005).

The path to sustainable development, the EU recognizes six main sources of threat, which is:

- The climatic changes which influence the rise in global temperatures and the presence of extreme weather events,
- The risks to public health from disease-resistant antibiotics , and the use of chemicals in everyday life,
- The poverty and social exclusion,
- The aging of the population,
- The increasing pressure on vital natural resources and biodiversity loss,
- The problem of transport (traffic problems in urban areas) and pollution caused by transport (Commission of the European Communities, 2001; Social Affairs, 2002).

Some authors have expressed reservations or objections regarding the usefulness or purpose of sustainable development. Thus it has been suggested that the goal of sustainability, at least in commonly acceptable form, is continued economic growth in developed countries at the expense of the Third World, as a global screening measure, on the pretext of environmental problems and the expected depletion of natural resources. He has also written that sustainable development as a central overlying principle that ‘manages' specific power centers, will have long-term unexpected results due to unforeseen interdependencies between various factors in the ecology and economy. The best route would therefore be environmental protection be left to the free market (e.g. a system of allowances similar to "carbon trading" provided for by the Kyoto Protocol) (Jamieson, 1998; Schmidheiny, 1992).

From a completely different perspective, the movement of degrowth argues that sustainability and economic development are conflicting goals, since any improvements made to the natural environment or social cohesion thanks to "green" technologies, policies and plans will automatically offset by increased production and consumption of goods and services implied by the development (Barbier, 1987). From this perspective, the West has long supported the economy of the excessive production and excessive consumption due to the "ideology of development." In many Marxists, 'green growth' conditions capitalism is nothing but an opportunity for new investments at the expense of the working class, without substantial positive effects on the environment, usually, however, does not reject the objective of economic development that in itself (O'Connor, 1998).

An Operational Approach to Implement Sustainable Development Work

Companies today are interested in optimizing the management of their workflow and improve their environmental practices. To the public, a key idea is to move towards economic short circuits across a territory, a die, an urban area, a business area. These sub- industrial systems including analysis of outgoing inflows / material and energy will help to highlight potential synergies but also reveal opportunities for development. In economic terms, waste is a significant commercial windfall for businesses, because ultimately represent a significant share of resources used by industrial processes, given the rise in commodity prices. On the other hand operations pooling of resources related to the mass flow are synonymous with economies of scale and cost reduction (Harmon, 2003).

Specifically, the implementation of industrial ecology approaches can result in actions such as:

• Valuation / exchange of industrial flows (waste and byproducts, steam, heat, industrial water, etc.);
• The pooling of resources and services (collective waste management, logistics, transport and bulk purchases, travel plans);
• Sharing of equipment or resources (means of treatment / recovery of waste or effluent, skills, jobs in time shared, common areas, etc.);

The creation of new activities, services, markets or local industries (related to the value of by-products or pooling). It can be both business projects, sometimes resulting in a simple linking or requiring mediation and regional projects in response to local issues, and potentially involving public actors (development of sectors, public facilities).

Finally, experience shows that beyond the technical dimension of quantification and analysis of physical flows, the success of such approaches relies heavily on the ability to mobilize, exchange and cooperation of local actors that whether it is business or stakeholders of territorial development (Tibbs, 1993).

The economic indicators are focused on a number of main aspects:

- Business and finance (Hussey, et, al 2001).
- Employees (Hussey, et, al, 2001., Michaelis, 2004).
- Customer.
- Development expenditure (Veleva & Ellenbecker, 2001., LCFSD, 1998., Azapagic, 2003., O'Brien, 1999., Hussey, et, al, 2001).
- Production operation (O'Brien, 1999., Hussey, et, al 2001).
- Supplier (Ranganathan, 1998)

Problem Statement

The companies are using sustainable development for reaching more markets in the world. Its importance has enhanced for the companies due to changes occurring in the political, economic and financial situations of the entire globe. Thus, it is significant for applying the sustainable development principles as they have enhanced the lives of the people. Sustainable development is not only related to the connection between the economy, society and the environment. Apart from its importance there are different external manifestations related to the process of sustainable development. Thus, the study finds out how we can measure one of the sustainability dimensions (Economy) but it is more proper to find out how we are able to measure up according to the sustainability levels. Therefore, the study tries to resolve the problem of the study.

Purpose of Study

This research aimed to compare the extent to which domestic and international companies in Jordan achieve sustainable development. Sustainable development was evaluated in one area: economic sustainability of the companies' activities. This research was conducted in the framework of the study of quantity. Quantitative data was collected through a questionnaire to determine the use of each of the participants' perceptions and attitudes towards the achievement of economy dimension of in the Jordanian industrial companies. Finally, there was a limited work related to this research, which have been identified. Thus, it is hoped that this research may help to promote more research on this topic.

Research question and hypothesis

Find a research based on the question next question, what is the comparison between domestic and international industrial organizations in Jordan, which is sustainable development on the basis of the economy application?

On the basis of the proposed above question, and test the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a difference between domestic and international industrial companies in the application of sustainable economic development?

Population

Survey respondents for this research study consisted of the managers of the Al Hassan Industrial Estate (HIE) which is one of the Jordanian Industrial Estates Corporations (JIEC's), located in the northern region of Jordan, which consists of 103 factories: 45 factories are international, and 58 factories are domestic. The researcher submitted the survey to 103 participants who responded to the survey, out of which 72 participants responded to all questions in the survey and 31 participants did not answer all questions in the survey. Of the respondents who completed the survey, 26 international factories were represented, along with 46 domestic factories. The participants selected for this research study were managers who had a comprehensive knowledge of their industrial companies.

Data Analysis

An important requirement of the research was to have an appropriate number of respondents in order to provide a suitably sized sample for the descriptive statistics conducted as well as a reasonable level of statistical power for the inferential statistical tests conducted. Data collection was conducted through questionnaires distributed to the respondents. After the completion of the process of the data collection, the following was done:

1. Describe the data (subject's responses to the survey items).
2. Determine if the data were reliable (i.e., if the data demonstrated consistency in the measurements obtained).
3. Conducting the following statistical analyses:
   a) Describing demographic data in terms of measures of central tendency/frequency distributions.
   b) *t*-test at the 0.10 level.
   c) Univariate Analysis of Variance (used with one dependent variable) at the 0.10 level.

Limitations and Delimitations

The data collected for this study was limited to its study scope, the population examined, and controls incorporated. Additionally, only Al Hassan Industrial Estate (HIE) managers participated in this study. The managers at other Jordanian industrial estate corporations (JIEC's) may has differed in some fundamental way from these participants, which may have biased the results of this study. Therefore, any findings or conclusions derived from this study are primarily relevant to this research sample. Also, there are certain influences in the design of a field study which may or may not affect the outcome observed; therefore, the findings of this research study should be subjected to close scrutiny and evaluation.

The study was delimited in the following ways:

1. The data was collected in the fall of 2013.
2. This research was conducted only in one Industrial Estate in Jordan.
3. The research respondents were only mangers for the industrial companies in the Al Hassan Industrial Estate (HIE) in Jordan.
4. The analysis of data was limited to complete responses from the study population of 103 participants identified for this study.

Finding and Analysis

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1. Demographic and functional characteristics for participants due to type of industry

Variable	Type of industry	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Management experience	Domestic	Less than 5 years	10	21.7
		5 – 10 years	16	34.8
		More than 10 years	20	43.5
		Total	46	100.0
	International	Less than 5 years	7	26.9
		5 – 10 years	10	38.5
		More than 10 years	9	34.6
		Total	26	100.0
Qualification	Domestic	Bachelor degree or less	37	80.4
		Graduate studies	9	19.6
		Total	46	100.0
	International	Bachelor degree or less	16	61.5
		Graduate studies	10	38.5
		Total	26	100.0
Age of industry	Domestic	Less than 5 years	17	37.0
		More than 5 years	29	63.0
		Total	46	100.0
	International	Less than 5 years	13	50.0
		More than 5 years	13	50.0
		Total	26	100.0
Nationality	Domestic	Jordanian	43	93.5
		Non Jordanian	3	6.5
		Total	46	100.0
	International	Jordanian	12	46.2
		Non Jordanian	14	53.8
		Total	26	100.0

Table 1 showed that:

Domestic industrial:

As shown in table 1, it can be interpreted that for management experience variable, there were 20 individuals in the highest category, more than 10 years and has the frequency of percentage 43.5%, but the lowest category, less than 5 years, has the frequency percentage 21.7%, i.e. 10 individuals.

For qualification variable, there were 37 individuals in the highest category, i.e. bachelor degree or less, and has the frequency percentage 80.4%, but the lowest category, i.e. graduate studies, has the frequency percentage 19.6%, i.e. 9 individuals.

For age of industry variable, there were 29 individuals in the highest category, i.e. more than 5 years, and has the frequency percentage 63.0%, but the lowest category, i.e. less than 5 years, has the frequency percentage 37.0%, i.e. 17 individuals.

For nationality variable, there were 43 individuals in the highest category, i.e. Jordanian, and has the frequency percentage 93.5%, but the lowest category, i.e. non Jordanian, has the frequency percentage 6.5%, i.e. 3 individuals.

International industrial:

From the table 1, it can be interpreted that for management experience variable, there were 10 individuals in the highest category, i.e. 5 – 10 years, and has the frequency percentage 38.5%, but the lowest category, i.e. less than 5 years, has the frequency percentage 26.9%, i.e. 7 individuals.

For qualification variable, there were 16 individuals in the highest category, i.e. bachelor degree or less, and has the frequency percentage 61.5%, but the lowest category, i.e. graduate studies, has the frequency percentage, 10 individuals.

For age of industry variable, the frequencies of the two categories are equal, i.e. 13 individuals each in less than 5 year category and more than 5 year category with frequency percentage 50.0%.

For nationality variable, there were 14 individuals in the highest category, i.e. non Jordanian, and has the frequency percentage 53.8%, but the lowest category, i.e. Jordanian, has the frequency percentage 46.2%, i.e. 12 individuals.

Management Experience Variable:

Table 2a. The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for type of industry due to less than 5 years

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Less than 5 years	Domestic	3.48	0.47	0.263	0.796
	International	3.42	0.43		

The results presented in table 2a showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories less than 5 years management experience. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 0.263 was less than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.796. Since, the significance value was greater than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are no significant differences in type of industries based on less than 5 years category*.

Table 2b. The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for type of industry due to 5-10 years

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
5-10 years	Domestic	3.35	0.43	2.035	0.053
	International	3.77	0.61		

The results presented in table 2b showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories 5-10 years management experience. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 2.035 was greater than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.053. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are significant differences in type of industries based on 5-10 years category*.

Table 2c: The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for type of industry due to more than 10 years

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
More than 10 years	Domestic	3.39	0.61	3.371	0.002
	International	4.12	0.31		

The results presented in table 2c showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories more than 10 years management experience. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 3.371 was greater than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.002. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10 here can be concluded that the t-test is valid. Therefore, it can be concluded that, *there are significant differences in type of industries based on more than 10 years category*.

Qualification Variable:

Table 3a: The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to Bachelor degree or less

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Bachelor degree or less	Domestic	3.38	0.54	3.354	0.002
	International	3.90	0.48		

The results presented in table 3a showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories bachelor degree or less. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 3.354 was greater than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.002. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are significant differences in type of industries based on bachelor degree or less category*.

Table 3b: The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to Graduate studies

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Graduate studies	Domestic	3.48	0.43	0.626	0.540
	International	3.63	0.61		

The results presented in table 3b showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories graduate studies. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 0.626 was less than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.540. Since, the significance value was greater than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are no significant differences in type of industries based on graduate studies category*.

Age of industry Variable:

Table 4a: The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to less than 5 years

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Less than 5 years	Domestic	3.50	0.46	0.086	0.932
	International	3.48	0.50		

The results presented in table 4a showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories Less than 5 years. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 0.086 was less than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.932. Since, the significance value was greater than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are no significant differences in type of industries based on Less than 5 years category*.

Table 4b: The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to more than 5 years

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
More than 5 years	Domestic	3.34	0.54	4.634	0.000
	International	4.11	0.38		

The results presented in table 4b showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 4.634 was greater than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.000. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are significant differences in type of industries based on More than 5 years category*.

Nationality Variable:

Table 5a. The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to (Nationality Variable, Jordanian)

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Jordanian	Domestic	3.37	0.52	2.731	0.009
	International	3.85	0.60		

The results presented in table 5a showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories Jordanian nationality. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 2.731 was greater than 0.90 (2 –tailed test), with the significance value of 0.009. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are significant differences in type of industries based on Jordanian nationality category*.

Table 5b. The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for Type of industry due to (Nationality Variable, non Jordanian)

Categories	Type of industry	*M*	*SD*	"t" value	Sig
Non Jordanian	Domestic	3.81	0.08	0.198	0.846
	International	3.75	0.49		

The results presented in table 5b showed comparison between types of industry (Domestic and International) in the categories Non Jordanian nationality. The t-test showed that the t-statistic of 0.198 was less than 0.90 (2 – tailed test), with the significance value of 0.846. Since, the significance value was greater than 0.10, therefore, can be concluded that, *there are no significant differences in type of industries based on Non Jordanian nationality category*.

Reliability Analysis:

Table 6. Alpha values for economic indicator and total

No	Domain	Alpha	Items No
1	**economic indicator**	0.80	6
Total		0.80	6

Table (6) showed that the highest alpha value reached (0.80) for "economic indicator". The total alpha values reached (0.80), since the value of alpha was high this means that reliability was high.

Table 7. Means and standard deviation for economic indicators and total them

No	Items	*M*	*SD*	Rank
1	The development of business methods	3.83	0.89	1
2	Increase the level of financial growth	3.64	0.95	4
3	Improve Employees conditions	3.68	0.82	2
4	Better ways of spending on development expenditure	3.21	0.96	6
5	Improve methods of production processes	3.64	0.92	4
6	Find suppliers committed to quality assurance	3.65	0.92	3
Total Means		3.61	0.65	-

Table 7 showed that the highest mean was 3.78 out of 5 for item (1) "the development of business methods ", which meant that majority of the respondents agreed to the statement. Furthermore, for item (3) “improve Employees conditions ", the mean value was 3.68, then for item (6) “find suppliers committed to quality assurance ", the mean value was 3.65. However, the lowest mean value was 3.21 for item (4) “better ways of spending on development expenditure ". The total mean value for economic indicators was 3.61.

Hypotheses Testing

H1: There are significant differences between domestic and international industrial companies in applying sustainable economical development?

The comprehension data was entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 utilizing Independent Sample t-test to analyze data and to determine if the null and alternative hypothesis should be accepted or rejected. An alpha value of p=0.10 was set to establish a confidence level of 90.0% as the benchmark for determining when to accept or reject the hypothesis, table 8 showed that.

Table 8 The result of (Independent Sample t. Test) for economic indicator domain due to type of industry variable

Domain	Domestic		International		"t" value	Sig
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Economic indicator	3.50	0.57	3.80	0.74	1.92	0.058

The results presented in table 8 showed that the t-statistic of 1.92 was greater than 0.90, with the significance value of 0.058. Since, the significance value was less than 0.10, therefore, the null hypothesis one was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted, can be concluded that, *there are significant differences between domestic and international industrial companies in applying sustainable economical development practices*.

It can be seen from t-test tables that the group means significantly differ as the calculated probability level is 0.058, which is less than 0.10. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, with the associated alternative hypothesis being supported. This result indicates that there is a significant difference between domestic and international industrial companies with regard to applying sustainable economic development. For economic indicators (table 8), the mean for domestic companies was 3.50 (SD = .57), and was 3.8 for international companies (SD = .74). This result indicates that the international industrial community is applying sustainable economic development more effectively than domestic industrial companies. This may be due to several reasons. First, this may be due to a high degree of reliance on cheap expatriate labor. Similarly, this may be because a lot of domestic industries in Jordan are owned by family business, where managers are the owners. Also, this could be due to the huge financial privileges they receive because they are the business owners. This would be related to the literature by Azapagic (2004), as the regulatory authorities in Jordan have played a vital role in creating sustainability by promoting an international economic system for the local and multinational companies so that they can contribute towards a progressive Jordanian economy.

Recommendations

The results of this study show that the item “better ways of spending on development expenditure” has the lowest mean which means that the majority of the respondents disagreed with the statement; followed by the item "Increase the level of financial growth" and the item "Improve methods of production processes". Therefore, the researcher recommends:

- Organizations have to adopt sustainable development in their business in the following elements of the business; that is, productivity, opportunities equality, sustainability and empowerment.
- Organizations should ensure that all the resources are used in the most efficient and effective manner with the least amount of waste.
- Exploitation and development of renewable energy sources, and searching for alternative sources of energy.
- Take into account the needs of clients in a sustainable manner.
- The regulatory authorities in Jordan should have played a vital role in creating sustainability by promoting an international economic system for the domestic and international companies so that they can contribute to a progressive Jordanian economy.

References

Ayres, R., van den Berrgh, J., & Gowdy, J. (2001). Strong Versus Weak Sustainability: Economics, Natural Sciences, and Consilience.

Azapagic, A., (2003). Developing a framework for sustainable development indicators for the mining and minerals industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 12, pp. 639-662.

Azapagic, Adisa. 2004. Developing a framework for sustainable development indicators for the mining and minerals industry**,** Journal of Cleaner Production 12 (2004) 639–662, School of Engineering, University of Surrey, Guildford, and Surrey, GU2 7NN, UK.

Barbier, E. B. (1987). The concept of sustainable economic development.*Environmental conservation*, *14*(02), 101-110.

Cabeza Gutés, M. (1996). The concept of weak sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, *17*(3), 147-156.

Ekins, P., Simon, S., Deutsch, L., Folke, C., & De Groot, R. (2003). A framework for the practical application of the concepts of critical natural capital and strong sustainability. *Ecological economics*, *44*(2), 165-185.

European Commission. (2001). *A sustainable Europe for a better world: A European Union strategy for sustainable development*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Gowdy, J., & O'Hara, S. (1997). Weak sustainability and viable technologies.*Ecological Economics*, *22*(3), 239-247.

Harmon, P. (2003). *Business process change: A manager's guide to improving, redesigning and automating processes*. Morgan Kaufmann.

Hussey, D.M., Kirsop, P. L., and Meissen, R.E (2001) Global reporting initiative guidelines: an evaluation of sustainable development metrics for industry. *Environmental Quality Management* pp 1 - 20.

Jamieson, D. (1998). Sustainability and beyond. *Ecological Economics*, *24*(2), 183-192.

Lee, K (2000). Global sustainable development: its intellectual and historical roots. In Global Sustainable Development in the 21st Century, Lee K, Holland A, McNeill D (eds). *Edinburgh University Press*: Edinburgh; 31–47.

Málovics, G., Csigéné, N. N., & Kraus, S. (2008). The role of corporate social responsibility in strong sustainability. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, *37*(3), 907-918.

McNeill, D. (2000). The concept of sustainable development. *Global Sustainable Development in the*, *21*, 10-29.

Medovoi, L. (2010). "Sustainability as Disavowal". Retrieved from "Social Text";
http://www.socialtextjournal.org/periscope/2010/02/sustainability-as-disavowal.php on Jan, 29th, 2013.

Michaelis, L., (2004). The role of business in sustainable consumption. *Journal of*
Cleaner Production, 11, 915-921.

Mihelecic et al., (2003), Development And Implementation Of A Sustainable Apparel Design And Production Model. Retrieved from http://digital.library.okstate.edu/etd/umi-okstate-2307.pdf

O'Brien, C (1999). Sustainable production – a new paradigm for a new millennium; *International Journal of Production Economics*, 60-61.

O'Connor, J. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Natural causes: Essays in ecological Marxism*. Guilford Press.

Ott, K. (2003). The case for strong sustainability. *Greifswald's environmental ethics. Greifswald: Steinbecker Verlag Ulrich Rose*.

Pearce, D. W., & Atkinson, G. D. (1993). Capital theory and the measurement of sustainable development: an indicator of "weak" sustainability. *Ecological economics*, *8*(2), 103-108.

Ranganathan, L.S. 1998. Pressmud as organic fertilizer farning. Worm digest, 22:18-19.

Redclift, M. (2002). *Sustainable development: Exploring the contradictions*. Routledge.

Schaltegger, S., & Burritt, R. (2005). 5. Corporate sustainability. *The international yearbook of environmental and resource economics 2005/2006: A Survey of current issues*, 185.

Smit, B., & Pilifosova, O. (2003). Adaptation to climate change in the context of sustainable development and equity. *Sustainable Development*, *8*(9), 9.

Social Affairs. Unit D. (2002). *Corporate social responsibility: A business contribution to sustainable development*. Office for official publications of the European Communities.

Tibbs, H. (1993). *Industrial ecology: an environmental agenda for industry*. Global Business Network.

Turner, B. L., Kasperson, R. E., Matson, P. A., McCarthy, J. J., Corell, R. W., Christensen, L., ... & Schiller, A. (2003). A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, *100*(14), 8074-8079.

Veleva & Ellenbecker (2001), Indicators of sustainable production: framework and methodology", Journal of Cleaner Production, Vol.9, pp.519-549 data retrieved from
http://www.ifba.edu.br/professores/armando/eng531/Unid%20I/MIT%20Lowell%20Indicatorsustenableproduction.pdf