Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)
Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/4522
DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4522
ISSN NO. 2320-5407

RESEARCH ARTICLE

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AND SELF-EFFICACY WITH MINERS' ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND BEHAVIOR.

Sahmin Madina.
State University Of Jakarta.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 18 April 2017
Final Accepted: 20 May 2017
Published: June 2017

Key words:-
indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, self-efficacy, environmental sound behavior

Abstract

This research is aim at determining relationship between indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self-efficacy with miners' environmentally sound behavior at Gold Mine in Gorontalo, North-East Indonesia. The method used was survey with a correlational study by involving 100 sample. There were four instruments which measured environmental sound behavior (rel. .906), indigenous knowledge (rel. .823), and self-efficacy (rel. .931). Data has been analyzed by two-way ANOVA. Research results revealed that there is positive and significant correlation among those variables, even though it has been controlled by second-order correlation, it is still significant among them. Therefore, it could be concluded that if environmentally sound behavior would be improved, then indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self-efficacy should be taken into consideration.

Introduction:-

The Behavior as a deed done by man. One's behavior can determine whether he succeeds or fails, ultimately behavior is how a person acts against others and his environment. Behavior can be defined as the way in which an individual behaves or acts. Behavior is the way an individual does himself. Behavior should be seen in reference to a phenomenon, object or person. This can be seen in reference to the norms of society, or the manner in which a person treats others or handles things.

The Environmental sound has a meaning as a view, conception or perspective on the environment. The view of the environment includes a unity of space with all things, power, circumstances and living things including humans and their personality that affects the viability of life and the welfare of human beings and other living beings. Behavior Environmental sound is a person's actions about the environment constructed in the human mind that is reflected to be the basis for interacting with the environment.

The Environmental sound behavior requires a person to behave that is concerned about the environment and has an awareness that the ability of the environment and natural resources is very limited. Environment includes aspects of natural resource limitations, natural balance, forest sustainability, pollution, and biodiversity that need to be preserved. The behavior of one's environmental sound can be attributed to indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy.

Corresponding Author:-Sahmin Madina.
Address**:-**State University Of Jakarta.

This is in accordance with the results of research conducted by R. Fermandez Manzana (2006: 431) with the title of relationship between ecology fieldwork and student attitudes toward environmental protection. The results concluded that understanding of ecological concepts and principles and developing a more favorable attitude toward ecosystem defenses and environmental issues. In addition, Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) is one of the widely used models for behavioral change (Glanz & Bishop, 2007: 399-418). This theory emphasizes that human behavior depends on mutual interactions of personal factors, behavior, and environment (Glanz, Rimer, & Viswanath, 2008). The main constructs include knowledge, expectations of results, self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, self-regulation, observational learning, behavioral capacity, motivational incentives, and social support (Glanz et al., 2008; Bandura, 2004; DiClemente, Salazar, & Crosby, 2011; Edberg 2015; McKenzie, Neiger, & Thackeray, 2013) in Hall (2016: 245-253).

According to Guez and Allen (2000: 2), "behavior can be defined as the way in which an individual behaves or acts. Behavior is the way an individual does himself. Behavior should be seen in reference to a phenomenon, object or person. This can be seen in reference to the norms of society, or the manner in which a person treats others or handles things ". Behavior can occur based on phenomena, objects, or individuals that affect individuals. As for the understanding of environmental sound as a view, conception or perspective on the environment. The view of the environment includes a unity of space with all things, power, circumstances and living things including humans and their personality that affect the viability of life and the welfare of human beings and other living beings.

The environment is not only determined by the type and number of living or dead objects, but is determined by the conditions and the state of living things and inanimate objects, and the relationship between the objects, for which society needs to have a view of the environment in research It uses the term environmental sound, Chiras (1991: 462) suggests that: 1) uses resources sparingly and conservatively; 2) reusing and recycling used materials; 3) wherever possible using renewable resources; 4) Controlling population density. So the behavior of one's environmental sound can be done by using resources sparingly and conserving, recycling goods, using renewable resources, and controlling population density.

The relationship of organisms with their environment is precisely described by Mason and Langenheim (1957) in Enger and Smith (2008: 3),"about all that the environmental phenomena have in common is that they impinge in some significant way upon the organism. ... More significant ... is the way in which each phenomenon impinges upon the organism, and the fact that each phenomenon impinges differently." Fietkau and Kessel (1981) used psychological and sociological factors to explain pro-environmental behavior or lack thereof. Their models include variables that affect either directly or indirectly in pro-environment behavior. Blake (1999) talks about gaps in attitudes and behavior. He pointed out that the most pro-environmental behavioral model is limited because they fail to take into account individual, social, and institutional constraints and assume that human beings are the rational and systematic use of information available to them. Based on the above explanation, the synthesis of environmental sound behavior is the activity of a person about the environment constructed in the human mind which is reflected to be the basis for interacting with the environment. Which is realized through efforts: (1) managing the environment well, (2) complying with environmental regulations, (3) utilizing resources.

A.J. Romiszowski (1981: 241-242) defines knowledge as a storehouse of information in one's mind. Knowledge is distinguished by factual and conceptual knowledge. Knowledge that is factual in the form of a) knowing objects, events and people, b) knowing what is done in certain situations or know the procedure. While the conceptual knowledge may take the form of: a) a specific concept or group of concepts, b) concepts that relate concepts to facts. Thus the knowledge aspect consists and 4 categories: 1) facts, 2) procedures, 3) concepts, and 4) principles.

In the opinion of Bloom (1996: 103), that: knowledge includes the cognitive aspect and is the result of scientific activity (mind) that combines various main sensations. The knowledge formed as a result of the learning process is divided into the cognitive domain with six domains: (1) knowledge; (2) understanding; (3) application; (4) analysis; (5) synthesis and (6) evaluation. In cognitive knowledge, the aspects of remembering or memorizing either by way of statement or recalling ideas, materials and phenomena. In this category, intellectual activity has not developed before the formation of intellectual skill in the form of understanding capacity, application, analysis and evaluation.

Anita E. Woolfolk (1998: 248) says, "knowledge is the notion of concepts, theories in different subject realms and general cognitive abilities such as conditions of plan and problem solving". Anderson and Krathwolh (2001: 30) in the revision of taxonomy Bloom states that, "the cognitive process dimension has six levels, the six levels are (a)

memories, (b) understanding, (c) Apply, (d) analyze , (e) evaluate and (f) create". The revisions of Anderson and Krathwolth against Taxonomy Bloom on the addition of creative domains.

According to Forsyth (2004), local meaning in the sense of Indigenous Knowledge refers to, "knowledge bounded by space in a particular region, or perhaps also based on certain cultural and ethnic aspects". This means that Indigenous Knowledge is something that is specifically tied to a particular person or place. According to Chamber (1987), “Indigenous Knowledge often referred to as the science of the people, ethnoscience, rural science, and some also use the original technical science term ". Thus indigenous knowledge is a local knowledge owned by people who inhabit a certain region based on cultural and ethnic aspects.

Kalland (2005: 16-17), Indigenous knowledge is actually not a myth, because it also has properties as empirical knowledge (concerning perception of the environment), paradigmatic knowledge (understanding), and institutional knowledge (attachment with social institutions). Based on the above definition, the synthesis of Indigenous knowledge is anything that occurs based on the factual dimension including the term, the conceptual includes the classification and principles, and the procedural includes the habits and methods of understanding pollution of the environment, which includes traditions and practices have long And develop in certain areas, native to the place or local communities manifested in the wisdom, knowledge, and learning of the community.

According to Santrock (2004: 282), "socioeconomic status as a grouping of people based on similarity of work characteristics, economic education". Socioeconomic status indicates a certain inequality. In general, community members have (1) a variety of prestige work, and some individuals have greater access to higher status jobs than others; (2) different levels of education, some individuals have greater access to better education than others; (3) different economic resources; (4) the level of power to influence public institutions. Differences in ability controlling resources and participating in community rewards generate unequal opportunities.

According to Russell (1993: 164-165), "the distribution system determines the division of society into classes, and where classes exist, different classes will receive different kinds of education". So the synthesis of socioeconomic status in this study is a person's assessment of the level of welfare that refers to the empirical conditions of education and income. Schermerhorn et. al., (2010: 29) suggests that “self-efficacy is an individual belief about the likelihood of successfully completing a specific task”. According to Mcshane and Glinow (2010:45), “self-efficacy is relates personal beliefs a personal beliefs regarding competencies and abilities. Bandura (1994:71-81), perceived self-efficacy is definiting as people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that effect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce these diverse effects four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes.

Hellriegel, and Slocum (2010:151), “self-efficacy is the individual’s estimate of his or her own ability to perform a specific task in a particular situation.” Kreitner dan Knicky (2008:127) suggests that, ”self-efficacy is a person’s belief about his or her chaneces of successfully accomplishing a specific task.” According to Woolfook (2007:332), “self-efficacy refers to the knowledge of one’s own ability to succesfull accomplish a particular taks with no need for comparisons with other’s ability.” According to Luthans (2007:203), the formal definition of self-efficacy that is usually used is Bandura’s early statement of personal judgment of belief of how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situation.

Self-efficacy is how a person can well do something of the necessary action in accordance with the situation that will arise. So self-efficacy is the individual's desire for his ability to perform certain behaviors, efforts, opportunities, and achievements successfully, with indicators: (1) having the ability to work, (2) effort for work success, (3) work effectiveness, (4) diligence to achieve work performance, (5) effort to carry out work, and (6) willingness to take a risk. The novelty of research conducted by researchers, that the environmental sound behavior can be associated with indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy. While the basic theory used is the theory derived from Hinnes about behavior.

Based on the description, the researcher is interested in conducting research on the relationship between indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy with environmental sound behavior, correlational study on Gold Miners at Desa Hulawa Kecamatan Buntulia Kabupaten Pohuwato Provinsi Gorontalo Year 2016.

Research Methodology:-
The purpose of the research to find out whether there is a positive relationship between indigenous knowledge, social economic status and self-efficacy with miners' environmentally sound behavior.

Survey method has been applied with a correlational study by involving 100 sample selected randomly. There were four instruments which measured environmental sound behavior (rel. .906), indigenous knowledge (rel. .823), socioeconomic status (factual data), and self efficacy (rel. .931).

Data analysis in this research was conducted by descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics was used to describe data of research variables, among others, in the form of mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation. Descriptively, data is also displayed in the form of frequency distribution and histogram. Inferential statistics are used to test hypotheses using correlation and regression techniques.

Testing the first, second and third hypotheses each performed with a simple correlation and regression technique was Pearson product moment. Meanwhile, the fourth hypothesis has been verified by multiple regression and correlation. It was also applied a partial correlation by using second-order correlation.

Research Findings and Discussions:-

The shape of the relationship between *indigenous knowledge* with environmental sound behavior could be seen in the regression equation which generates the direction of regression coefficients and constants b = .999; and a = 79.137. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was subsesquently tested, as shown in the following table 1.:

Table 1:- ANOVA Table of Regression Model
$\hat{Y} = 79.137 + .999X_1$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
Total	99				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretssion (b/a)	1	1643.552	1643.552	7.69**	2.70	3.99
Residual	98	20948.558	213.761			
Deviation from linearity	13	4857.851	373.681	1.47^{ns}	1.84	2.35
Error	85	16090,707	189.302			

** P < .01 ^{ns} = Non significant

According to the table above, it shows that, the resulting regression equation was significant where $F_{cal} = 7.69 > F_{table} = 2.70$ with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 79.137 + .999X_1$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between environmental sound behavior with the *indigenous knowledge* which was very significant. Next a large correlation coefficient between *indigenous knowledge* with environmental sound behavior was found, as shown in the following table 2.

Table 2:- Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y1}).

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	T_{cal}	T_{table}	
				.05	.01
100	.270	.073	2.77^{**}	1.66	2.38

There is highly significant correlation between the *indigenous knowledge*with environmental sound behavior. The variation of environmental sound behavior is determined by 7,3% of the *indigenous knowledge* variation through the regression model $\hat{Y} = 79.137 + .999X_1$.

The shape of the relationship between socioeconomic status with environmental sound behavior could be seen in the regression equation which generated the direction of regression coefficients and constants b = .514; a= 86.563. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). F was next tested , as shown in the following table 3.:

Table 3:- ANOVA Table of Regression Model
$\hat{Y} = 86.563 + .514X_2$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
Total	99				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretion (b/a)	1	1238.589	1238.589	5.68**	2.70	3.99
Residual	98	21353.521	217.,893			
Deviation from linearity	3	847.460	282.487	1.31^{ns}	1.84	2.35
Error	95	20506.061	215.853			

** P < .01 ^{ns} = Non signifikan

According to the table above. it showed that, the resulting regression was significant where $F_{cal} = 5.68 > F_{table} = 2.70$ with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 86.563 + .514X_2$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between the environmental sound behavior with socioeconomic status which were very significant. Next, a large correlation coefficient between socioeconomic status with environmental sound behavior was found, as shown in the following table 4.:

Table 4:- Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y2})

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	T_{cal}	T_{table}	
				.05	.01
100	0.234	.055	2.38^{*}	1.66	2.38

There is highly significant correlation between the socioeconomic status and environmental sound behavior. The variation of environmental sound behavior is determined by 5.5% of the socioeconomic status variation through the regression model $\hat{Y} = 86.563 + .514X_2$.

The shape of the relationship between self efficacy with environmental sound behavior could be seen in the regression equation which generated the direction of regression coefficients and constants b = .184; a = 75.525. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was subsequently tested as shown in the following table 5.:

Table 5:- ANOVA Table of Regression Model
$\hat{Y} = 75.525 + .184X_3$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
Total	99				.05	.01
Coefficient (a)	1					
Regretion (b/a)	1	1465.084	1465.084	6.79**	2.70	3.99
Residual	98	21127.026	215.582			
Deviation from linearity	59	12073.726	204.639	0.88^{ns}	1.68	2.10
Error	36	9053.300	232.136			

** P < .01 ^{ns} = Non signifikan

According to the table above, the resulting regression equation was significant where $F_{cal} = 6.79 > F_{table} = 2.70$ with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 75.525 + .184X_3$. Therefore there was a positive relationship between the environmental sound behavior with self efficacy which was very significant. A large correlation coefficient between self efficacy with the environmental sound behavior could be seen in the following table 6:

Table 6:- Test of Coefficient Correlation (r_{y3})

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	T_{cal}	T_{table}	
				.05	.01
100	.255	.065	2.61^{*}	1.66	2.38

There is highly significant correlation between the self efficacy and environmental sound behavior. The variation of environmental sound behavior is determined by 6.5 % of the self efficacy variation through the regression model $\hat{Y} = 75.525 + .184X_3$.

The shape of the relationship between indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy with environmental sound behavior could be seen in the regression equation which produced a directions regression coefficient = . 818 b_1, b_2 = .145, b_3 = .157, and the constant = 55.229. To determine the degree of significance (level of significance). The F was tested, as shown in the following table 7.:

Table 7:- ANAVA Multiple Regression Table
$\hat{Y} = 55.229 + . 818X_1 + .145X_2 + .1573X_3$

Source of Variances	degrees of freedom (df)	Sum of Square (SS)	Means Square (MS)	$F_{cal.}$	F_{table}	
Total Reduced	99				.05	.01
Regretion (b/a)	3	3.703,110	1.234,370	6,27**	2,70	3,99
Residual	96	18.889,000	196,760			

** p < .01

According to the table above, the resulting regression equation was significant where $F_{cal} = 6.27 > F_{table} = 2.70$ with a regression model $\hat{Y} = 55.229 + . 818X_1 + .145X_2 + .1573X_3$. Therefore, there was a positive relationship between environmental sound behavior with the indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy which was very significant.

A correlation coefficient between indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy with environmental sound behavior could next be seen, as shown in the following table 8.:

Table 8:- Table of Relationship between Indigenous Knowledge, Socioeconomic Status, and Self Efficacy with Environmental Sound Behavior

Sample (n)	correlation coefficient	determination coefficient	F_{cal}	F_{table}	
				.05	.01
100	.405	.164	6.28**	2.70	3.99

** p < .01

16.4 % of the environmental sound behavior variation determined together with the variations of the indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy through the linier regression model, as follows: $\hat{Y} = 55.229 + . 818X_1 + .145X_2 + .1573X_3$. From the table above, the value of the correlation coefficient between indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy with environmental sound behavior of $ry_{123} = .405$. The higher the indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy, the higher was the environmental sound behavior.

Results of testing the first hypothesis, suggested that indigenous knowledge was positively related to the environmental sound behavior. The shape of the positive relationship indicated by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 79,137 + 0,999X_1$ with t cal > t table and the strength of the relationship $r_{x1y} = .270$ with a coefficient of determination of 7.3.The success of increasing the environmental behavior of gold miners is determined by indigenous knowledge in the form of gold miners' understanding of everything that happens to the environment. Indigenous knowledge in this study based on the factual dimension includes the term, conceptual includes classification and principles, and procedural includes the habits and methods of understanding pollution on the environment, which includes traditions and practices have been long and developed in certain areas, originally originated From that place or local communities manifested in the wisdom, knowledge, and learning of the community.

The basic theoretical references used in describing variables affecting environmental sound behavior such as indigenous knowledge use Hines, Hungeford & Tomera's theory, proposed of responsible environmental behavior (1987). In addition, according to research results according to R. Fermandez Manzana (2006: 431) with the title of relationship between ecology fieldwork and student attitudes toward environmental protection. The results concluded that understanding of ecological concepts and principles and developing a more favorable attitude toward

ecosystem defenses and environmental issues. In addition, Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) is one of the widely used models for behavioral change (Glanz & Bishop, 2007: 399-418). This theory emphasizes that human behavior depends on mutual interactions of personal factors, behavior, and environment (Glanz, Rimer, & Viswanath, 2008). Elisha Hall, Weiwen Chai, Julie A. Albrecht (2016: 245-253), says the main constructs include knowledge, expectations of results, self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, self-regulation, observational learning, behavioral capacity, motivational incentives, and Social support (Glanz et al, 2008; Bandura, 2004; DiClemente, Salazar, & Crosby, 2011; Edberg 2015; McKenzie, Neiger, & Thackeray, 2013).

Results of testing the second hypothesis, suggests that socio-economic status is positively associated with environmental sound behavior. The form of positive relationship is shown by regression equation $\hat{Y} = 86.563 + .514X_2$ with t cal > t table and the strength of the relationship $r_{x2y} = .234$ with coefficient of determination equal to 5.5. The success of increasing environmental behavior of gold miners is determined by socioeconomic status. The socioeconomic status in this study includes a person's assessment of the level of welfare that refers to the empirical conditions of education and income. The basic theoretical references are used in describing the variables that influence the behavior of environmental sounds such as socioeconomic status by using the theory of Environmental Responsible Behavior Model adapted by Blaikie & Ward (1993) from Model Hines et al. (1986/1987). According to Santrock (2004: 282), socio-economic status as a grouping of people based on similarities of work characteristics, economic education. According to Russell (1993: 164-165), the distribution system determines the division of society into classes, and where classes exist, different classes will receive different kinds of education.

The result of the third hypothesis testing shows that self-efficacy is positively related to environmental sound behavior. The form of positive relationship is shown by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 75.525 + .184X_3$ with t cal > t table and the strength of the relationship $r_{x3y} = .255$ with the coefficient of determination 6.5. The successful increase in environmental behavior of gold miners is determined by self-efficacy. Self-efficacy in this study includes indicators: self-confidence in work, effort for work success, work effectiveness, persistence to achieve work performance, effort to carry out work, and risk-taking willingness. Schermerhorn et. al. (2010: 29), suggests that self-efficacy is an individual belief about the likelihood of successful completing a specific task. It is explained that self-efficacy is an individual's belief to develop and succeed fully in accomplishing a specific work. The writer's understanding of the above explanation is for every job done by every individual must have high confidence so that every work done will be more balanced. Elisha Hall, Weiwen Chai, Julie A. Albrecht (2016: 245-253), says the main constructs include knowledge, expectations of results, self-efficacy, collective-efficacy, self-regulation, observational learning, behavioral capacity, motivational incentives, and Social support.

The results of the fourth hypothesis testing, argued that indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy together with environmental sound behavior are positively and significantly related. The form of positive relation is shown through regression equation $\hat{Y} = 55.229 + .818X_1 + .145\ X_2 + .157X_3$with t cal > t table and the strength of the relationship $rx_{123y} = .405$ with coefficient of determination 16.4. The success of increasing environmental behavior of gold miners proved to be determined by indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic status, and self efficacy. Indigenous knowledge in this study includes traditions and practices that have long been developed and developed in certain areas, native to the place or local communities manifested in the wisdom, knowledge, and learning of the community. Socioeconomic status includes the empirical condition of education and income (income). Self efficacy includes indicators of self-confidence in work, effort for work success, work effectiveness, perseverance to achieve work performance, effort to carry out work, and risk-taking willingness. This is in line with the opinion of Ajzen (2005) in Theory of Planned Behavior or the planned behavior contains various variables, ie background factors, such as age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, mood, personality traits, and knowledge; behavioral belief normative beliefs; subjective norm; control beliefs; and perceived behavioral control.

Conclusions:-

Based on those research findings, it could be concluded that miners' environmentally sound behavior would be able to be predicted by indigenous knowledge, social economic status (SES) and self-efficacy. Therefore if miners' behavior want to be improved, needless to say, indigenous knowledge, SES and self-efficacy could not be neglected. However, more other variables might be involved in next research to examine miners' environmentally sound behavior in depth, especially its analysis directed to path analysis or even SEM.

References:-

1. Anderson, Lorin W. & David R. Krathwohl, *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 2001.
2. Anita Woolfook, *Educational Psychology*. USA: Person Education, 2007.
3. Bandura, (1994). *Self-efficacy*. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.),*Ensyclopedia of Human Behavior* (Vol. 4, h. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Ensyclopedia of Mental Health*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998). (Diakses 11 Desember 2014).
4. Bernardin, John H. and Russel, E.A., *Human Resource Management, An Experiential Approach*, Mc. Graw Hill International Edition, Singapore: Mac Graw Hill Book Co, 1993.
5. Boersema, Jan J. & Lucas Reijnders (ed), *Principles of Environmental Sciences*, USA: Springer Science, 2009.
6. Bloom, Benyamin.C. et al. *Taxonomy of Educational*. Objectives The Classification of Educational Goals., Handbook 1, Cognitif Domain, New York: David Mc Kay Co, Inc, 1996.
7. Chiras, Daniel D. *Enviromental Science, Action for a Sustainabel Future, Third Edition*. Colorado, The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company Inc, 1991.
8. Craig C. Pinden, *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill, 2008.
9. Colquitt, Jason A, Lepine Jeffery A, Wesson Michael J., *Organizational Behavior, Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*, New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2009.
10. Dunlap, Riley E., Kent D. Van Liere, Angela G. Mertig, Robert Emmet Jones, "*Measuring Endorsement of the New Ecological Paradigm: A Revised NEP Scale*" Journal of Social Issues, Vol, 56, No.3, 2000, pp. 425-427.
11. Don Hellriegel & John W. Slocum, *Organizational Behaviour, 13th Edition*. USA: Cengage Learning, 2010.
12. Eldon D, Enger&Bradley F. Smith, *Environmental Science A Study of Interrelationships*, New York: The McGraw-Hill, 2008.
13. Fred Luthans, dkk. *Psychological Capital: Developing The Human Competitive Edge*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
14. Gordon, Judith. R., *A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior* Boston Allyn and Bacon, 1991.
15. Grant, Lyle, *Principles of Behavior Analysis*. New York: Harper Collins College Publisher, 1994.
16. Gross, M. & Harald Heinrichs, *Environmental Sociology European Perspectves and Interdisciplinary Challenges*, Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg. London, 2010.
17. Guez, Wilma and John Allen, *Behaviour Modification*. Uganda: Winsome Gordon, 2000.
18. Heckhausen, Jutta, & Heinz Heckhausen, *Motivation and Action*, Irvine: University of California, 1988.
19. Jerald Greenberg & Robert A. Baron, *Behavior In Organizations*. New Jersey of Canada: Prentince-Hall, Inc. 2000.
20. Krech D., and Gratchfiel, K. S, *Teory and Problem Social Psykology*. New York: McGraw hall Book Company, Inc, 1962.
21. McShane & Von Glinow. *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill, International edition, 2010.
22. Naeem, Shahid & Robert Costanza, "*Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning Maintaining Natural Life Support Processes*" Journal Issues in Ecology. No .4. 1999.
23. Odum, Eugene. P., *Fundamentals of Ecology Third Edition*. Copyright, 1993.
24. Ritzer, George., *Sociological Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill. Inc, 2010.
25. Robbins, Stephen, & T. Judges. *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall international, Inc, 2007.
26. Roberts D. & T. M Roberts, *Planning and Ecology*. London: Chapma, 1994.
27. Robert Kreitner & Angelo Knicky, *Organizational Behavior 8th Ed*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 2008.
28. Santrock, J. W., *Educational Psychology* (2nd ed), New York: McGraw Hill Companies,Inc., 2004.
29. Schermerhorn, *et. al.Organizational Behavior 11th Edition*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
30. Solso, Robert L., *Cognitive Psychology*, Boston: Allya and Bacon, 1991.
31. Truk, Jonathan, Amos Truk, & Karen Arms, *Enviromental Science,Third Edition*, New York: CBS College Publishing, 1994.
32. Vallerand, Robert J. et. al, *Ajzen and Fishbein's Theory of Reasoned Action as Applied to Moral Behaviour: A Confirmatory Analysis* (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1992, Vol. 62, No. 1, 98-109, American Psychological Association, Inc), h.100*.
33. Wali, Mohan K., Fatih Evrendilek, & M. Siobhan Fennessy.*The Environment: Science, Issues and Solutions*, Boca Raton, FLU: CRC Press, 2010.
34. Woolfolk, Anita E., *Educational Psychology*. USA: Person Education, 2007.