



Original Article

International Journal of Educational Research and Technology

Volume 2, Issue 1, June 2011: 117 - 128

ISSN 0976-4089

Journal's URL: www.soeagra.com/ijert.htm

Organizational Business Strategy as Social Responsibility

Nasser Fegh-hi Farahmand

Department of Industrial Management, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

E-mail: farahmand@iaut.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

Products or services have emerged as the fastest growing component of international trade. Rating the importance of every customer's expectation is essential to the social responsibility process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes. The strategy implementation, strategic control, marketing and successful measurement literature develop a conceptual model and research propositions. In fact, without customer's expectation organizations would not exist. The strategic importance of customer's expectation discussed as an asset. In addition, this paper considers satisfy of customer's expectation as an important asset of official organizations and proposes a customers expectations method that considers organizations information. In today's organizational environment, there are usually several products and services to fulfill certain functions. The success of a products and services depends not only on whether it meets the customer's expectations, but also on how it compares with other organizations products and services. Implementing organizational can give a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward organizational business. The importance of strategic, long-term policy and organizational business strategy as social responsibility is very clear to planners.

Key words: *business strategy, social responsibility, customer's expectation*

INTRODUCTION

Although customer's expectation relationship management has been one of the fastest growing official organizations, critics point to the high failure rate of the organizational business strategy as social responsibility projects as evidenced by organizations studies. The purpose of the study is to investigate success and failures of organizational business strategy as social responsibility system implementations. In addition, this study found that the scope, size, complexity and duration of the organizational business strategy as social responsibility projects seem to vary quite significantly across official organizations. Poor planning, lack of clear objectives and not recognizing the need for official organization change are the key reasons for organizational business strategy as social responsibility failures. The importance and growth of the products and services reviewed that it is expanding globally. The percentage of growth of the different organizational criteria in the products and services as customer's expectations is continuing to increase as the organization base declines.

Business success is about lucrative financial gains or about building something for organization. It is about making a difference in organizational community, or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something organization love to do. Most likely, organization will quantify success in many ways. It is not difficult to envision what organization want out of their business, but how will you get there. Making a difference in organization or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something loves to do. Most likely, organization will quantify success in many ways. It is not difficult to envision what you want out of organizational business, but how will organization get there. The key to organizational success is having a business plan in place. Whether organization is about to launch a start-up or organization have been in business for years, organizational business' direction guided by organizational business plan. To begin the planning process, organization need to do some critical analysis; business planning is about realistically forecasting where your business is going.

Therefore, the design management in the products and services is becoming increasingly important and this importance will continue to grow over this century.

Excellence organizations are facing fundamental issues such as how to design and implement an effective quality service delivery system, which will help to establish and to retain global market share. Much of the published work on quality focuses on manufactured products and services, but managers are paying more attention to emphasizing quality in services.

ORGANIZATIONAL CUSTOMER'S EXPECTATION

Research into strategy implementation is damning in its findings. The official organizations field is now giving high priority to developing official metrics. The role of official organizations is to implement official strategy. A fundamental proposition in official strategy is that distribution methods must align with customer's expectations and competitive advantage. Unfortunately, method successful measurement literature has provided ambiguous guidance to official managers.

In order to achieve marketing success, it is important to understand the relationship between method successful measures and strategy implementation success. It is also important to know whether, regardless of official strategy, the same method successful measures should use. A positive experience throughout the customer's expectation cycle should foster trust and develop loyalty, therefore allowing official organizations to generate more revenue for less incremental expenditure. For example:

- Make of new customer's expectations aware of a product or service.
- Loyal customer's expectations tend to receive more frequently.
- Happy existing customer's expectations are more willing to receive other services from official organization and try new service offerings.
- The cost of servicing existing customer's expectations can be lower.

For strategic purposes, satisfy of an intangible asset in its own right is not particularly relevant; however, an understanding of how this satisfy is comprised and the key metrics that impact on the assets' contribution to official organization successful can be extremely beneficial for management decision making.

While the definition of what constitutes an organization varies, it generally based on the number of employees and products and services turnover (Zuckerman, E. W., 2000, 228). In practice, organization usually characterized by simple organizational structures, which facilitate rapid decision-making and often display, a high degree of innovation. The management techniques and operating structures employed are one way of identifying the maturity of the organization (Bridge, S. O'Neill, K and Cormier S, 2002, 651). Therefore, organizational capability relies in particular on coaching management skills, which rely on emotional intelligence and emphasis one-to-one, dialoguing, subordinate empowerment and mutually agreed targeting. Anyhow tactical actions steps for coupling quality with customers or customer's expectation recovering satisfaction are as follows:

- a) Board of director's support: An organization's total quality efforts must begin at the very top and begin with the board of directors.
- b) Action plan: The answers to these and other questions will provide valuable insights into the existing corporate culture and indicate the organization's readiness for adopting quality.
- c) Vision/mission: Develop a vision or mission statement if the organization does not have one already. The key to the initial adoption of quality is continuous communication of the vision within a comprehensive communication plan.
- d) Quality principles: Coaching in the organization setting provides a key component in the transformational processes towards value-driven management. Through its support for and focus on individual performance, it aims at achieving corporate excellence. Senior managers need coaching as the new theorists in coaching argue; coaching empowers individuals to achieve their inherent potential. Coaching makes sense as investment only if it improves the performance not only of the individual, but the organization as well. In this sense, the word strategic becomes important. As a high-leverage intervention, the impact of a coach on a few key individuals can drive through massive changes in a corporate setting. Organization's with successful quality cultures start by training and educating senior management, followed by all employees that the establishment of quality teams is a top priority.
- d) Quality committee: Employees, shareholders and customers, suppliers and competitors have a stake and essential ingredient for success is a senior quality committee, which provides leadership in quality and stimulates cultural change. This should be chaired by the CEO and comprise the entire senior management team and the individual responsible for quality. Depending on the size and structure of the organization, these committees can establish within operating divisions, functional group or by geography.

e) Responsibility: The responsibilities accept of a senior quality committee can include: establishing strategic quality goals, allocating resources, sanctioning quality improvement teams, reviewing key indicators of quality, estimating the cost of poor quality, ensuring adequate training of employees and recognizing and rewarding individual and team efforts.

f) Satisfaction: This survey should be sponsored by the top management to send a clear message throughout the organization that quality linked to customer satisfaction and the senior executives should then present the results to all employees that detailed strategies for improving customer satisfaction can devised and communicated.

g) Goals: The results of the customer satisfaction survey lead the senior management to establishing a set of quality goals. Although the whole organization can provide input to this task, the setting of goals is part of management's leadership responsibility.

The range and sophistication of excellence organization techniques status is beyond the aspirations and competence of many small, medium and large sized organizations (Feghhi farahmand, 2004, 166). The techniques covered by excellence organization must make recognizable and relevant to the organizations if there is to be any possibility of them being adopted (Adebanjo, D. and Kehoe, D.2001, 325). When the concept of excellence organization introduced into popular parlance, the term was seen to embrace the techniques and factors (Mason, C and Stark, M, 2004, 332).

However, techniques of excellence organization can related in part to the growing influence of the organizations philosophies. In recent years, it has expanded most notably to include simultaneous engineering, benchmarking and increasing emphasis on issues relating to organization strategy.

Clearly, the management of organizations seeking excellent status would appear faced with a far more complex task than was the case previously (Feghhi farahmand, 2004, 169). One of the main reasons for the inappropriate use of advanced organizations technologies and techniques in many organizations arises from an inadequate understanding of their Production and Operation (Pando) problems and the integrated nature of modern technology. Technological solutions are imposed which necessitate the organization to engage in an organizational metamorphosis to effectively employ them (Bolton, B and Thompson J, 2003, 111). These can often produce sub optimal results. Ideally, the reverse process should occur, where the organization progresses from a detailed understanding of its problems, which ensures that a particular technology or technique is adapted to meet the needs of the organization (Curran, J. and Blackburn, R, 2002, 117). This process of adaptation should also take into account the production and operation, size and workforce. Excellence organization needs to frame in terms of the needs of the organization rather than the other way round.

For many organizations, becoming excellence does not always mean implementing the most advanced technologies; instead, its competitiveness may arise from the flexibility and skills of its workforce, or a unique market niche and organization strategy (Shemwell, D, 1998, 158).

BUSINESS STRATEGY

A useful framework for analyzing the deficiencies of the organizations operations is to identify gaps in the production and operation that lead to inefficiencies and compare these to its own model of what constitutes world class in its field. In order to understand whether the method is performing or not, we need to ensure that the method measures are appropriate for each marketing strategy. By applying an iterative process and identifying gaps in its performance, the organization can assess the suitability of potential solutions at a level appropriate to the requirements and resources of an organization. The operational concept based on customer satisfaction, where the operation of quality management system is customer-oriented and aims at improving:

- Customer satisfaction by consider to customers' needs and expectations;
- Clear management responsibility by communication,
- Resource management by product realization process,
- Structure of measuring for monitoring customer satisfaction,

All above-mentioned items proposed based on overall performance of the quality system and requires enterprises evaluate performance from the perspective of customers.

The assumption underlying the model is that official strategy is the key determinant of appropriate method measures. The model suggests official strategy is a more important influence on method measures than variables such as official manager's characteristics, stage of service lifecycle, market share, organizational or strategic official organization unit size, official profitability and growth, environment or competitors. For this reason, business strategy gives an overview of organizational business where organization have been, where you are now, and where organization is going in the future. Include:

- A short history of organizational business for purpose of organizational business definition,
- A description of organizational products and services,
- Organizational business' legal structure and current position,
- Organizational competitive advantage,
- Organizational competitors,
- Organizational business model,
- Organizational growth timeline,

The starting point in the business strategy is the assumption of business. Table 1 shows models of business strategy that they Organizational super ordinate goals and strategies. Organizational super ordinate goals are business instrumental. In general, super ordinate goals; there is an endemic need for increasing business effective communication. Organizational strategies is the businesspersons empowerment of sustainable decision-making are core values, to which increasing public participation is though to be a most appropriate means.

BUSINESS PLAN STRATEGY CHALLENGES

Successful measurement systems were both outcome focused, financially focused, and were neither multidimensional nor strategic. These systems became broader and included measures of innovation and customer's expectation satisfaction.

The most essential successful originated tools of official organizations are:

- a) The process management model by EFQM, BSC and Malcolm Baldrige self-assessment procedure for process auditing and assessment procedure of official organization process successful;
- b) The project management model for problem solving and improvement procedures;
- c) The benchmarking procedure based on organization successful results depend on the factors at the practical level as understanding the issue, i.e. the ideas and principles of organizational business management guiding the official organization activities and innovativeness of the leadership system by effectiveness and efficiency of management tools.

By coupling organizational business strategy with customer recovering satisfaction, a few tactical actions as follow can make the challenge simpler and provide leadership (Johnson, M.D.and Gustafsson, A, 2000, 288):

- Obtain support from the board of directors for prepare an action plan,
- Vision/mission statement for establish top-level quality committee
- Customer satisfaction survey by incorporate quality performance

Traditional successful measurement systems were profitable focused and were neither multidimensional nor strategic. Based on the degree of service innovation inherent in social responsibility strategies, it is likely that they would compete with higher quality services and be first to market with new generation services. Conversely, social responsibility strategy would depend more on efficiency and cost reduction to compete and rely more on older generation services. As a result, social responsibility would place greater emphasis on cost control measures in supporting official strategy. Social responsibility measures of managers may be more important than social responsibility measures of successful. In the current literature, some existing methods incorporate organization information to prioritize customer's expectation s that they are as follows:

1) Social responsibility method: Social responsibility method has been widely used as a multi functional design tool to translate customer's expectations to a products and services technical attributes. Thus, social responsibility used to help design teams to develop products and services with higher quality to meet or surpass customers expectation s. With the development and widespread use of social

responsibility, its application areas expanded to much wider fields including design, planning, decision making, engineering, management, teamwork, timing, satisfaction, costing and so on (Chan and Wu, 2002, 178). The inherent incentive of the widespread use of social responsibility is its benefits to practitioners. Many papers (Sullivan, 1986, 27; Hauser and Clausing, 1988, 85; Zairi and Youssef, 1995: 92; Chan and Wu, 2005, 118) have mentioned the benefits of social responsibility. Correctly rating the importance of every customer's expectation is essential to the social responsibility process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes. Traditionally, capturing customers expectations involves three steps in social responsibility:

- a) Identifying customers expectations,
- b) Structuring customers expectations,
- c) Determine of the importance weight for the individual customers expectations.

The first two steps usually accomplished via society survey combined with expert opinion. Many papers have proposed several mature methods on this topic.

This review will focus on the third step, to rate the customers expectations importance because, today the success of a products and services in a society place depends not only on how well it meets the customers expectations, but also how it compares with other organizations products and services (Chan and Wu, 2002, 85). Therefore, it is important to integrate organization analysis into products and services design and development. Then, the ranking of customers expectations for the allocation of development resources should based also on organization analysis.

This paper introduces customer's expectations rating method that takes organizations into consideration and rates customers' expectations from perspectives as competition, performance, and customer's expectation and so gives more priority to those requirements that lag behind organizations, have a lower customer's satisfaction that customers think more important. The weights indicate the most important customer's expectations that organizations should focus on (Belsey, D. A., Kuh, A. and Welsch, M. E., 1980, 854).

2) Analytic hierarchy process method: Analytic hierarchy process proposed to use in rating customer's expectations and the sensitivity (Akao, 1990, 341; Armacost et al., 1994, 187; Aswad, 1989, 95; Karsak et al., 2002, 75) of the customer's voice in social responsibility analyzed (Xie, Goh, and Wang, 1998, 289). However, customer's opinions are often vague and contain ambiguity and multiple meanings (Fung et al., 1998, 322; Khoo and Ho, 1996, 95). From the customer's perspective, all methods have the same characteristics that coordinated with the basic spirit of social responsibility, customers driven design. However, in todays, several products and services can satisfy the customers that simply meeting customer's expectations cannot guarantee a successful products and services. Organizations must consider their positions to make sure that their products and services would not lag behind other organizations products and services.

The relative importance rating obtained from the traditional rating methods, such as customers expectations survey, expert opinion, analytic hierarchy process method, and so on. The present point method is very straightforward, and there are many papers discussing it in social responsibility (Cohen, 1995, 112; Robertshaw, 1995, 331). However, this method is very subjective and may cause some problems.

BUSINESS STRATEGY AS SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FACTORS

A customer's expectation management system is a technology-based official organization management tool for developing and leveraging customer's expectation knowledge to maintain, and strengthen profitable relationships with customer's expectations. Thus, a customer's expectation management system is an essential part of a global strategy which emphasis creation of satisfaction through the development of appropriate relationship with key customer's expectations segments. The underlying premise of customer's expectation management system is that firms create customer's expectation knowledge in order:

- Segment customer's expectations,
- Develop and maintain long-term relationships with profitable customer's expectations,

- Determine how to handle unprofitable customer's expectations.

Through the creation and better utilization of customer's expectation knowledge, the customer's expectation relationship should improve. To begin the planning process, organization will need to do some critical analysis; business planning is about realistically forecasting where organizational business is going. For this reason, business strategy factors are as follows:

1) Customer's expectation optimization: Optimal utilization of business plan is advancing at a very fast pace, and obsolescence of physical business infrastructure, as also of skills and competence, take place rapidly.

2) Customer's expectation empowerment: Strengthening of business plan as a major initiative to modernize the infrastructure in organization will be undertaken.

3) Customer's expectation meteorology: Mechanisms for business plan for setting up of more efficient funding mechanisms will be examined, either by creating new structures or by strengthening or restructuring the existing ones, for promotion of basic research in business plan.

4) Customer's expectation interests: Intensive of business plan engineering that will be launched to develop innovative business plan and to increase organizational share in high-tech products or services. Simultaneously, efforts will be made to strengthen traditional industry to meet the new requirements of competition with appropriate business plan.

5) Customer's expectation standards: Quality standards of business plan for testing and calibration laboratories according to international requirements will give an enhanced push to enable organization to entrance in global trade.

6) Customer's expectation knowledge: Knowledge of business plan would be further developed and harnessed for the purpose of business generation.

7) Customer's expectation management: Management of business plan has an important role in any general strategy to address the problems of management of the impacts of natural hazards.

BUSINESS STRATEGY AS SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY MANAGEMENT

Social responsibility management refers to the internal systematic approach systematically of the organizations management and leadership to strive for official organization successful excellence.

Successful management refers to all those measures through which one creates and strengthens confidence and trust in outsiders, especially customer's expectations, towards the organization abilities and service. When the comprehensiveness of the social responsibility approach is emphasized, one also can use the concept Successful management instead of organizational business strategy. In practice, however, the both mean the same.

The aim of organizational business approach is to strive for the official organization strategic and operational goals. Organizational business management is based on a special expertise for enhancing effectiveness and efficiency of official organization management and leadership. Thus, genuine realization of the organizational business management practices takes place in real official organization activities both in the official organization strategic leadership as well as in the operational realization of the official organization services and targets. The broad challenge for organizational business management is to enhance positive substance of official organization brand through various means that are consistent both with respect to one another and aligned with the official organization strategic course.

Implementing good environmental and social practices is good business can give organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward organizational business. Organization should discuss ways in which organizational business honors ethical values and respects people, organizational community, and the environment.

Customer satisfaction and target management structure derive management system requirements. As in business plan strategy as social responsibility:

1) Social responsibility policy: Organization should set up definite policy and target and the degree of customer satisfaction should clarify.

2) Social responsibility system: According to quality target, enterprises should plan total management system structure, authority and responsibility control, operation process, in order to ensure comply with plan and achieve enterprise quality target.

3) Social responsibility staffs: Organization should carry out communicating harmonization, encourage staffs involvement and full commitment to customer satisfaction managers' decision-making should comply with the business policy and target as the maximum guidance principle. Organizations provide all required resources, according to the plan then produce and sell products to customers.

4) Social responsibility feedbacks: Organization aim at customers after sales feedback must verify the degree of customer satisfaction. If it does not achieve the expected degree of satisfaction, the manager should identify the cause and work out an improvement scheme to enhance customer satisfaction. Rectification and preventing methods can used through adjusting original quality policy and target, quality rules, communication, training, resources and operation process, etc. After the adjustment and improvement, enterprises should re-measure customer satisfaction, to ensure the improvement scheme is proper and effective. Organization should provide customers' feedback information to management for inspection and verify appropriateness and effectiveness of the definition of quality policy and target, quality scheme and operation methods.

Relevant certifications, such as fair-trade certification, organic certification, or leadership in energy and environmental design certification. Environmental programs and resources could influence organizational business, from greening your business to finding funding to become environmentally efficient. In order to stay competitive in today's market, organization might want to consider where corporate social responsibility fits into your operations.

RESULT

The key to organization success is having a business plan in place. Whether organization is about to launch a start-up or organization have been in business for years, organizational business' direction guided by business plan. In spite of this general awareness, such long-term business, strategic-level planning of business has been lacking in most organizations. A central motivation for this has been the public uneasiness towards many of the applications of gene organizations technology, as well as the general distrust of the public towards officials, scientists and representatives of organizations in the management of risks. As a whole, the main principles in official organizations approach include the following:

- Focus on supporting the strategic goals of the official organization;
- Consistency of different organizational business management measures in order to strengthen one another;
- Alignment of the whole official organization strategically and operationally for centering on the key official organization issues;
- Comprehensiveness and a scope, which covers the entire corporation;
- Integrating organizational business management measures with official organization processes.

Systematic approach instead of building separate systems such as social responsibility systems organizational business management approach well harmonized with the official organization strategies. On that basis, also the quality policy defined. The organizational business strategy as social responsibility policy statements considers general intention and direction towards social responsibility:

- Always, act so that the customer's expectation receives what he or she needs and do what organizational business management promise.
- Improve activities and their results continually so that they will be better and more effective and efficient.

The goal of business strategy as social responsibility, i.e. official organization excellence, reached through innovative management and leadership practices. In order to realize business strategy as social responsibility objectives in all parts of the official organization and at all levels of official organization and management, an organization-wide management structure, a leadership infrastructure framework been defined. The framework model originally created at official organizations. This model covers all official

organization functions in a natural and flexible manner and covers the following four levels of the official organization:

1) The organizational business level: where the general principles, the common insight, goals, shared tools, and practices concerning quality created, including how these principles applied in practice based on the official organization requirements.

2) The strategic areas and unit's level: where decisions made by the general manager of the official organization unit and the other top official organization leaders, and measures undertaken concerning the entire particular official organization and especially the future competitiveness of the official organization and management of the completely official organization system addressed. The official organization system is composed of the interrelated operational official organization processes. Very often in corporations, there are different official organization areas that may be at different development stages. All these need different strategic organizational business approaches but they may operate within one corporate culture.

3) The operational individual official organization processes level: where decisions and measures concerning daily management made and undertaken, and services realized in real time for customer's expectation needs.

Organizations compete with the quality level of their products and services that managers cannot manage organizational competition, will have problems surviving.

The key issue is whether the organization wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages customers expectations or not, and whether a given customers wants to be an actively managed relationship with the products and services provider, or not.

Forever, organization should set up definite policy and target and the degree of customer satisfaction should clarify. In according to business target, organization should plan business system and relative structure, authority and responsibility control, operation process and standards, in order to ensure comply with plan and achieve enterprise business target.

In addition, organization should carry out communicating harmonization, encourage staffs involvement and full commitment to customer satisfaction, also managers' decision-making should comply with the quality business and target as the maximum guidance principle.

Anyhow, organization must provide all required resources, according to the plan then produce and sell products to customers. Because, organizational aim at customers' after sales feedback, to verify the degree of customer expectations. If it does not achieve the expected degree of satisfaction by expectations performs, the manager should identify the cause and work out an improvement scheme to enhance customer satisfaction. After the adjustment and improvement, organization should re-measure customer expectations, to ensure the improvement scheme is proper and effective.

CONCLUSIONS

In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services of excellence organization has to view its business and its customer relationships from a expectation perspective. There are always relationships between a products and services of organization and its customer's expectations.

Organizations compete with the quality level of their products and services which cannot manage organizations competition, will have problems surviving. In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services excellence organization has to view its business and its customer relationships from a products and services quality improvement perspective. There are always relationships between a products and services and its customers expectations.

The key issue is whether the firm wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages customers expectations or not, and whether a given customers wants to be an actively managed relationship with the products and services provider, or not.

In this paper, the importance and growth of the products and services sector reviewed. The products and services are expanding globally. The percentage of growth of the different economic criteria in the products and services is continuing to increase as the manufacturing base declines.

Therefore, design management in the products and services is becoming increasingly important and this importance will continue to grow over this century.

Excellence organizations are facing fundamental issues such as how to design and implement an effective quality service delivery system, which will help to establish and to retain global market share. Much of the published work on quality focuses on manufactured products and services, but managers are paying more attention to emphasizing quality in services. The reason is the general perception that products and services quality is not good.

Therefore, improving quality is becoming a major objective in excellence organizations throughout the world. The recognition that survival much less growth in the Excellence is a function of quality led to the increasing emphasis on quality. Excellence organizations have witnessed what has happened to manufacturers that allowed the quality of their products and services to deteriorate. They also recognize that providing high-quality products and services to keep a customer is much less expensive than acquiring a new one. Products and services quality has a major effect on the ability to attract and retain both customers and employees, and it contributes directly to superior productivity. For this reason, implementing good environmental and social practices is good business can give organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward organizational business. Organization should discuss ways in which organizational business honors ethical values and respects people, organizational community, and the environment.

Many of organizational business have sustained their organizational business strategy as social responsibility systems focus over time, although these investments may or may not considered part of a long-term organizational business strategy as social responsibility strategy. For example, one major hospital defines its organizational business strategy as social responsibility systems as the marketing databases and campaign management and considers distribution methods to be a separated systems investment area.

The scope, size, complexity and duration of the organizational business strategy as social responsibility projects seem to vary quite significantly across organizations. Poor planning, lack of clear objectives and not recognizing the need for official organization change are the key reasons for organizational business strategy as social responsibility failures.

The most recent organizational business strategy as social responsibility programs, for example some have clearly benefited from previous systems experience of suppliers, including considerably reduced implementation times and lower risk levels for comparable size programs. All these organizations had very different levels of success. Their success was determined mainly by the relationship between the complexity of the system and the speed and phasing of its development and roll out. A organizational business strategy as social responsibility system is not just customer's expectation interface software. organizational business strategy as social responsibility believe that successful measurement frameworks should be multidimensional. Unfortunately, the early attempts at successful measurement frameworks were too financially oriented and did not provide strategic vision.

REFERENCES

1. Adebajo, D. Kehoe, D. (2001), Teamwork and Customer Focus, Managing Quality, Vol.12, no.10
2. Akao, Y. Akao, (1990), Quality function deployment: integrating customer requirements into product design, Productivity Press, Cambridge.
3. Shahin, Arash (2009), Growth of the service sector: a demand for the use of quality improvement techniques to increase service quality, The Third International Conference on Quality Management, University of Newcastle
4. Armacost et al. (1994), An AHP framework for prioritizing customer requirements, IIE Transactions. no 16.
5. Armacost, P.J. Compton, M.A. Mullens and W.W. Swart (1994), An AHP framework for prioritizing customer requirements in QFD: an industrialized housing application, IIE Transactions 26 (4), pp. 72-79.
6. Aswad, A. (1989). Quality function deployment: a systems approach. In Proceedings of the 1989 IIE integrated systems conference (pp. 27-32). Norcross, GA.
7. Barkham, R. (1996), The Determinants of small Organization Growth, London, Jessica Kingsley.
8. Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986), The distinction in social research, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51.
9. Baysinger, B. D., Kosnik, R. and Turk, T. A. (1991), Effects ownership structure, Academy of Management Journal, 34.
10. Belsey, D. A., Kuh, A. and Welsch, M. E. (1980), Regression Diagnostics, New York: John Wiley.
11. Bethel, J. E. and Liebeskind, J. (1993). The effects of corporate ownership on corporate, Strategic Management Journal, 14.

12. Bolton, B and Thompson J. (2003), *Entrepreneurs and Technique*, London: Butterworth Heinemann.
13. Bridge, S. O'Neill, K and Cormier S. (2002), *Understanding Enterprise*, London: Macmillan Business.
14. Brunett, Ken, (2001), *The Handbook of Key Customer Relationship Management*, prentice Hall
15. C. Temponi, J. Yen and W.A. Tlao (1999), House of quality: a fuzzy logic-based requirements analysis, *European Journal of Operational Research* 117 (2), pp. 340-354.
16. C.K. Kwong and H. Bai (2002), A fuzzy AHP approach to the determination of importance weights of customer requirements in quality function deployment, *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 13 (5), pp. 367-377.
17. Cameron Kim S, (1996), A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors, *Management science review*.
18. Cameron, K. S. (1994). Strategies for successful organizational downsizing, *Human Resource Management*, 33.
19. Capron, L. (1999), The long term performance of horizontal learning, *Strategic Management Journal*, 20.
20. Chan and Wu, (2002), Quality function deployment, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 153.
21. Chan and Wu, (2005). A systematic approach to quality function deployment, *Omega* 33.
22. Chan et al., (1999), Customer needs in quality function deployment by fuzzy, *Journal of Production*, no 37.
23. Chandler Alfred Jr, (1992), *Strategy and structure*, Cambridge mass, M.I.T press.
24. Chen and Weng, (2006), Engineering designs in HOQ, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 172.
25. Cohen, L. (1999), *Quality function deployment*, Addison Wesley, Massachusetts.
26. Colin Carnal Susan (1988), *Management principles policy*, ICSA Cambridge.
27. Collis, D. J. (1998), Creating competitive advantage, *Harvard Business Review*, 76.
28. Collis, D. J. and Montgomery, C. A. (1995), Competing on resources, *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 73.
29. Curran, J. and Blackburn, R. (2002), *Business planning and Local Economic Networks*, London: Paul Chapman.
30. D.G. Ullmand (1992), *The mechanical design process*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
31. Denison Daniel R, (1995), *Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness*, New York, John wiles andsons.
32. E.E. Karsak (2004), Fuzzy multiple objective programming framework to prioritize design requirements in quality function deployment, *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 47, pp. 149-163.
33. E.E. Karsak, S. Sozer and S.E. Alptekin (2002), Product planning in quality function deployment using a combined analytic network process and goal programming approach, *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 44 (1), pp. 171-190.
34. E.S. Ho, Y.J. Lai and S.I. Chang (1999), An integrated group decision-making approach to quality function deployment, *IIE Transactions* 31, pp. 553-567.
35. Evans and Lindsay, (2002), *Management and control of quality*, Singapore, Thomson Learning.
36. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2001), *Executive Management Process*, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 109-203.
37. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Permanent Management of Organization*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 70-83.
38. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Strategic Structure of Organization Management Process*, Forth edition, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 110-125.
39. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2005), *Strategic Management of Organization*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 19.
40. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2009), *Organization Strategic Plan compilation*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 74-314.
41. Feghhi farahmand, Nasser (2011), *Active and Dynamic Management of Organization*, Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 87-190.
42. Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2011a), *Technology Management of Organization*, Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 11-198.
43. FIB (1998). Uusinta tietoa suomalaisten asenteista biotekniikkaan, FIB, Suomen Bioteollisuus.
44. Finkelstein, S. (1992), Power in top management teams, measurement and validation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35.
45. Frewer, L., Rowe, G., Marsh, R. and Reynolds, C. (2001). *Public Participation Methods: Evolving and Operationalising an Evaluation Framework*. UK Department of Health.
46. Fuller, S. (2000). *The Governance of Science: Ideology and the Future of the Open Society*. Buckingham - Philadelphia, Open University Press.
47. Fung et al., (1998), Customer requirement analysis, *International Journal of Production*, no 38.
48. Fung et al., (2006), Quality function deployment under uncertainties, *Fuzzy Systems*, no 157.
49. Garvin, D.A., (1987). Competing on the eight dimensions of quality. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 65: 101-109.
50. Gerwin, D., (1993). Manufacturing flexibility strategic perspective. *Manage. Sci.*, 39: 395-41
51. Hamel, G. and C. K. Prahalad, (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Harvard Business School, Boston, London.
52. Leonard, D., (1997). Spark innovation through empathic design. *Harvard Business Rev.*, 75: 102-113.
53. Porter, M.E., (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. 1st Edn., Free Press, New York.
54. Robert, K. and N. David, (1992). The balanced scorecard measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Rev.*, 70: 71-79.
55. Stalk, G., (1988). Time the next source of competitive advantage. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 66: 41-51.
- Ulwick, A.W., (2002). Turn customer input into innovation. *Harvard Business Rev.*, 80: 91-97.
56. Gibbs, P. A. (1993), Determinants of corporate restructuring, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14.
57. Greene, W. H. (2000), *Econometric Analysis*, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
58. Griffin and Hauser, (1993), The voice of the customer, *Marketing Science*, no 12.

59. Gustafsson, A., and Gustafsson, N. (1994). Exceeding customer expectations. In Proceedings of the sixth symposium on quality function deployment (pp. 52–57). Novi, MI.
60. Haunschild, P. R. (1994), How much is that organization worth? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39.
61. Hauser and Clausing, J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing, (1996) The house of quality, *IEEE Engineering Management Review* 24 (1) (1996), pp. 24–32.
62. Hayes R. and Clark K, (2003), Why some factories are more productive than others, *Harvard Business Review*.
63. Haynes, M., Thompson, S. and Wright, M. (2002), Organization performance, *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 1.
64. Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Uhlenbruck, K. and Shimizu, K. (2006), Resources, *Academy of Management Journal*, 49.
65. Ho et al., (1999), An integrated group decision making approach to QFD, *IIE Transactions*, no 31.
66. <http://www.canadabusiness.ca/eng/125/141/>
67. <http://www.canadabusiness.ca/eng/86/>
68. <http://www.canadabusiness.ca/eng/87/187/>
69. Irwin, A. (1995). *Citizen Science. A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development*. London and New York, Routledge.
70. Irwin, A. and Wynne, B. (1996). Introduction. *Misunderstanding Science? The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1-17.
71. Irwin, A. and Wynne, B., Eds. (1996). *Misunderstanding Science? The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
72. J. Wang (1999), Fuzzy outranking approach to prioritize design requirements in quality function deployment, *International Journal of Production Research* 37 (4), pp. 899–916.
73. J.R. Evans and W.M. Lindsay (2002), *Management and control of quality* (5th ed.), Thomson Learning, Singapore.
74. J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing (1988), The house of quality, *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 63–73.
75. Jagdish, N. (2001), *Customer Relationship Management: Concept, Tools, Applications*, McGraw Hill.
76. Johnson, M.D. Gustafsson, A. (2000), *Improving customer satisfaction*, Jossey Bass Press.
77. Joss, S. and Durant, J., Eds. (1995). *Public Participation in Science - The Role of Consensus Conferences in Europe*. London, Science Museum with the Support of the European Commissions Directorate General XII.
78. Karsak et al., (2002), Product planning in quality function deployment, *Industrial Engineering*, no 44.
79. Karsak, E., (2004), Fuzzy multiple objective programming in qfd, *Industrial Engineering*, no 47.
80. Kaufmann and Gupta, (1985), *Introduction to fuzzy arithmetic* Van No strand Reinhold, New York.
81. Kendall st, friezes Ja., steeples Jo, etal.(2004), Flexibility program, *Journal of clinical engineering*.
82. Khoo and Ho, L.P., (1996), Framework of a fuzzy QFD system, *International Journal of Production Research*, no 34.
83. Klüver, L., Nentwich, M., Peissl, W., Torgersen, H., Gloede, F., Hennen, L., Eijndhoven, J. v., Est, R. v., Joss, S. and Bellucci, S. (2000).. *European Participatory Technology Assessment. Participatory Methods in Technology Assessment and Technology Decision-Making*. Copenhagen, The Danish Board of Technology.
84. Kuwahara, T., (1997). *Technology Foresight in Japan: a New Approach in Methodology and Analysis*. Technology Foresight, NSTDA, Bangkok, p. 87-93.
85. Kwong and Bai, C.K., (2002), A fuzzy AHP approach in QFD, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no 13.
86. L. Cohen (1995), *Quality function deployment: How to make QFD work for you*, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts.
87. L.H. Chen and M.C. Weng (2006), An evaluation approach to engineering design in QFD processes using fuzzy goal programming models, *European Journal of Operational Research* 172 (1), pp. 230–248.
88. L.K. Chan and M.L. Wu (2002), Quality function deployment: A literature review, *European Journal of Operational Research* 143, pp. 463–497.
89. L.K. Chan and M.L. Wu (2005), A systematic approach to quality function deployment with a full illustrative example, *Omega* 33 (2), pp. 119–139.
90. L.K. Chan, H.P. Kao, A. Ng and M.L. Wu (1999), Rating the importance of customer needs in quality function deployment by fuzzy and entropy methods, *International Journal of Production Research* 37 (11), pp. 2499–2518.
91. L.P. Khoo and N.C. Ho (1996), Framework of a fuzzy quality function deployment system, *International Journal of Production Research* 34 (2), pp. 299–311.
92. L.P. Sullivan (1986), Quality function deployment, *Quality Progress* 19, pp. 39–50.
93. L.V. Vanegas and A.W. Labib (2001), A fuzzy quality function deployment (FQFD) model for driving optimum targets, *International Journal of Production research* 39 (1), pp. 99–120.
94. Lai et al., Y.J. Lai, E.S. Ho and S.I. Chang, (1998), *Identifying customer preferences*, Wiley, NY.
95. M. Xie, K.C. Tan and T.N. Goh (2003), *Advanced QFD applications*, ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
96. M. Xie, T.N. Goh and H. Wang (1998), A study of the sensitivity of customer voice in QFD analysis, *International Journal of Industrial Engineering* 5 (4), pp. 301–307.
97. M. Zairi and M.A. Youssef (1995), Quality function deployment: a main pillar for successful total quality management and product development, *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management* 12 (6), pp. 9–23.
98. M. Zhou (1998), Fuzzy logic and optimization models for implementing QFD, *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 35 (1-2), pp. 237–240.
99. Martin, B. R., (1997). *Technology Foresight as a Tool for Strategic Management*. *Managing Technology for Competitive Advantage*, Ch. 2, Anderson, J., Fears, R. and Taylor, B. (Eds.), Financial Times Healthcare, London, p. 131-147.
100. Mason, C and Stark, M. (2004), What do Investors look for in a Business Plan, *International Business Journal*, no32.
101. McKinley, W., Zhao, J. and Rust, K. G. (2000), A socio cognitive interpretation, *Academy of Management Review*, 25.

Nasser Fegh-hi Farahmand

102. Michael, M. (2001). Technoscientific Bespoking: Animals, Publics and the New Genetics. *New Genetics and Society* 20(3): 205-224.
103. Miettinen, R. and Välvirronen, E. (1999). In *Science and Technology We Trust: On the Public Understanding of Science in Finland*. Biotechnology and Public Understanding of Science. Proceedings of the UK-Nordic Co-Operative Seminar Helsinki October 25-27, 1998 Publications of the Academy of Finland 3/99..
104. Morgan R, (1994), *The Emergence of new organizational forms*, London, no 27.
105. Morrow, J. L., Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A. and Holcomb, T. R. (2005), *Creating Value*, Society Conference, Orlando.
106. Niva, M. (2002). *Gene Technology in Food Production and Consumer Interpretations of Risks*.
107. Nixon, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Lee, H. and Jeong, E. (2004), *Market reactions*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 25.
108. NSTDA, (1996). *Important Future Technologies of Thailand*, A Project Undertaken by Chiang Mai University, NSTDA, Bangkok.
109. R.H. Zhao and R. Govind (1991), *Defuzzification of fuzzy intervals*, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 43, pp. 45–55.
110. R.Y.K. Fung, K. Popplewell and J. Xie (1998), *An intelligent hybrid system for customer requirement analysis and product attribute targets determination*, *International Journal of Production Research* 36 (1), pp. 13–34.
111. R.Y.K. Fung, Y.Z. Chen and J.F. Tang (2006), *Estimating the functional relationships for quality function deployment under uncertainties*, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 157 (1), pp. 98–120.
112. Robert Shaw, W. (1995), *Using an objective sales point measure*, *Transactions from the Symposium on HOQ*.
113. Robertshaw, W. (1995). *Using an objective sales point measure to incorporate elements of the Kano model into QFD*. *Transactions from the 7th Symposium on QFD* (pp. 201–216).
114. Rue, L. and Ibrahim, N. (1998), *Planning and Performance*, *Journal of small Business Management*, no 36.
115. Runkler, T.A. Runkler, (1997), *Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods*, *IEEE Fuzzy Systems*, no 5.
116. Schwenk, C. R. and Shrader, C. B. (1993), *Effects of formal Strategic Planning: Theory and Practice*, no 17.
117. Seth, A., Song, K. P. and Pettit, R. R. (2002), *Value creation and destruction*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 23.
118. Shemwell, D, (1998), *Practices for Sales Culture*, *International Journal of Marketing*, Vol.16, no.7.
119. Shen, X.X. Tan and M. Xie, (2001), *QFD on linguistic data*, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no12.
120. Solvency Gavial, (1992), *Handbook of industrial Engineering*, John wily andsons Inc.
121. Stutely, R, (2003), *The definitive Business Plan*, London: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
122. Sullivan, L.P. (1999), *QFD, Quality Progress*.
123. T.A. Runkler (1997), *Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods using application specific properties*, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* 5 (1), pp. 72–79.
124. Tempon et al., (1999), *House of quality*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 117
125. Thompson, J.D., (2004), *Organizations in action*, New York, Mc Graw Hill.
126. Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2000), *Business Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure*, <http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>
127. Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2007), *Business Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure*, <http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>
128. Ullmand, D.G., (1992), *The mechanical design process*, New York, McGraw Hill.
129. Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R. (2005), *Circuits of power in corporation.*, *Journal of Management Studies*, no 42.
130. Vanegas and Labib, (2001), *A fuzzy QFD model*, *International, Journal of Production*, no 39.
131. Walsh timothy.(2002), *Total quality management*, *Equipment proceeding of National Forum*.
132. Wang, J. (1999), *Fuzzy approach to design requirements in QFD*, *International Journal of Production*, no 37.
133. Watts, H. D., Wood, A. M. and Wardle. P. (2003), *Making Friends or Making Things? Urban Studies*.
134. Westhead, P (2001), *Management and BP Performance*, *International Business Journal*.no 14.
135. Wiseman, R. M. and Gomez Mejia, L. R. (1998), *A model of managerial risk taking.*, *Academy of Management Review*, no 23.
136. Woods, A. and Joyce, P. (2003), *Practice of Strategic Management*, *International small Business Journal*, no 21.
137. WWW. *QFD and The expanded House of quality*.
138. X.X. Shen, K.C. Tan and M. Xie (2001), *The implementation of quality function deployment based on linguistic data*, *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 12 (1), pp. 65–75.
139. Xie, K.C. Tan and T.N. Goh, (2003), *Advanced HOQ applications*, ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
140. Xie, T.N. Goh and H. Wang, (1998), *Customer voice in QFD*, *International Journal of Industrial Engineering*, no 5.
141. Y.J. Lai, E.S. Ho and S.I. Chang (1998), *Identifying customer preferences in quality function deployment using group decision-making techniques*. In: U. Usher, U. Roy and H. Parsaei, Editors, *Integrated product and process development – Methods, tools, and technologies*, Wiley, NY, pp. 1–28.
142. Zairi and Youssef, (1995), *QFD*, *International Journal of Quality Management*, no 22.
143. Zuckerman, E. W. (2000), *focusing the corporate product*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, no 45.