

# TEACHING STRATEGY AS EXCELLENCE ORGANIZATION MISSION

*Dr. Nasser Fegh-hi Farahmand,*

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

## ABSTRACT

*During the last decade, theoretical and empirical researches have indicated that organizational teaching as a process occurs in various sites and situations, and it should not be viewed from only an economic-profit perspective. Individual organizational teaching in organizations' context includes the actions of key actors at every level for creating value in the organization. Generally, teaching strategy behavior in organizations is regarded as a tool for organizations' growth and profitability, strategic innovation, organizational and customer-oriented changes. This article attempts to explain the teaching plan strategy by patterns of thinking. The importance of strategic, long-term policy and teaching plan strategy is very clear to planners. Teaching managers like to follow a similar and routine teaching behavioral pattern. Teaching plan strategy, normally taken, as a part of teaching planning, therefore also tends to run in cycles of around last years. Implementing excellence organization can give a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward teaching strategy approach. Studies on corporate organizational teaching have possessed an increasing growth. The rise of intense competition among the domestic and global markets has revealed the crucial role of organizational teaching in actualization and maintenance of competitive privilege development in the teaching organizations.*

**Keywords:** *organizational teaching, teaching plan, teaching strategy, excellence organization, learning organization, teaching strategy approach*

### Introduction:

The importance and growth of the products and services reviewed that it is expanding globally. The percentage of growth of the different excellence organizational criteria in the products and services as learning organization expectations is continuing to increase as the excellence organization base. Furthermore, researchers believe that the primary objective of the corporate organizational teaching is creation of dynamism, competitive structure and culture (Ergun et al., 2004). With the rise in the standard of living, resulting from increased excellence organizational productivity changes in the needs and demands of the population. Teaching strategy approach has been widely used to translate learning organization expectation to a products and services technical attributes. Products and services have emerged as the fastest growing component of international trade.

Correctly rating the importance of every learning organization expectation is essential to the teaching strategy approach process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes.

This paper proposes a learning organization expectations method that considers excellence organization's information. In today's excellence 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 learning organization expectations, but also on how it compares with other excellence organization's products and services. Teaching success is about lucrative financial gains or about building something for excellence organization. It is about making a difference in excellence organizational community, or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something excellence organization love to do. Most likely, excellence organization will quantify success in many ways.

### Excellence organizations:

It is not difficult to envision what excellence organizations want out of their teaching, but how will you get there. The key to excellence organizational success is having a teaching plan in place. Whether excellence organization is

about to launch a start-up or excellence organization have been in teaching for years, excellence organizational teaching' direction guided by excellence organizational teaching plan. To begin the planning process, excellence organization need to do some critical analysis; teaching planning is about realistically forecasting where your teaching 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. Making a difference in excellence organization or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something loves to do. Most likely, excellence organization will quantify success in many ways. It is not difficult to envision what you want out of excellence organizational teaching, but how will excellence organization get there. While the definition of what constitutes an excellence organization varies, it generally based on the number of employees and products and services turnover (Zuckerman, E. W., 2000, 228). In practice, excellence organization usually characterized by simple excellence 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 excellence organization (Bridge, S. O'Neill, K and Cormier S, 2002, 651). Therefore, excellence 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.

#### Teaching strategy:

When there are cross effects between innate teaching strategy and teaching strategy management experience, the variance of teaching will also increase with teaching strategy tenure in absence of learning. Several papers (Murphy, 1986, 365; Foster and Rosenzweig, 1993, 37; Baker et al, 1994, 58; Poppo and Weigelt, 2000, 391) report a positive association between variance of teaching and teaching strategy tenure and explain it as a consequence of learning. However, this evidence can be explained one from learning theory and the other from the interaction between innate and acquired abilities. Other tests (Farber and Gibbons, 1996, 264; Altonji and Pierret, 2001, 62; Bauer and Haisken, 2001, 341) conducted with panel data are subject to the same doubts about the true causes behind their empirical evidence. In addition, it could happen that the proxies used for innate abilities can be correlated with unobserved investments in on the teaching strategy training by workers or with other proxies of innate abilities used by employers when the teaching strategy management is hired. Anyhow tactical actions steps for

coupling quality with learning organization or service receivers recovering satisfaction are as follows:

- 1) Teaching strategy support: An excellence organization's total teaching strategy efforts must begin at the very top and begin with the board of directors.
  - Teaching strategy plan: The answers to these and other questions will provide valuable insights into the existing corporate culture and indicate the excellence organization's readiness for adopting teaching strategy.
- 2) Teaching strategy mission: Develop a vision or mission statement if the excellence organization does not have one already. The key to the initial adoption of teaching strategy is continuous communication of the vision within a comprehensive communication plan.
- 3) Teaching strategy principles: Coaching in the excellence 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 excellence 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. Excellence 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.
- 4) Teaching strategy committee: Employees, 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.

However, techniques of excellence organization can be related in part to the growing influence of the excellence organization's philosophies. In recent years, it has expanded most notably to include simultaneous engineering, benchmarking and increasing emphasis on issues relating to excellence organization strategy. Clearly, the management of excellence organization's seeking world class status would appear to be 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 excellence organization's technologies and techniques in many excellence organization's arises from an inadequate understanding of their production and operation problems and the integrated nature of modern technology. All too often, technological solutions are imposed which necessitate the excellence organization to engage in an excellence 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 excellence 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 excellence 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 excellence organization rather than the other way round.

Moreover, the predictions teaching strategy could also explained by the hypothesis of cross effects between innate and acquired ability together with the additional assumption that the periodical increase in abilities from work experience. It is a decreasing function of excellence organization mission because, for example, on the teaching plan training decreases as a worker gets older. If this were the case, teaching organization would get another empirical prediction. Therefore, teaching strategy management find a possible alternative explanation for teaching strategy main predictions of learning theory that can be empirically tested by models of between teaching dispersion.

### Teaching plan strategy:

For many excellence 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 excellence organization strategy (Shemwell, D, 1998, 158). A useful framework for analyzing the deficiencies of the excellence organization s 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. By applying an iterative process and identifying gaps in its performance, the excellence organization can assess the suitability of potential solutions at a level appropriate to the requirements and resources of an excellence organization. The operational concept based on customer satisfaction, where the operation of quality management system is customer-oriented and aims at improving of:

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

All above-mentioned items proposed based on overall performance of the teaching strategy and requires enterprises evaluate performance from the perspective of learning organization. For this reason, teaching plan strategy give a overview of excellence organizational teaching where excellence organization have been, where you are now, and where excellence organization is going in the future. Include:

- a) The purpose of excellence organizational teaching with description of excellence organizational products and services in teaching legal structure,
- b) Excellence organizational industry by achievements and competitive advantage,

- c) Excellence organizational teaching model for growth timeline

The central mission of excellence organization s activities under the enlightenment model is to raise the teaching plan strategy level of the excellence organization. The starting point in the teaching plan strategy is the assumption of teaching. The corporate organizational teaching may considered as a system, which enables individuals to employ the creative processes that offer them opportunity to apply or invent the technologies that can be purposeful and planned in terms of the innovative activities' level (Echols & Neck, 1998). The corporate organizational teaching is a process that creates products and services or innovative processes by establishing the entrepreneurial culture in an organization (Fry, 1993). As a part of successful organizations, the corporate organizational teaching is associated with the large organizations' growth. Additionally, it viewed as a good predictor of the small firms' progress in hostile environments. Organizational teaching involves uncommon events and recognition of entrepreneurial firms. The characteristics of corporate organizational teaching are new-business-venturing, innovativeness of products/services, innovation in the process, self-renewal, risk taking, proactive ness, and competitive privileges (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2004). The information collected from sample of middle and top managers from each teaching organizations through face-to-face, consultant sessions, interview, mail and e-mail about the characteristics of the organizations. The characteristics were such as size and industry; about personal characteristics of managers, such as age, formal education, years in the current teaching strategy; and about teaching strategy positions, such as hierarchical level and functional area. The formal education and experience improve the information available to organizations about managers' ability and that there will be better matching between employees' abilities and teaching strategy over time. Conditional teaching dispersion increases with formal education and work experience when the teaching equation does not control for teaching strategy positions. Furthermore, this conditional teaching dispersion is greater for those managers who, controlling for age, have more years of education that this result interpreted because of the signaling properties of education (Harris and Holmstrom, 1982, 146) and education could used to signal innate ability (Spence, 1976, 82). Teaching organizations should expect higher teaching dispersion for more educated workers if higher education is a more effective way of signaling hidden abilities than work experience. Otherwise, teaching strategy management would prefer to take a teaching strategy earlier on in life so that employers could learn about their hidden abilities from work experience. Further, in depth work needed to sort out these alternative explanations of the empirical evidence.

### Teaching strategy items:

Miller and Frizen (1982) and Kandwalla (1977) made use of risk taking, proactive ness, and innovation for the

purpose of conceptualization and organizational teaching measurement. In the most of other research studies (Covin and Covin 1990; Covin and Slevin 1991; Lumpkin and Dess 1996; Birkinshaw 1999; Covin and Miles 1999; Pittaway 2001; Dess, Ireland, Zahra, Floyd, Janney and Lane 2003) corporate organizational teaching has been introduced as concept embracing proactiveness, risk taking, innovation, and competitive aggressiveness (Aktan and Bulut, 2008). As teaching variation increases with teaching strategy tenure (Murphy, 1986, 75; Baker et al., 1994, 115), but the multivariate analysis of the error variance also led us to verify that, it decreases with formal education and work experience prior to the current teaching strategy. These results cannot be explained by conventional human capital models and provide a more robust test of learning. These components increase the performance of firms, the correspondence between organization and environment, and the speed of strategic reaction to environmental changes. There are, however, other possible explanations for the results highlighted in the theory section, which come from teaching strategy approach theory. For example, it may be that the return on investment in teaching strategy training decreases over time in situations where innate ability and acquired human capital interact in determining the workers' productivity. In that case, teaching dispersion expected to increase per additional year of teaching strategy at a lower rate than per year of general experience.

All managers within a hierarchical position will have an estimated ability at the time of promoted to the teaching strategy equal to that demanded for that position. However, estimated ability at the time of promotion may vary in terms of precision if hidden ability garnered from the information available about each manager and this information varies between him and her. Learning will continue in the new teaching strategy, but the information content of this learning expected to be lower for managers who started the teaching strategy with more precision in their estimated abilities. This implies that conditional teaching variance within the teaching strategy will increase with teaching strategy tenure learning continues, and teaching variance precision will be lower or higher for managers with a more formal education and more work experience at the time of the promotion, because there is more information available to estimate their ability. To begin the planning process, excellence organization will need to do some critical analysis; teaching planning is about realistically forecasting where excellence organizational teaching is going. For this reason, teaching strategy items are as follows:

- 1) Teaching optimization: Optimal utilization of teaching plan is advancing at a very fast pace, and obsolescence of physical teaching infrastructure of skills and competence, take place rapidly.
- 2) Teaching empowerment: Strengthening of teaching plan as a major initiative to modernize the infrastructure in organization will be undertaken.

- 3) Teaching methodology: Mechanisms for teaching plan for setting up of more efficient funding mechanisms examined, either by creating new structures or by strengthening or restructuring the existing ones, for promotion of basic research in teaching plan.
- 4) Teaching persons: Personnel of teaching plan as teaching technologists, while being large in absolute numbers, is not commensurate with the requirements in teaching and when measured on a per capita basis.
- 5) Teaching technology: Technology development of teaching plan as a strong base of teaching plan provides a crucial foundation.
- 6) Teaching interest: Intensive of teaching plan engineering that launched to develop innovative teaching plan and to increase excellence organization al share in high-tech products or services. Simultaneously, efforts made to strengthen traditional industry to meet the new requirements of competition with appropriate teaching plan.
- 7) Teaching knowledge: Knowledge of teaching plan would be further developed and harnessed for the purpose of teaching generation.
- 8) Teaching management: Management of teaching plan has an important role in any general strategy to address the problems of management of the impacts of natural hazards.
- 9) The introduction of teaching strategy management positions to explain differences in managerial teaching could make the information about the characteristics of the manager irrelevant in determining teaching. After all, holding a particular teaching strategy position implies having the ability required for the teaching strategy management. Controlling for teaching strategy management substantially reduces the effects of education and general work experience on teaching. Although teaching strategy management heterogeneity and differences in excellence organization cannot ruled out as potential explanations, the insurance effects predicted by the learning models (Harris and Holmstrom, 1982, 251) may be an alternative explanation for the observed positive effect of experience and education in teaching after controlling for excellence organization. Another important result is that, controlling for teaching strategy management, the effect of teaching strategy tenure on teaching becomes statistically significant and positive. Teaching strategy managers acquire specific human capital with on the teaching strategy management experience (Topel, 1991, 109), which can only be properly evaluated when teaching strategy management are incorporated into the model.

There is evidence in the data that teaching strategy tenure is higher for lower hierarchical positions than for higher ones. Teaching strategy management tenure is associated with lower estimated innate ability, because those managers whose ability believed to be higher promoted faster to higher hierarchical positions. Promotion to a higher hierarchical position may be the result of an optimal assignment of abilities to teaching strategy management or the consequence (Lazear and Rosen, 1981) of the incentives established by the

organizations, as in tournament models. The observed convexity between hierarchical position and teaching, together with the fact that teaching strategy management has more explanatory power for differences in teaching than do teaching strategy variables interpreted as evidence of tournament-type explanations for the teaching differences between hierarchical positions.

### Teaching strategy approach:

Organizational teaching accompanies venturous innovation while people are escaping from its risk. Innovativeness is the step of technology development process. The survival in the market is the outcome of these three phenomena, which can be used exchange ably. A teaching strategy manager is a person who takes all the three steps simultaneously, whereas a successful teaching strategy manager is the one who does the stages to gain the title of teaching strategy manager.

Innovativeness is an environmental requirement in the field of organizational teaching, which refers to the capability of a corporation for creation of a new product and successful launch of it to the market (Avlonitis and Salavou, 2007). Striving for innovativeness brings about a lasting value which is part of the teaching' nature (Ergün et al, 2004:260). The concept of innovative products has attracted the attention of some experts and researchers (Avlonitis and Salavou, 2007: 567). Deshpande et al (1993) consider innovativeness as one of the essential competitive instruments for achieving success and long-term survival of teaching organizations.

The increase of attention to innovativeness can be a key factor in the success of enduring competitive privilege of teaching organizations. By coupling quality 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):

- teaching strategy obtain support from the board of directors for prepare an action plan,
- teaching strategy mission statement for establishes top-level quality committee,
- Customer satisfaction survey by incorporate teaching strategy performance

In the current literature, some existing methods incorporate excellence organization information to prioritize learning organization expectations that they are as follows:

1)Teaching strategy method: Teaching strategy approach has been widely used as a multi functional design tool to translate learning organization expectations to a products and services technical attributes. Thus, teaching strategy approach used to help design teams to develop products and services with higher quality to meet or surpass learning organization expectations. Correctly rating the importance of every learning organization expectation is essential to the teaching strategy approach process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes. Traditionally, capturing learning organization expectations involves three steps in teaching strategy approach:

- Identifying learning organization expectations,
- Structuring learning organization expectations,
- Determine of the importance weight for the individual learning organization expectations.

Therefore, it is important to integrate excellence organization analysis into products and services design and development. Then, the ranking of learning organization expectations for the allocation of development resources should based also on excellence organization analysis.

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

The relative importance rating obtained from the traditional rating methods, such as learning organization expectations survey, expert opinion, analytic hierarchy process method. The present point method is very straightforward, and there are many papers discussing it in teaching strategy approach (Cohen, 1995, 112; Robertshaw, 1995, 331). Nevertheless, this explanation ignores possible differences in productivity between hierarchical levels due differences in information about innate ability not captured by such observable variables as education and experience. Teaching strategy managers promoted to higher teaching strategy management for excellence organization, but these increases are lower than the differences in average teaching between levels (Baker et al., 1994, 307). Managers who have held their positions for a longer period will have acquired more teaching strategy approach, and on the teaching strategy acquisition increases with the innate ability of the managers (Gibbons and Waldman, 1999, 155). If managers who need less work experience to reach their current hierarchical position are, also those with higher innate abilities the marginal return from one year of teaching strategy tenure should decrease with the age of the manager.

### Teaching strategy as excellence organization mission:

The marginal return of teaching strategy management tenure decreases with the age of the manager, but cannot rule out the alternative explanation that investment in on the teaching strategy training decreases, as managers get

older. The evidence suggests that better assignment of managers to teaching strategy positions because of learning competes with incentive/tournament reasons for explaining the promotion of managers to higher-level teaching strategy, something that has often been ignored in previous empirical tests of tournament models (Eriksson, 1999, 81; Conyon et al., 2001, 301). Implementing good environmental and social practices is good teaching can give excellence organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward excellence organizational teaching. Excellence organization should discuss ways in which excellence organizational teaching honors ethical values and respects people, excellence organizational community, and the environment.

Teaching strategy as excellence organization mission and target management structure derive management system requirements as in teaching plan strategy:

- 1) Teaching strategy policy: Excellence organization should set up definite policy and target and the degree of customer satisfaction should clarify.
- 2) Teaching strategy 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) Teaching strategy staffs: Excellence organization should carry out communicating harmonization, encourage staffs involvement and full commitment to customer satisfaction managers' decision-making should comply with the teaching policy and target as the maximum guidance principle. Excellence organization s provide all required resources, according to the plan then produce and sell products to learning organization.
- 4) Teaching strategy feedbacks: Excellence organization aim at learning organization 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. Excellence organization should provide learning organization' 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 excellence organizational teaching, from greening your teaching to finding funding to become environmentally efficient. In order to stay competitive in today's market, excellence organization might want to consider where corporate social responsibility

fits into your operations. There is no consensus upon the sense of innovativeness. This concept defined as creation of novelty, admission of a behavior or belief that is novel for the organization. A number of the researchers (Kleinschmidt & Cooper, 1991; Olsen & Sallis 2006; Olson, Walker, & Ruekert, 1995) describe innovativeness as degree of novelty that is in connection with corporate and outside world. Although introducing a teaching strategy is necessary, it is not sufficient for starting innovation. The innovative product or service should outrival the competitors in the market (Tajeddini, 2010).

#### **Result:**

Teaching strategy management regarded as one of the prerequisites of success and survival of the teaching organizations and classified into teaching plan and teaching strategy in economy and business. The gradual teaching strategies are the outcome of a continuously improving process. Put differently, teaching strategy could improve and develop the knowledge and the process. Radical teaching strategies are a completely new phenomenon, which can obtain through investigation and development in the industrial, investigative laboratories. The teaching organizations are order to keep pace with technology, markets, and flow and even rebuild them. The teaching strategy is corporate culture, which persuades the staff for innovativeness and gaining an organizational perception of developing new products or processes. The key to excellence organization success is having a teaching plan in place. Whether excellence organization is about to launch a start-up or excellence organization have been in teaching for years, excellence organizational teaching' direction guided by teaching plan. In spite of this general awareness, such long-term teaching, strategic-level planning of teaching has been lacking in most excellence organization s. A central motivation for this has been the public uneasiness towards many of the applications of gene excellence organization s technology, as well as the general distrust of the public towards officials, scientists and representatives of excellence organization s in the management of risks.

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

In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services of excellence organization has to view its teaching and its customer relationships from a expectation perspective. There are always relationships between products and services of excellence organization and its learning organization expectations. The key issue is whether the excellence organization wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages learning organization expectations or not, and whether a given learning organization wants to be an actively managed relationship with the products and services provider, or not.

Forever, excellence organization should set up definite policy and target and the degree of customer satisfaction should clarify. In according to teaching target, excellence

organization should plan teaching system and relative structure, authority and responsibility control, operation process and standards, in order to ensure comply with plan and achieve enterprise teaching target.

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

Anyhow, excellence organization must provide all required resources, according to the plan then produce and sell products to learning organization. After the adjustment and improvement, excellence organization should re-measure customer expectations, to ensure the improvement scheme is proper and effective.

Teaching strategy is definable at least from two perspectives;

- 1) What the teaching organizations intends to do? From this perspective, teaching is a comprehensive plan for achieving an organization's objectives and performing its own mission, with the underlying theory that the strategy should formulated in the framework of a process.
- 2) What the teaching organizations does finally? From this perspective, teaching strategy is the pattern of the organization's reactions to its environment over time, with the assumption that the strategy developed through insight and inspiration.

Teaching strategy as a pattern or a plan that integrates the objectives, policies, and action sequences of an organization into a cohesive whole if well formulated, it can be useful in allocation of an organization's resources into a unique and viable posture based on its relative internal competencies and shortcomings, predicted environmental changes, and intelligent rivals' contingent moves.

Teaching strategy as the determination of an organization's major and long-term goals, can select of actions, and allocation of the required resources for achieving the goals.

Teaching strategy as the large-scale and future-oriented plans for interaction with the competitive environment to optimize achievement of an organization's objectives, in other words, a game plan that although does not detail all of the future needs associated with people, finances, or materials, it provides a framework for decision making.

### Conclusions:

The empirical prediction coming from this is that within-teaching strategy teaching dispersion will be lower among that teaching strategy management for whom the assessment of their ability was more imprecise at the time of the promotion. If teaching strategy management experience and formal education improve the precision of the assessment, then within teaching strategy teaching dispersion should decrease with experience and education, whereas between teaching strategy dispersion is expected to increase with these two variables. This distinction, new in the literature formalized and empirically supported by a large sample of data for managerial teaching. Excellence organization s compete with the quality level of their

products and services which cannot manage excellence organization s competition, will have problems surviving.

In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services excellence organization has to view its teaching and its customer relationships from a products and services quality improvement perspective. There are always relationships between a products and services and its learning organization expectations. The key issue is whether the firm wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages learning organization expectations or not, and whether a given learning organization 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 organization s 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 organization s throughout the world. The recognition that survival much less growth in the Excellence is a function of quality led to the increasing emphasis on teaching strategy management.

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 learning organization and employees, and it contributes directly to superior productivity.

For this reason, implementing good environmental and social practices is good teaching can give excellence organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward excellence organizational teaching. Excellence organization should discuss ways in which excellence organizational teaching honors ethical values and respects people, excellence organizational community, and the environment.

The empirical results that the assignment of a manager to a particular teaching strategy reveals the information employers have about the teaching strategy management manager's hidden ability at the time of the assignment. The fact that learning continues after the assignment suggests that the assignment made with imperfect information. If promotions based on the estimated teaching strategy management ability of the individual managers, workers

assigned to a given hierarchical level at the same moment in time will have similar expected abilities, albeit assessed with different levels of precision. Consistent with teaching strategy and learning models, there will be less to learn in the future for those workers whose ability has been better assessed at the time of promotion.

#### References:

- [1] Griffin and J.R. Hauser (1993), The voice of the customer, *Marketing Science* 12 (1), pp. 1–27.
- [2] Kaufmann and M.M. Gupta (1985), Introduction to fuzzy arithmetic: Theory and application, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- [3] Adebajo, D. Kehoe, D. (2001), Teamwork and Customer Focus, *Managing Quality*, Vol.12, no.10
- [4] Akao, Y. Akao, (1990), Quality function deployment: integrating customer requirements into product design, Productivity Press, Cambridge.
- [5] Altonji, J.G. and C.R. Pierret (2001), Employer Learning and Statistical Discrimination, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116.
- [6] Andersson, F.(2002), Career Concerns, Contracts, and Effort Distortions, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [7] Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate Strategy: An analytic approach to teaching policy for growth and expansion*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [8] Anton, J. Perkins, D. Feinberg, R.A. (1998), *Voice of the Customer*, Bard Press.
- [9] Antoncic B and Hisrich R.D. (2004)”, Corporate excellence organizational teaching contingencies and excellence organizational wealth creation”, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol, Vol. 23, No. No. (6), pp. pp. 518- –550.
- [10] Arash Shahin (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
- [11] Armacost et al. (1994), An AHP framework for prioritizing customer requirements, *IIE Transactions*. no 16.
- [12] Armacost, P.J. Componation, 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.
- [13] Aswad, A. (1989). Quality function deployment: a systems approach. In *Proceedings of the 1989 IIE integrated systems conference* (pp. 27–32). Norcross, GA.
- [14] Auriol, E., F. Guido, Pechlivanos (2002), Career Concerns in Teams, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [15] Baker, G., Gibbs, B. Holmstrom (1994), The Wage Policy of a Excellence organization , *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 92.
- [16] Barkham, R. (1996), *The Determinants of small Excellence organization Growth*, London, Jessica Kingsley.
- [17] Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986), The distinction in social research, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51.
- [18] Barringer, Bruce R And Bluedorn, Allen C.(1999), The Relationship Between Corporate Excellence organizational teaching And Strategic Management, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 20: , 421–444.
- [19] Bauer, T.K. and J.P. Haisken-DeNew (2001), *Employer Learning*, *Labour Economics*, 8.
- [20] Baysinger, B. D., Kosnik, R. and Turk, T. A. (1991), Effects ownership structure, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34.
- [21] Becker, G.S. (1964), *Human Capital*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- [22] Belsey, D. A., Kuh, A. and Welsch, M. E. (1980), *Regression Diagnostics*, New York: John Wiley.
- [23] Bernhardt, D.(1995),Strategic Promotion and Teaching, *Review of Economic Studies*, 62.
- [24] Bethel, J. E. and Liebeskind, J. (1993). The effects of corporate ownership on corporate, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14.
- [25] Blaug, M.(1976), The Empirical Status of Human Capital Theory, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 14.
- [26] Blaug, M.(1992), *The Economic Value of Education*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- [27] Bolton, B and Thompson J. (2003), *Entrepreneurs and Technique*, London: Butterworth Heinemann.
- [28] Bridge, S. O’Neill, K and Cormier S. (2002), *Understanding Enterprise*, London: Macmillan Teaching.
- [29] Brunett , Ken , (2001),*The Handbook of Key Customer Relationship Management*, prentice Hall
- [30] Bygrave, W., *The Portable MBA in Excellence organizational teaching*, N.Y: John Wiley and Sons Ashmos,D.P.andDuchon,D.(2000),spirituality at work: definitions, measures, assumptions, and validity clamims, paper presented at the academy of management, Toronto.
- [31] 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.
- [32] 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.
- [33] Cameron Kim S, (1996), A study of excellence organizational effectiveness and its predictors, *Management science review*.
- [34] Cameron, K. S. (1994). Strategies for successful excellence organizational downsizing, *Human Resource Management*, 33.
- [35] Cappelli, P. and W.F. Cascio (1991), Why Some Jobs Command Wage Premiums, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34.

- [36] Capron, L. (1999), The long term performance of horizontal learning, *Strategic Management Journal*, 20.
- [37] Chan and Wu, (2002), Quality function deployment, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 153.
- [38] Chan and Wu, (2005). A systematic approach to quality function deployment, *Omega* 33.
- [39] Chan et al., (1999), Customer needs in quality function deployment by fuzzy, *Journal of Production*, no 37.
- [40] Chandler Alfred Jr, (1992), *Strategy and structure*, Cambridge mass, M.I.T press.
- [41] Chevalier, J. and G. Ellison (1999), *Career Concerns of Mutual Fund Managers*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114.
- [42] Cohen, L. (1999), *Quality function deployment*, Addison Wesley, Massachusetts.
- [43] Colin Carnal Susan (1988), *Management principles policy*, ICSA Cambridge.
- [44] Collis, D. J. (1998), *Creating competitive advantage*, *Harvard Teaching Review*, 76.
- [45] Collis, D. J. and Montgomery, C. A. (1995), *Competing on resources*, *Harvard Teaching Review*, July–August, 73.
- [46] Conyon, M.J., I.P. Simon, and V.S. Graham (2001), *Corporate Tournaments and Executive Teaching*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 22.
- [47] Cornwall, J. R., and Perlman, B. (1990). *Corporate excellence organizational teaching*. Homewood, IL: 17 Boston-Irvin.Deakins,D, and Freel,M.(1998)entrepreneurial learning and the Growth process in sme s, the learning orgnazation:144-55 white rose centre for excellence in teaching and learning of enterprise.
- [48] Curran, J. and Blackburn, R. (2002), *Teaching planning and Local Economic Networks*, London: Paul Chapman.
- [49] D.G. Ullmand (1992), *The mechanical design process*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [50] David, F. A. (2000). *Strategic management* (Translated by A. Parsian and M. Araabi). Tehran: Cultural Researches Office, Vol. 1, 4<sup>th</sup> edition.
- [51] DeGroot, M.H.(1970), *Optimal Statistical Decisions*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [52] Denison Daniel R, (1995), *Corporate culture and excellence organizational effectiveness*, New York, John wiles andsons.
- [53] Dimitratos P et al.(2004),” The relationship between excellence organizational teaching and international performance: the importance of domestic environment”, *International Teaching Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 19-41.
- [54] 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.
- [55] 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.
- [56] 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.
- [57] Enrahimp-pour, H., Khalili, H., and Habibian, S. (2011). *The investigation of relationship between strategic management and excellence organization al teaching*. *Management Researches*, No. 11.
- [58] Entrialgo M et al.(2000),” *Linking excellence organization al teaching and strategic management: evidence from Spanish SMEs*”, *Technovation*, Vol. 20,pp. 427-436.
- [59] Ergün Ercan et al.(2004), “*Connecting The Link Between Corporate Excellence organization al teaching And Innovative Performance*”, *Global Teaching and Technology Association Annual Conference Proceedings Book*,pp.259-265, July, Cape Town.
- [60] Eriksson, T.(1999), *Executive Teaching and Tournament Theory*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17.
- [61] Evans and Lindsay, (2002), *Management and control of quality*, Singapore, Thomson Learning.
- [62] Farber, H.S. and R. Gibbons (1996), *Learning and Wage Dynamics*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111.
- [63] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2001), *Executive Management Process*, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 109-203.
- [64] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Permanent Management of Excellence organization* , First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 70-83.
- [65] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Strategic Structure of Excellence organization Management Process*, Forth edition, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 110-125.
- [66] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2005), *Strategic Management of Excellence organization* , First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 19.
- [67] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2009), *Excellence organization Strategic Plan compilation*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 74-314.
- [68] Feghhi farahmand, Nasser (2011), *Active and Dynamic Management of Excellence organization* , Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 87-190.
- [69] Feghhi Farahmand, Nasser (2011a), *Technology Management of Excellence organization* , Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 11-198.
- [70] FIB (1998). *Uusinta tietoa suomalaisten asenteista biotekniikkaan*, FIB, Suomen Bioteollisuus.
- [71] Finkelstein, S. (1992), *Power in top management teams, measurement and validation*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35.

- [72] Foster, A.D. and M.R. Rosenzweig (1993), Information Learning, and Wage Rates in Low-Income, *The Journal of Human Resources*, 28.
- [73] Frewer, L., Rowe, G., Marsh, R. and Reynolds, C. (2001). *Public Participation Methods: Evolving and Operationalising an Evaluation Framework*. UK Department of Health.
- [74] Fry, L. W., Vittuci, S., and Cedillo, M. (2005 ). *Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory measurement, and establishing a baseline*, *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, 835–862.
- [75] Fry, L.W. (2003) *Toward a theory of spiritual leadership*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.14 pp.693-727 .
- [76] Fry, L.W. and Matherly, L.L. (2006), *Spiritual Leadership and Excellence organization al Performance: An Exploratory Study*, Tarleton State University Central Texas.
- [77] Fuller, S. (2000). *The Governance of Science: Ideology and the Future of the Open Society*. Buckingham - Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- [78] Fung et al., (1998), *Customer requirement analysis*, *International Journal of Production*, no 38.
- [79] Fung et al., (2006), *Quality function deployment under uncertainties*, *Fuzzy Systems*, no 157.
- [80] Garicano, L. (2000), *Hierarchies and the Excellence organization of Knowledge in Production*, *Journal of Political Economy*, 108.
- [81] Garvin, D.A., (1987). *Competing on the eight dimensions of quality*. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 65: 101-109.
- [82] Gerwin, D., (1993). *Manufacturing flexibility strategic perspective*. *Manage. Sci.*, 39: 395-410.
- [83] Hamel, G. and C. K. Prahalad, (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Harvard Teaching School, Boston, London.
- [84] Leonard, D., (1997). *Spark innovation through empathic design*. *Harvard Teaching Rev.*, 75: 102-113.
- [85] Porter, M.E., (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. 1st Edn., Free Press, New York.
- [86] Robert, K. and N. David, (1992). *The balanced scorecard measures that drive performance*. *Harvard Teaching Rev.*, 70: 71-79.
- [87] Stalk, G., (1988). *Time the next source of competitive advantage*. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 66: 41-51.
- [88] Ulwick, A.W., (2002). *Turn customer input into innovation*. *Harvard Teaching Rev.*, 80: 91-97.
- [89] Gerhart, B. and G. Milkovich (1990), *Excellence organization al Differences in Managerial Teaching* , *Academy of Management Journal*, 33.
- [90] Gibbons, R. and K. Murphy (1992), *Optimal Incentives Contracts in the Presence of Career Concerns*, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100.
- [91] Gibbons, R., and M. Waldman (1999), *A Theory of Wage and Promotion Dynamics*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114.
- [92] Gibbs, P. A. (1993), *Determinants of corporate restructuring*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14.
- [93] Greene, W. H. (2000), *Econometric Analysis*, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [94] Greene, W.H. (1998), *Econometric Analysis*, Prentice-Hall International Limited.
- [95] Greenwald, B.C. (1986), *Adverse Selection in the Labour Market*, *Review of Economic Studies*, 53.
- [96] Griffin and Hauser, (1993), *The voice of the customer*, *Marketing Science*, no 12.
- [97] Gustafsson, A., and Gustafsson, N. (1994). *Exceeding customer expectations*. In *Proceedings of the sixth symposium on quality function deployment* (pp. 52–57). Novi, MI.
- [98] Harris, M. and B. Holmstrom (1982), *A Theory of Wage Dynamics*, *Review of Economic Studies*, 49.
- [99] Harvey, A. (1976), *Estimating Regression Models with Multiplicative Heteroskedasticity*, *Econometrica*, 44
- [100] Haunschild, P. R. (1994), *How much is that excellence organization worth?* *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39.
- [101] Hauser and Clausing, J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing, (1996) *The house of quality*, *IEEE Engineering Management Review* 24 (1) (1996), pp. 24–32.
- [102] Hayes R. and Clark K, (2003), *Why some factories are more productive than others*, *Harvard Teaching Review*.
- [103] Haynes, M., Thompson, S. and Wright, M. (2002), *Excellence organization performance*, *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 1.
- [104] Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Uhlenbruck, K. and Shimizu, K. (2006), *Resources*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 49.
- [105] Ho et al., (1999), *An integrated group decision making approach to QFD*, *IIE Transactions*, no 31.
- [106] Holmstrom, B. (1982), *Managerial Incentive Schemes*, *Reedited in Review of Economic Studies*, 66.
- [107] Hong, H. and J.D. Kubik (2003), *Analyzing the Analysts*, *Journal of Finance*, 58.
- [108] <http://www.canadateaching.ca/eng/125/141/>
- [109] <http://www.canadateaching.ca/eng/145/146/>
- [110] <http://www.canadateaching.ca/eng/86/>
- [111] <http://www.canadateaching.ca/eng/87/187/>
- [112] Ireland R. Duane, Covin Jeffrey G. and Kuratko Donald F. (2009), *Conceptualizing Corporate Excellence organization al teaching Strategy*, *Baylor University, Excellence organization al teaching Theory and Practice*, pp. 1042-2587.
- [113] Irwin, A. (1995). *Citizen Science. A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development*. London and New York, Routledge.
- [114] Irwin, A. and Wynne, B. (1996). *Introduction. Misunderstanding Science? The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1-17.
- [115] Irwin, A. and Wynne, B., Eds. (1996). *Misunderstanding Science? The Public*

- Reconstruction of Science and Technology. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [116] J. Wang (1999), Fuzzy outranking approach to prioritize design requirements in quality function deployment, *International Journal of Production Research* 37 (4), pp. 899–916.
- [117] J.R. Evans and W.M. Lindsay (2002), *Management and control of quality* (5th ed.), Thomson Learning, Singapore.
- [118] J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing (1988), The house of quality, *Harvard Teaching Review*, pp. 63–73.
- [119] Jagdish, N. (2001), *Customer Relationship Management: Concept, Tools, Applications*, McGraw Hill.
- [120] Johnson, M.D. Gustafsson, A. (2000), *Improving customer satisfaction*, Jossey Bass Press.
- [121] 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.
- [122] Karsak et al., (2002), Product planning in quality function deployment, *Industrial Engineering*, no 44.
- [123] Karsak, E., (2004), Fuzzy multiple objective programming in qfd, *Industrial Engineering*, no 47.
- [124] Kaufmann and Gupta, (1985), *Introduction to fuzzy arithmetic* Van No strand Reinhold, New York.
- [125] Kendall st., friezes Ja., steeples Jo, etal.(2004), Flexibility program, *Journal of clinical engineering*.
- [126] Khanka, S(2003), *Entrepreneurial Development*, New Delhi: Chandan Company ltd.
- [127] Khoo and Ho, L.P., (1996), Framework of a fuzzy QFD system, *International Journal of Production Research*, no 34.
- [128] 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.
- [129] Koratco, D. Of., and Richard, M. H. (2004). *Current view on excellence organization al teaching* (Translated by E. A. Mehrabi, and Tabraei, M.). Mashhad: Ferdosi University of Mashhad Publications, 1<sup>st</sup> edition.
- [130] Kotha, Suresh(2010), spillovers, spill-ins and strategic entrepreneurship: America's first commercial jet airplane and boeing s ascendancy in cimmercial aviatin, *Strategic Excellence organization al teaching Journal*, J., 4: 284–306.
- [131] Kuwahara, T., (1997). *Technology Foresight in Japan: a New Approach in Methodology and Analysis*. Technology Foresight, NSTDA, Bangkok, p. 87-93.
- [132] Kwong and Bai, C.K., (2002), A fuzzy AHP approach in QFD, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no 13.
- [133] L. Cohen (1995), *Quality function deployment: How to make QFD work for you*, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts.
- [134] 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.
- [135] L.K. Chan and M.L. Wu (2002), Quality function deployment: A literature review, *European Journal of Operational Research* 143, pp. 463–497.
- [136] 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.
- [137] 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.
- [138] 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.
- [139] L.P. Sullivan (1986), Quality function deployment, *Quality Progress* 19, pp. 39–50.
- [140] 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.
- [141] Lai et al., Y.J. Lai, E.S. Ho and S.I. Chang, (1998), *Identifying customer preferences*, Wiley, NY.
- [142] Lazear, E. and S. Rosen (1981), Rank Order Tournaments as Optimum Labour Contracts, *Journal of Political Economy*, 89.
- [143] Leonard, J. (1990), Executive Pay and Excellence organization Performance, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 43.
- [144] M. Xie, K.C. Tan and T.N. Goh (2003), *Advanced QFD applications*, ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- [145] 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.
- [146] 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.
- [147] M. Zhou (1998), Fuzzy logic and optimization models for implementing QFD, *Computers and Industrial Engineering* 35 (1-2), pp. 237–240.
- [148] 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.

- [149]Mason, C and Stark, M. (2004), What do Investors look for in a Teaching Plan, *International Teaching Journal*, no32.
- [150]McKinley, W., Zhao, J. and Rust, K. G. (2000), A socio cognitive interpretation, *Academy of Management Review*, 25.
- [151]Michael, M. (2001). Technoscientific Bespoking: Animals, Publics and the New Genetics. *New Genetics and Society* 20(3): 205-224.
- [152]Miettinen, R. and Väliverronen, 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..
- [153]Mincer, J. (1974), *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, New York, Columbia University.
- [154]Morgan R, (1994), *The Emergence of new excellence organizational forms*, London, no 27.
- [155]Morrow, J. L., Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A. and Holcomb, T. R. (2005), *Creating Value*, Society Conference, Orlando.
- [156]Murphy, K.J.(1986),Incentives, Learning, and Teaching, *Journal of Economics*, 17.
- [157]Niva, M. (2002). *Gene Technology in Food Production and Consumer Interpretations of Risks*.
- [158]Nixon, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Lee, H. and Jeong, E. (2004), *Market reactions*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 25.
- [159]Novos, I.E.(1992),*Learning by Doing, Adverse Selection, and Excellence organization Structure*, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Excellence organization* , 19.
- [160]NSTDA, (1996). *Important Future Technologies of Thailand, A Project Undertaken by Chiang Mai University*, NSTDA, Bangkok.
- [161]Ortín-Angel, P. and V. Salas-Fumas (1998), *Agency Theory and Internal Labor* , *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 7.
- [162]Ortín-Angel, P., and V. Salas-Fumas (2002), *Teaching and Span of Control in Hierarchical Excellence organization s*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [163]Poppo, L. and K. Weigelt (2000), *A Test of the Resource-Based Model Using* , *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 9.
- [164]R.H. Zhao and R. Govind (1991), *Defuzzification of fuzzy intervals*, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 43, pp. 45–55.
- [165]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.
- [166]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.
- [167]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).
- [168]Rosen, S.(1986),*Prizes and Incentives in Elimination Tournaments*, *American Economic Review*, 76.
- [169]Rue, L. and Ibrahim, N. (1998), *Planning and Performance*, *Journal of small Teaching Management*, no 36.
- [170]Runkler, T.A. Runkler, (1997), *Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods*, *IEEE Fuzzy Systems*, no 5.
- [171]Salop, J. and S. Salop (1976), *Self-Selection and Turnover in the Labor Market*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 90.
- [172]Sattinger, M.(1975),*Comparative Advantage and the Distribution of Earnings*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 43.
- [173]Schwenk, C. R. and Shrader, C. B. (1993), *Effects of formal Strategic Planning: Theory and Practice*, no 17.
- [174]Seth, A., Song, K. P. and Pettit, R. R. (2002), *Value creation and destruction*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 23.
- [175]Shemwell, D, (1998), *Practices for Sales Culture*, *International Journal of Marketing*, Vol.16, no.7.
- [176]Shen, X.X. Tan and M. Xie, (2001), *QFD on linguistic data*, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no12.
- [177]Solveny Gavial, (1992), *Handbook of industrial Engineering*, John wily andsons Inc.
- [178]Spence, M. (1976), *Competition in Salaries, Credentials for Jobs*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 90.
- [179]Stutely, R, (2003), *The definitive Teaching Plan*, London: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- [180]Sullivan, L.P. (1999), *QFD, Quality Progress*.
- [181]T.A. Runkler (1997), *Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods using application specific properties*, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* 5 (1), pp. 72–79.
- [182]Tempon et al., (1999), *House of quality*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 117
- [183]Thompson, J.D., (2004), *Excellence organization s in action*, New York, Mc Graw Hill.
- [184]Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2000), *Teaching Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure*,<http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>
- [185]Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2007), *Teaching Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure*,<http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>

- [186] Topel, R. (1991), Specific Capital, Mobility, and Wages, *Journal of Political Economy*, 99.
- [187] Ullmand, D.G., (1992), *The mechanical design process*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- [188] Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R. (2005), Circuits of power in corporation,. *Journal of Management Studies*, no 42.
- [189] Vanegas and Labib, (2001), A fuzzy QFD model, *International Journal of Production*, no 39.
- [190] Waldman, M.(1984), Job Assignments, Signaling and Efficiency, *Journal of Economics*, 25.
- [191] Waldman, M.(1990), Up-or-out Contracts: A Signaling Perspective, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 8.
- [192] Walsh timothy.(2002), Total quality management, *Equipment proceeding of National Forum*.
- [193] Wang, J. (1999), Fuzzy approach to design requirements in QFD, *International Journal of Production*, no 37.
- [194] Watts, H. D., Wood, A. M. and Wardle. P. (2003), Making Friends or Making Things? *Urban Studies*.
- [195] Westhead, P (2001), Management and BP Performance, *International Teaching Journal*.no 14.
- [196] Wiseman, R. M. and Gomez Mejia, L. R. (1998), A model of managerial risk taking,. *Academy of Management Review*, no 23.
- [197] Woods, A. and Joyce, P. (2003), Practice of Strategic Management, *International small teaching Journal*, no 21.
- [198] WWW. QFD and The expanded House of quality.
- [199] 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.
- [200] Xie, T.N. Goh and H. Wang, (1998), Customer voice in QFD, *International Journal of Industrial Engineering*, no 5.
- [201] 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.
- [202] Zahra, Shaker A., Rawhouser, Hans N., Bhawe, Nachiket(2008), Globalisation Of Social Excellence organizational teaching Opportunities, *Strategic Excellence organizational teaching Journal Strat. Excellence organizational teaching J.*, 2: 117–131.
- [203] Zairi and Youssef, (1995), QFD, *International Journal of Quality Management*, no 22.
- [204] Zhao and Govind, R.H., (1991), Defuzzification of fuzzy intervals, *Fuzzy Systems* no 63.
- [205] Zuckerman, E. W. (2000), Focusing the corporate product, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, no 45.

\*\*\*\*\*