

# Value Cohesiveness Comprehension as Forward Thinking Organization Formulation

Nasser Fegh-hi Farahmand

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

**Abstract** The importance of strategic, long-term policy and value cohesiveness plan comprehension is very clear to planners. Value cohesiveness managers like to follow a similar and routine value cohesiveness behavioral pattern. Value cohesiveness plan comprehension, normally taken, as a part of value cohesiveness planning, therefore also tends to run in cycles of around last years. Implementing forward thinking organization can give a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward value cohesiveness comprehension formulation. Studies on corporate organizational value cohesiveness have possessed an increasing growth. Improving quality is becoming a major objective in forward thinking organization s throughout the world. The recognition that survival much less growth in the Forward thinking is a function of quality led to the increasing emphasis on value cohesiveness comprehension management. Forward thinking 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 commitment organization and employees, and it contributes directly to superior productivity. Generally, value cohesiveness-comprehension behavior in organizations regarded as a tool for organizations' growth and profitability, strategic innovation, organizational and customer-oriented changes. During the last decade, theoretical and empirical researches have indicated that organizational value cohesiveness as a process occurs in various sites and situations, and it should not viewed from only economic-profit perspective. This article attempts to explain the value cohesiveness plan comprehension by patterns of thinking. The percentage of growth of the different forward thinking organization al criteria in the products and services as commitment organization expectations is continuing to increase as the forward thinking organization base.

**Keywords** Value Cohesiveness Comprehension, Forward Thinking Organization, Commitment Organization

## 1. Introduction

Individual organizational value cohesiveness in organizations' context includes the actions of key actors at every level for creating value in the organization. The importance and growth of the products and services reviewed that it is expanding globally [22],[24],[45], [48], [73],[75]. The key issue is whether the firm wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages commitment organization expectations or not, and whether a given commitment organization wants to be an actively managed relationship with the products and services provider, or not. Furthermore, researchers believe that the primary objective of the corporate organizational value cohesiveness is creation of dynamism, competitive structure and culture [61]. Value cohesiveness comprehension feedbacks as forward thinking organization aim at commitment

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.

With the rise in the standard of living, resulting from increased forward thinking organization al productivity changes in the needs and demands of the population. Value cohesiveness comprehension formulation has been widely used to translate commitment organization expectation to a products and services technical attributes [107]. Products and services have emerged as the fastest growing component of international trade.

Correctly rating the importance of every commitment organization expectation is essential to the value cohesiveness comprehension formulation process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes. This paper proposes a commitment organization expectations method that considers forward thinking organizations information. In today's forward thinking organization al environment, there are usually several products and services to fulfill certain

\* Corresponding author:

farahmand@iaut.ac.ir (Nasser Fegh-hi Farahmand)

Published online at <http://journal.sapub.org/mm>

Copyright © 2013 Scientific & Academic Publishing. All Rights Reserved

functions[41],[44],[64],[66],[69]. The success of a products and services depends not only on whether it meets the commitment organization expectations, but also on how it compares with other forward thinking organization s products and services[120]. Most likely, forward thinking organization will quantify success in many ways.

The rise of intense competition among the domestic and global markets has revealed the crucial role of organizational value cohesiveness in actualization and maintenance of competitive privilege development in the value cohesiveness. Making a difference in forward thinking organization or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something loves to do. Most likely, forward thinking organization will quantify success in many ways.

## 2. Forward Thinking Organizations

Value cohesiveness success is about lucrative financial gains or about building something for forward thinking organization. It is about making a difference in forward thinking organization al community, or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something forward thinking organization love to do. It is not difficult to envision what forward thinking organizations want out of their value cohesiveness, but how will you get there[18],[23],[25],[165],[166]. The key to forward thinking organization al success is having a value cohesiveness plan in place. Whether forward thinking organization is about to launch a start-up or forward thinking organization have been in value cohesiveness for years, forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness' direction guided by forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness plan. To begin the planning process, forward thinking organization need to do some critical analysis; value cohesiveness planning is about realistically forecasting where your value cohesiveness 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[1],[4],[9],[14].

Forward thinking 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 forward thinking organization or creating the very best product or service on the market or simply doing something loves to do. Most likely, forward thinking organization will quantify success in many ways. It is not difficult to envision what you want out of forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness, but how will forward thinking organization get there[2],[8],[11],[39],[40],[72]. While the definition of what constitutes an forward thinking organization varies, it

generally based on the number of employees and products and services turnover. In practice, forward thinking organization usually characterized by simple forward thinking organization al 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 forward thinking organization[63],[82],[96],[112]. Therefore, forward thinking organization al 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. In addition, it could happen that the proxies used for innate abilities can correlated with unobserved investments in on the value cohesiveness comprehension training by workers or with other proxies of innate abilities used by employers when the value cohesiveness comprehension management is hired.

## 3. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension

Forward thinking organization usually characterized by simple forward thinking organization al 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 forward thinking organization Value cohesiveness comprehension committee with 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. When there are cross effects between innate value cohesiveness comprehension and value cohesiveness comprehension management experience, the variance of value cohesiveness will also increase with value cohesiveness comprehension tenure in absence of commitment. Several papers report a positive association between variance of value cohesiveness and value cohesiveness comprehension tenure and explain it as consequence of commitment. However, this evidence can explained one from commitment theory and the other from the interaction between innate and acquired abilities[3],[12],[34],[42],[70],[77],[86],[89],[140].

Other tests conducted with panel data are subject to the same doubts about the true causes behind their empirical evidence.

Anyhow, tactical actions steps for coupling quality with commitment organization or service receivers recovering satisfaction are as follows[5],[15],[84],[116],[119],[156]:

1) Value cohesiveness comprehension support: An forward thinking organization's total value cohesiveness comprehension efforts must begin at the very top and begin with the board of directors.

2) Value cohesiveness comprehension plan: The answers to these and other questions will provide valuable insights into the existing corporate culture and indicate the forward

thinking organization's readiness for adopting value cohesiveness comprehension.

3) Value cohesiveness comprehension formulation: Develop a vision or formulation statement if the forward thinking organization does not have one already. The key to the initial adoption of value cohesiveness comprehension is continuous communication of the vision within a comprehensive communication plan.

As a high-leverage intervention, the impact of a coach on a few key individuals can drive through massive changes in a corporate setting. Forward thinking 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[130],[155],[186]. However, techniques of forward thinking organization can related in part to the growing influence of the forward thinking organization philosophies. In recent years, it has expanded most notably to include simultaneous comprehension, benchmarking and increasing emphasis on issues relating to forward thinking organization comprehension. Clearly, the management of forward thinking organization's seeking excellent status would appear faced with a far more complex task than was the case previously. One of the main reasons for the inappropriate use of advanced forward thinking organization's technologies and techniques in many forward thinking organization's arises from an inadequate understanding of their production and operation problems and the integrated nature of modern technology[6],[13],[52],[53],[122],[157],[158]. All too often, technological solutions are imposed which necessitate the forward thinking organization to engage in a forward thinking organization al metamorphosis effectively employ them.

These can often produce sub optimal results. Ideally, the reverse process should occur, where the forward thinking 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 forward thinking organization. This process of adaptation should also take into account the production and operation, size and workforce. Forward thinking organization needs to frame in terms of the needs of the forward thinking organization rather than the other way round[178],[171]. Moreover, the predictions value cohesiveness comprehension 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 forward thinking organization formulation because, for example, on the value cohesiveness plan training decreases as a worker gets older. If this were the case, value cohesiveness organization would get another empirical prediction[7],[19],[27],[59],[134],[136],[138]. Therefore, value cohesiveness comprehension management find a possible alternative explanation for value cohesiveness comprehension main predictions of commitment theory that can be empirically tested by models of between value

cohesiveness dispersion. Coaching in the forward thinking 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 forward thinking. Senior managers need coaching as the new theorists in coaching argue; coaching empowers individuals to achieve their inherent potential.

## 4. Value Cohesiveness Plan Comprehension

Coaching makes sense as investment only if it improves the performance not only of the individual, but the forward thinking organization as well. In this sense, the word strategic becomes important. For many forward thinking organizations, becoming forward thinking 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 forward thinking organization comprehension[68],[74],[81],[153],[160],[182]. A useful framework for analyzing the deficiencies of the forward thinking 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 forward thinking organization can assess the suitability of potential solutions at a level appropriate to the requirements and resources of an forward thinking organization. The operational concept based on customer satisfaction, where the operation of quality management system is customer-oriented and aims at improving of bellow items[26],[31],[109],[198],[199]:

- Customer satisfaction by commitment organization's needs and expectations;
- Clear management responsibility by communication,
- Resource management for product realization process,
- Structure of measuring for monitoring customer satisfaction
- The purpose of forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness with description of forward thinking organizational products and services in value cohesiveness legal structure,
- Forward thinking organizational industry by achievements and competitive advantage,
- Forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness model for growth timeline

All above-mentioned items proposed based on overall performance of the value cohesiveness comprehension and requires enterprises evaluate performance from the perspective of commitment organization. For this reason, value cohesiveness plan comprehension give a overview of forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness where forward thinking organization have been, where you are now, and where forward thinking organization is going in

the future. The central formulation of forward thinking organization's activities under the enlightenment model is to raise the value cohesiveness plan comprehension level of the forward thinking organization. The starting point in the value cohesiveness plan comprehension is the assumption of value cohesiveness [10],[29],[114],[118],[169]. The corporate organizational value cohesiveness may be 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. The characteristics of corporate organizational value cohesiveness are new-business-venturing, innovativeness of products/services, innovation in the process, self-renewal, risk taking, proactiveness, and competitive privileges. The information collected from sample of middle and top managers from each value cohesiveness 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 value cohesiveness comprehension; and about value cohesiveness comprehension 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 value cohesiveness comprehension over time [16],[21],[33],[103],[104]. Conditional value cohesiveness dispersion increases with formal education and work experience when the value cohesiveness equation does not control for value cohesiveness comprehension positions. Furthermore, this conditional value cohesiveness dispersion is greater for those managers who, monitoring for age, have more years of education that this result interpreted because of the signaling properties of education and education could be used to signal innate ability. Value cohesiveness organizations should expect higher value cohesiveness dispersion for more educated workers if higher education is a more effective way of signaling hidden abilities than work experience. Otherwise, value cohesiveness comprehension management would prefer to take a value cohesiveness comprehension 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 [17],[20],[65],[67],[71]. Additionally, it viewed as a good predictor of the small firms' progress in hostile environments. Organizational value cohesiveness involves uncommon events and recognition of entrepreneurial firms.

## 5. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension Items

A useful framework for analyzing the deficiencies of the forward thinking 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 forward thinking organization can assess the suitability of potential solutions at a level appropriate to the requirements and resources of an forward thinking organization. The corporate organizational value cohesiveness is a process that creates products and services or innovative processes by establishing the entrepreneurial culture in an organization [179]. As a part of successful organizations, the corporate organizational value cohesiveness is associated with the large organizations' growth.

In the most of other research studies, corporate organizational value cohesiveness introduced as concept embracing proactiveness, risk taking, innovation, and competitive aggressiveness. As value cohesiveness variation increases with value cohesiveness comprehension tenure, 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 value cohesiveness comprehension [28],[30],[32],[101],[106],[108]. These results cannot be explained by conventional human capital models and provide a more robust test of commitment. 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 value cohesiveness comprehension formulation theory. For example, it may be that the return on investment in value cohesiveness comprehension training decreases over time in situations where innate ability and acquired human capital interact in determining the workers' productivity. In that case, value cohesiveness dispersion expected to increase per additional year of value cohesiveness comprehension 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 value cohesiveness comprehension 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. This implies that conditional value cohesiveness variance within the value cohesiveness comprehension will increase with value cohesiveness comprehension tenure commitment continues, and value cohesiveness 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 [35],[43],[47],[115],[121],[125]. To begin the planning process, forward thinking organization will need to do some critical analysis; value cohesiveness planning is about realistically forecasting where forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness is going. For this reason, value cohesiveness-comprehension items are as

follows[79],[87],[113],[124]:

1) Value cohesiveness optimization: Optimal utilization of value cohesiveness plan is advancing at a very fast pace, and obsolescence of physical value cohesiveness infrastructure of skills and competence, take place rapidly.

2) Value cohesiveness empowerment: Strengthening of value cohesiveness plan as a major initiative to modernize the infrastructure in organization will be undertaken.

3) Value cohesiveness methodology: Mechanisms for value cohesiveness 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 value cohesiveness plan.

4) Value cohesiveness persons: Personnel of value cohesiveness plan as value cohesiveness technologists, while being large in absolute numbers is not commensurate with the requirements in value cohesiveness and when measured on a per capita basis.

5) Value cohesiveness technology: Technology development of value cohesiveness plan as a strong base of value cohesiveness plan provides a crucial foundation.

6) Value cohesiveness interest: Intensive of value cohesiveness plan comprehension that launched to develop innovative value cohesiveness plan and to increase forward thinking 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 value cohesiveness plan.

7) Value cohesiveness knowledge: Knowledge of value cohesiveness plan would be further developed and harnessed for the purpose of value cohesiveness generation.

8) Value cohesiveness management: Management of value cohesiveness plan has an important role in any general comprehension to address the problems of management of the impacts of natural hazards.

The introduction of value cohesiveness comprehension management positions to explain differences in managerial value cohesiveness could make the information about the characteristics of the manager irrelevant in determining value cohesiveness. After all, holding a particular value cohesiveness comprehension position implies having the ability required for the value cohesiveness comprehension management.

## 6. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension Monitoring

Value cohesiveness dispersion expected to increase per additional year of value cohesiveness comprehension at a lower rate than per year of general experience. Monitoring for value cohesiveness comprehension management substantially reduces the effects of education and general work experience on value cohesiveness. Although value cohesiveness comprehension management heterogeneity and differences in forward thinking organization cannot

ruled out as potential explanations, the insurance effects predicted by the commitment models may be an alternative explanation for the observed positive effect of experience and education in value cohesiveness after monitoring for forward thinking organization[97],[141],[149],[190]. Another important result is that, monitoring for value cohesiveness comprehension management, the effect of value cohesiveness comprehension tenure on value cohesiveness becomes statistically significant and positive. Value cohesiveness comprehension managers acquire specific human capital with on the value cohesiveness comprehension management experience, which can only be properly evaluated when value cohesiveness comprehension management are incorporated into the model.

There is evidence in the data that value cohesiveness comprehension tenure is higher for lower hierarchical positions than for higher ones. Value cohesiveness comprehension management tenure is associated with lower estimated innate ability, because those managers whose ability believed to be higher promoted faster to higher hierarchical positions[36],[37],[123],[127],[197],[200].

Promotion to a higher hierarchical position may be the result of an optimal assignment of abilities to value cohesiveness comprehension management or the consequence of the incentives established by the organizations, as in tournament models. The observed convexity between hierarchical position and value cohesiveness, together with the fact that value cohesiveness comprehension management has more explanatory power for differences in value cohesiveness than do value cohesiveness comprehension variables interpreted as evidence of tournament-type explanations for the value cohesiveness differences between hierarchical positions.

## 7. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension Formulation

Value cohesiveness comprehension management heterogeneity and differences in forward thinking organization cannot ruled out as potential explanations, the insurance effects predicted by the commitment models may be an alternative explanation for the observed positive effect of experience and education in value cohesiveness after monitoring for forward thinking organization. Commitment will continue in the new value cohesiveness comprehension, but the information content of this commitment expected to be lower for managers who started the value cohesiveness comprehension with more precision in their estimated abilities [83],[99],[126],[154],[159],[187]. A value cohesiveness-comprehension manager is a person who takes all the three steps simultaneously, whereas a successful value cohesiveness comprehension manager is the one who does the stages to gain the title of value cohesiveness comprehension manager. Organizational value cohesiveness 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. Innovativeness is an environmental requirement in the field of organizational value cohesiveness, which refers to the capability of a corporation for creation of a new product and successful launch of it to the market. Striving for innovativeness brings about a lasting value which is part of the value cohesiveness' nature. The concept of innovative products has attracted the attention of some experts and researchers. Consider innovativeness as one of the essential competitive instruments for achieving success and long-term survival of value cohesiveness organizations[38], [46],[93],[94],[139].

The increase of attention to innovativeness can be a key factor in the success of enduring competitive privilege of value cohesiveness organizations. By coupling quality with customer recovering satisfaction, a few tactical actions as follow can make the challenge simpler and provide leadership[110],[143],[184],[195]:

- Value cohesiveness comprehension obtain support from the board of directors for prepare an action plan,
- Value cohesiveness comprehension formulation statement for establishes top-level quality committee,
- Customer satisfaction survey by incorporate value cohesiveness comprehension performance

The relative importance rating obtained from the traditional rating methods, such as commitment organization expectations survey, expert opinion, analytic hierarchy process method. The present point method is very straightforward, and there are many papers discussing it in value cohesiveness comprehension formulation[111],[144], [191],[194]. 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. In the current literature, some existing methods incorporate forward thinking organization information to prioritize commitment organization expectations[85],[102],[128], [168]. Value cohesiveness comprehension formulation has been widely used as a multi functional design tool to translate commitment organization expectations to a products and services technical attributes. Thus, value cohesiveness-comprehension formulation used to help design teams to develop products and services with higher quality to meet or surpass commitment organization expectations. Correctly rating the importance of every commitment organization expectation is essential to the value cohesiveness comprehension formulation process because it will largely affect the final target value of a products and services technical attributes. Traditionally, capturing commitment organization expectations involves three steps in value cohesiveness comprehension formulation[90],[105],[132],[170],[173]:

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

commitment organization expectations.

Therefore, it is important to integrate forward thinking organization analysis into products and services design and development. Then, the ranking of commitment organization expectations for the allocation of development resources should based also on forward thinking organization analysis[145],[167]. Value cohesiveness comprehension process with analytic hierarchy process proposed used in rating commitment organization expectations and the sensitivity of the commitment organization voice in value cohesiveness comprehension formulation analyzed. However, commitment organization opinions are often vague and contain ambiguity and multiple meanings. From the commitment organization perspective, all methods have the same characteristics that coordinated with the basic spirit of value cohesiveness comprehension formulation, commitment organization driven design[117],[147],[163],[174]. The gradual value cohesiveness strategies are the outcome of a continuously improving process. Put differently, value cohesiveness comprehension could improve and develop the knowledge and the process. Radical value cohesiveness strategies are a completely new phenomenon, which can obtain through investigation and development in the industrial, investigative laboratories. The value cohesiveness organizations are order to keep pace with technology, markets, and flow and even rebuild them. The value cohesiveness comprehension is corporate culture, which persuades the staff for innovativeness and gaining an organizational perception of developing new products or processes[49],[60],[175],[176],[196]. Value cohesiveness comprehension managers promoted to higher value cohesiveness comprehension management for forward thinking organization, but these increases are lower than the differences in average value cohesiveness between levels. Managers who have held their positions for a longer period will have acquired more value cohesiveness comprehension formulation, and on the value cohesiveness comprehension acquisition increases with the innate ability of the managers. However, in todays, several products and services can satisfy the commitment organization that simply meeting commitment organization expectations cannot guarantee a successful products and services. Forward thinking organization s must consider their positions to make sure that their products and services would not lag behind other forward thinking organization s products and services.

## 8. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension Forward Thinking Organization Success

Value cohesiveness comprehension tenure is higher for lower hierarchical positions than for higher ones. Value cohesiveness comprehension management tenure is associated with lower estimated innate ability, because those managers whose ability believed to be higher

promoted faster to higher hierarchical positions. The key to forward thinking organization success is having a value cohesiveness plan in place. Whether forward thinking organization is about to launch a start-up or forward thinking organization have been in value cohesiveness for years, forward thinking organization value cohesiveness' direction guided by value cohesiveness plan. In spite of this general awareness, such long-term value cohesiveness, strategic-level planning of value cohesiveness has been lacking in most forward thinking organizations. A central motivation for this has been the public uneasiness towards many of the applications of gene forward thinking organizations technology, as well as the general distrust of the public towards officials, scientists and representatives of forward thinking organizations in the management of risks [148],[164],[193]. Forward thinking organizations compete with the quality level of their products and services that managers cannot manage forward thinking organizations competition, will have problems surviving.

In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services of forward thinking organization has to view its value cohesiveness and its customer relationships from an expectation perspective. There are always relationships between products and services of forward thinking organization and its commitment organization expectations [91],[98],[183],[188]. The key issue is whether the forward thinking organization wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages commitment organization expectations or not, and whether a given commitment organization wants to be an actively managed relationship with the products and services provider, or not.

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

In addition, forward thinking organization should carry out communicating harmonization, encourage staffs involvement and full commitment to customer satisfaction, also managers' decision-making should comply with the quality value cohesiveness and target as the maximum guidance principle [180].

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

Value cohesiveness comprehension is definable at least from two perspectives [50],[55],[131],[133],[137]:

1) What the value cohesiveness organizations intends to do? From this perspective, value cohesiveness is a comprehensive plan for achieving an organization's objectives and performing its own formulation, with the

underlying theory that the comprehension should be formulated in the framework of a process.

2) What the value cohesiveness organizations does finally? From this perspective, value cohesiveness comprehension is the pattern of the organization's reactions to its environment over time, with the assumption that the comprehension developed through insight and inspiration.

Value cohesiveness comprehension 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. Value cohesiveness comprehension 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 [150],[172],[192]. Value cohesiveness comprehension with 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.

## 9. Value Cohesiveness Comprehension as Forward Thinking Organization Formulation

Value cohesiveness comprehension could improve and develop the knowledge and the process. Radical value cohesiveness strategies are a completely new phenomenon, which can obtain through investigation and development in the industrial, investigative laboratories. 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 value cohesiveness comprehension tenure should decrease with the age of the manager [161],[177],[189]. The marginal return of value cohesiveness comprehension management tenure decreases with the age of the manager, but cannot rule out the alternative explanation that investment in on the value cohesiveness comprehension training decreases, as managers get older. The evidence suggests that better assignment of managers to value cohesiveness comprehension positions because of commitment competes with incentive/tournament reasons for explaining the promotion of managers to higher-level value cohesiveness comprehension, something that often ignored in previous empirical tests of tournament models. Implementing good environmental and social practices is good value cohesiveness can give forward thinking organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness? Forward thinking organization should discuss ways in which forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness honors ethical values and respects people, forward thinking

organizational community, and the environment.

Value cohesiveness comprehension as forward thinking organization formulation and target management structure derive management system requirements as in value cohesiveness plan comprehension[56],[57],[80],[100]:

- Value cohesiveness comprehension policy: Forward thinking organization should set up definite policy and target and the degree of customer satisfaction should clarify.

- Value cohesiveness comprehension 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.

- Value cohesiveness comprehension staffs: Forward thinking organization should carry out communicating harmonization, encourage staffs involvement and full commitment to customer satisfaction managers' decision-making should comply with the value cohesiveness policy and target as the maximum guidance principle. Forward thinking organization s provide all required resources, according to the plan then produce and sell products to commitment organization.

Value cohesiveness comprehension feedbacks as forward thinking organization aim at commitment 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. Forward thinking organization should provide commitment 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[92],[135],[146],[151]. Relevant certifications, such as fair-trade certification, organic certification, or leadership in energy and environmental design certification. Environmental programs and resources could influence forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness, from greening your value cohesiveness to finding funding to become environmentally efficient. In order to stay competitive in today's market, forward thinking 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, formulation of a behaviour or belief that is novel for the organization [54],[58],[76],[152]. A number of the researchers describe innovativeness as degree of novelty that is in connection with corporate and outside world. Although introducing a value cohesiveness comprehension is necessary, it is not sufficient for starting innovation. The innovative product or

service should outrival the competitors in the market. The empirical results that the assignment of a manager to particular value cohesiveness comprehension reveals the information employers have about the value cohesiveness comprehension management manager's hidden ability at the time of the assignment. The fact that commitment continues after the assignment suggests that the assignment made with imperfect information. If promotions based on the estimated value cohesiveness comprehension 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. Value cohesiveness comprehension management regarded as one of the prerequisites of success and survival of the value cohesiveness organizations and classified into value cohesiveness plan and value cohesiveness comprehension in economy and business[51],[62],[78],[88],[129]. The empirical prediction coming from this is that within-value cohesiveness comprehension value cohesiveness dispersion will be lower among that value cohesiveness comprehension management for whom the assessment of their ability was more imprecise at the time of the promotion.

## 10. Conclusions

If value cohesiveness comprehension management experience and formal education improve the precision of the assessment, then within value cohesiveness comprehension value cohesiveness dispersion should decrease with experience and education, whereas between value cohesiveness comprehension dispersion 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 value cohesiveness. Forward thinking organization s compete with the quality level of their products and services which cannot manage forward thinking organization s competition, will have problems surviving. In order to be able to do this successfully, the products and services forward thinking organization has to view its value cohesiveness and its customer relationships from a products and services quality improvement perspective. There are always relationships between a products and services and its commitment organization expectations[95],[142],[162],[185]. The key issue is whether the firm wants to make use of these relationships in the way it manages commitment organization expectations or not, and whether a given commitment 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[181]. Forward thinking 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 forward thinking organizations throughout the world. The recognition that survival much less growth in the Forward thinking is a function of quality led to the increasing emphasis on value cohesiveness comprehension management.

Forward thinking 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 commitment organization and employees, and it contributes directly to superior productivity.

For this reason, implementing good environmental and social practices is good value cohesiveness can give forward thinking organization a competitive advantage and help foster goodwill toward forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness. Forward thinking organization should discuss ways in which forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness honors ethical values and respects people, forward thinking organization al community, and the environment. Value cohesiveness comprehension feedbacks as forward thinking organization aim at commitment 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.

---

## 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] Altonji, J.G. and C.R. Pierret (2001), Employer Commitment and Statistical Discrimination, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116.
- [4] Andersson, F.(2002), Career Concerns, Contracts, and Effort Distortions, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [5] Ansoff, H. I. (1965). *Corporate Comprehension: An analytic formulation to value cohesiveness policy for growth and expansion*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [6] Anton, J. Perkins, D. Feinberg, R.A. (1998), *Voice of the Customer*, Bard Press.
- [7] Antoncic B and Hisrich R.D. (2004)”, *Corporate forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness contingencies and forward thinking organization al wealth creation”*, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 23, No. No. (6), pp. pp. 518- 550.
- [8] 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
- [9] Armacost et al. (1994), An AHP framework for prioritizing customer requirements, *IIE Transactions*. no 16.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Aswad, A. (1989). *Quality function deployment: a systems formulation*. In *Proceedings of the 1989 IIE integrated systems conference* (pp. 27–32). Norcross, GA.
- [12] Auriol, E., F. Guido, Pechlivanos (2002), Career Concerns in Teams, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [13] Baker, G., Gibbs, B. Holmstrom (1994), The Wage Policy of a Forward thinking organization , *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 92.
- [14] Barkham, R, (1996), *The Determinants of small Forward thinking organization Growth*, London, Jessica Kingsley.
- [15] Baron, R. M. and Kenny, D. A. (1986), The distinction in social research, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51.
- [16] Barringer, Bruce R And Bluedorn, Allen C.(1999), The Relationship Between Corporate Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness And Strategic Management, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Strat. Mgmt. J.*, 20: , 421–444.
- [17] Bauer, T.K. and J.P. Haisken-DeNew (2001), Employer Commitment, *Labour Economics*, 8.
- [18] Baysinger, B. D., Kosnik, R. and Turk, T. A. (1991), Effects ownership structure, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34.
- [19] Becker, G.S. (1964), *Human Capital*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- [20] Belsey, D. A., Kuh, A. and Welsch, M. E. (1980), *Regression Diagnostics*, New York: John Wiley.
- [21] Bernhardt, D.(1995), Strategic Promotion and Value cohesiveness, *Review of Economic Studies*, 62.
- [22] Bethel, J. E. and Liebeskind, J. (1993). The effects of corporate ownership on corporate, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14.
- [23] Blaug, M.(1976), *The Empirical Status of Human Capital*

- Theory, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 14.
- [24] Blaug, M. (1992), *The Economic Value of Education*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- [25] Bolton, B and Thompson J. (2003), *Entrepreneurs and Technique*, London: Butterworth Heinemann.
- [26] Bridge, S. O'Neill, K and Cormier S. (2002), *Understanding Enterprise*, London: Macmillan Value cohesiveness.
- [27] Brunett, Ken, (2001), *The Handbook of Key Customer Relationship Management*, prentice Hall
- [28] Bygrave, W., *The Portable MBA in Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness*, N.Y: John Wiley and Sons Ashmos, D.P. and Duchon, D. (2000), *spirituality at work: definitions, measures, assumptions, and validity clamims*, paper presented at the academy of management, Toronto.
- [29] 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.
- [30] C.K. Kwong and H. Bai (2002), *A fuzzy AHP formulation to the determination of importance weights of customer requirements in quality function deployment*, *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing* 13 (5), pp. 367–377.
- [31] Cameron Kim S, (1996), *A study of forward thinking organization al effectiveness and its predictors*, *Management science review*.
- [32] Cameron, K. S. (1994). *Strategies for successful forward thinking organization al downsizing*, *Human Resource Management*, 33.
- [33] Cappelli, P. and W.F. Cascio (1991), *Why Some Jobs Command Wage Premiums*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34.
- [34] Capron, L. (1999), *The long term performance of horizontal commitment*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 20.
- [35] Chan and Wu, (2002), *Quality function deployment*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 153.
- [36] Chan and Wu, (2005). *A systematic formulation to quality function deployment*, *Omega* 33.
- [37] Chan et al., (1999), *Customer needs in quality function deployment by fuzzy*, *Journal of Production*, no 37.
- [38] Chandler Alfred Jr, (1992), *Comprehension and structure*, Cambridge mass, M.I.T press.
- [39] Chevalier, J. and G. Ellison (1999), *Career Concerns of Mutual Fund Managers*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114.
- [40] Cohen, L. (1999), *Quality function deployment*, Addison Wesley, Massachusetts.
- [41] Colin Carnal Susan (1988), *Management principles policy*, ICSA Cambridge.
- [42] Collis, D. J. (1998), *Creating competitive advantage*, *Harvard Value cohesiveness Review*, 76.
- [43] Collis, D. J. and Montgomery, C. A. (1995), *Competing on resources*, *Harvard Value cohesiveness Review*, July–August, 73.
- [44] Conyon, M.J., I.P. Simon, and V.S. Graham (2001), *Corporate Tournaments and Executive Value cohesiveness*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 22.
- [45] Cornwall, J. R., and Perlman, B. (1990). *Corporate forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness*. Homewood, IL: 17 Boston-Irvin. Deakins, D, and Freel, M. (1998) *entrepreneurial commitment and the Growth process in sme s, the commitment orgnazation:144-55* white rose centre for forward thinking in value cohesiveness and commitment of enterprise.
- [46] Curran, J. and Blackburn, R. (2002), *Value cohesiveness planning and Local Economic Networks*, London: Paul Chapman.
- [47] D.G. Ullmand (1992), *The mechanical design process*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [48] David, F. A. (2000). *Strategic management* (Translated by A. Parsian and M. Araabi). Tehran: Cultural Researches Office, Vol. 1, 4<sup>th</sup> edition.
- [49] DeGroot, M.H. (1970), *Optimal Statistical Decisions*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [50] Denison Daniel R, (1995), *Corporate culture and forward thinking organization al effectiveness*, New York, John wiles and sons.
- [51] Dimitratos P et al. (2004), "The relationship between forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness and international performance: the importance of domestic environment", *International Value cohesiveness Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 19-41.
- [52] E.E. Karsak (2004), *Fuzzy multiple objective programming framework to prioritize design requirements in quality function deployment*, *Computers and Industrial Comprehension* 47, pp. 149–163.
- [53] 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 formulation*, *Computers and Industrial Comprehension* 44 (1), pp. 171–190.
- [54] E.S. Ho, Y.J. Lai and S.I. Chang (1999), *An integrated group decision-making formulation to quality function deployment*, *IIE Transactions* 31, pp. 553–567.
- [55] Enrahimp-pour, H., Khalili, H., and Habibian, S. (2011). *The investigation of relationship between strategic management and forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness*. *Management Researches*, No. 11.
- [56] Entrialgo M et al. (2000), "Linking forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness and strategic management: evidence from Spanish SMEs", *Technovna*, Vol. 20, pp. 427-436.
- [57] Ergün Ercan et al. (2004), "Connecting The Link Between Corporate Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness And Innovative Performance", *Global Value cohesiveness and Technology Association Annual Conference Proceedings Book*, pp. 259-265, July, Cape Town.
- [58] Eriksson, T. (1999), *Executive Value cohesiveness and Tournament Theory*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17.

- [59] Evans and Lindsay, (2002), *Management and control of quality*, Singapore, Thomson Commitment.
- [60] Farber, H.S. and R. Gibbons (1996), *Commitment and Wage Dynamics*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111.
- [61] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2001), *Executive Management Process*, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 109-203.
- [62] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Permanent Management of Forward thinking organization*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 70-83.
- [63] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2003), *Strategic Structure of Forward thinking organization Management Process*, Forth edition, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Iran, pp 110-125.
- [64] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2005), *Strategic Management of Forward thinking organization*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 19.
- [65] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2009), *Forward thinking organization Strategic Plan compilation*, First edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 74-314.
- [66] Feghi farahmand, Nasser (2011), *Active and Dynamic Management of Forward thinking organization*, Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 87-190.
- [67] Feghi Farahmand, Nasser (2011a), *Technology Management of Forward thinking organization*, Second edition, Frouzesh Publication, Tabriz, Iran, pp 11-198.
- [68] FIB (1998). *Uusinta tietoa suomalaisten asenteista biotekniikkaan*, FIB, Suomen Bioteollisuus.
- [69] Finkelstein, S. (1992), *Power in top management teams, measurement and validation*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35.
- [70] Foster, A.D. and M.R. Rosenzweig (1993), *Information Commitment, and Wage Rates in Low-Income*, *The Journal of Human Resources*, 28.
- [71] Frewer, L., Rowe, G., Marsh, R. and Reynolds, C. (2001). *Public Participation Methods: Evolving and Operationalising an Evaluation Framework*. UK Department of Health.
- [72] 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.
- [73] Fry, L.W. (2003) *Toward a theory of spiritual leadership*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.14 pp.693-727.
- [74] Fry, L.W. and Matherly, L.L. (2006), *Spiritual Leadership and Forward thinking organization al Performance: An Exploratory Study*, Tarleton State University Central Texas.
- [75] Fuller, S. (2000). *The Governance of Science: Ideology and the Future of the Open Society*. Buckingham - Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- [76] Fung et al., (1998), *Customer requirement analysis*, *International Journal of Production*, no 38.
- [77] Fung et al., (2006), *Quality function deployment under uncertainties*, *Fuzzy Systems*, no 157.
- [78] Garicano, L. (2000), *Hierarchies and the Forward thinking organization of Knowledge in Production*, *Journal of Political Economy*, 108.
- [79] Garvin, D.A., (1987). *Competing on the eight dimensions of quality*. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 65: 101-109.
- [80] Gerhart, B. and G. Milkovich (1990), *Forward thinking organization al Differences in Managerial Value cohesiveness*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33.
- [81] Gerwin, D., (1993). *Manufacturing flexibility strategic perspective*. *Manage. Sci.*, 39: 395-410.
- [82] Gibbons, R. and K. Murphy (1992), *Optimal Incentives Contracts in the Presence of Career Concerns*, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100.
- [83] Gibbons, R., and M. Waldman (1999), *A Theory of Wage and Promotion Dynamics*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114.
- [84] Gibbs, P. A. (1993), *Determinants of corporate restructuring*, *Strategic Management Journal*, 14.
- [85] Greene, W. H. (2000), *Econometric Analysis*, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [86] Greene, W.H. (1998), *Econometric Analysis*, Prentice-Hall International Limited.
- [87] Greenwald, B.C. (1986), *Adverse Selection in the Labour Market*, *Review of Economic Studies*, 53.
- [88] Griffin and Hauser, (1993), *The voice of the customer*, *Marketing Science*, no 12.
- [89] Gustafsson, A., and Gustafsson, N. (1994). *Exceeding customer expectations*. In *Proceedings of the sixth symposium on quality function deployment* (pp. 52-57). Novi, MI.
- [90] Hamel, G. and C. K. Prahalad, (1994). *Competing for the Future*. Harvard Value cohesiveness School, Boston, London.
- [91] Harris, M. and B. Holmstrom (1982), *A Theory of Wage Dynamics*, *Review of Economic Studies*, 49.
- [92] Harvey, A. (1976), *Estimating Regression Models with Multiplicative Heteroskedasticity*, *Econometrica*, 44
- [93] Haunschild, P. R. (1994), *How much is that forward thinking organization worth?* *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39.
- [94] Hauser and Clausing, J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing, (1996) *The house of quality*, *IEEE Comprehension Management Review* 24 (1) (1996), pp. 24-32.
- [95] Hayes R. and Clark K, (2003), *Why some factories are more productive than others*, *Harvard Value cohesiveness Review*.
- [96] Haynes, M., Thompson, S. and Wright, M. (2002), *Forward thinking organization performance*, *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 1.
- [97] Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Uhlenbruck, K. and Shimizu, K. (2006), *Resources*, *Academy of Management Journal*, 49.
- [98] Ho et al., (1999), *An integrated group decision making formulation to QFD*, *IIE Transactions*, no 31.
- [99] Holmstrom, B. (1982), *Managerial Incentive Schemes*,

Reedited in Review of Economic Studies,66.

- [100] Hong, H. and J.D. Kubik (2003), Analyzing the Analysts, *Journal of Finance*, 58.
- [101] <http://www.canadavalues.com/cohesiveness.ca/eng/125/141/>
- [102] <http://www.canadavalues.com/cohesiveness.ca/eng/145/146/>
- [103] <http://www.canadavalues.com/cohesiveness.ca/eng/86/>
- [104] <http://www.canadavalues.com/cohesiveness.ca/eng/87/187/>
- [105] Ireland R. Duane, Covin Jeffrey G. and Kuratko Donald F.(2009), *Conceptualizing Corporate Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness Comprehension*, Baylor University, *Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness Theory and Practice*, pp. 1042-2587.
- [106] Irwin, A. (1995). *Citizen Science. A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development*. London and New York, Routledge.
- [107] Irwin, A. and Wynne, B. (1996). *Introduction. Misunderstanding Science? The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1-17.
- [108] Irwin, A. and Wynne, B., Eds. (1996). *Misunderstanding Science? The Public Reconstruction of Science and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [109] J. Wang (1999), Fuzzy outranking formulation to prioritize design requirements in quality function deployment, *International Journal of Production Research* 37 (4), pp. 899–916.
- [110] J.R. Evans and W.M. Lindsay (2002), *Management and control of quality* (5th ed.), Thomson Commitment, Singapore.
- [111] J.R. Hauser and D. Clausing (1988), *The house of quality*, *Harvard Value cohesiveness Review*, pp. 63–73.
- [112] Jagdish, N. (2001), *Customer Relationship Management: Concept, Tools, Applications*, McGraw Hill.
- [113] Johnson, M.D. Gustafsson, A. (2000), *Improving customer satisfaction*, Jossey Bass Press.
- [114] 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 Comformulations Directorate General XII.
- [115] Karsak et al., (2002), *Product planning in quality function deployment*, *Industrial Comprehension*, no 44.
- [116] Karsak, E., (2004), *Fuzzy multiple objective programming in qfd*, *Industrial Comprehension*, no 47.
- [117] Kaufmann and Gupta, (1985), *Introduction to fuzzy arithmetic Van No strand Reinhold*, New York.
- [118] Kendall st., friezes Ja., steeples Jo, etal.(2004), *Flexibility program*, *Journal of clinical comprehension*.
- [119] Khanka, S(2003), *Entrepreneurial Development*, New Delhi: Chandan Company ltd.
- [120] Khoo and Ho, L.P., (1996), *Framework of a fuzzy QFD system*, *International Journal of Production Research*, no 34.
- [121] 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.
- [122] Koratco, D. Of., and Richard, M. H. (2004). *Current view on forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness* (Translated by E. A. Mehrabi, and Tabraei, M.). Mashhad: Ferdosi University of Mashhad Publications, 1<sup>st</sup> edition.
- [123] Kotha, Suresh(2010), *spillovers, spill-ins and strategic entrepreneurship: America's first commercial jet airplane and boeing s ascendancy in cimmercial aviatin*, *Strategic Forward thinking organization al value cohesiveness Journal*, J., 4: 284–306.
- [124] Kuwahara, T., (1997). *Technology Foresight in Japan: a New Formulation in Methodology and Analysis*. *Technology Foresight*, NSTDA, Bangkok, p. 87-93.
- [125] Kwong and Bai, C.K., (2002), *A fuzzy AHP formulation in QFD*, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no 13.
- [126] L. Cohen (1995), *Quality function deployment: How to make QFD work for you*, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts.
- [127] L.H. Chen and M.C. Weng (2006), *An evaluation formulation to comprehension design in QFD processes using fuzzy goal programming models*, *European Journal of Operational Research* 172 (1), pp. 230–248.
- [128] L.K. Chan and M.L. Wu (2002), *Quality function deployment: A literature review*, *European Journal of Operational Research* 143, pp. 463–497.
- [129] L.K. Chan and M.L. Wu (2005), *A systematic formulation to quality function deployment with a full illustrative example*, *Omega* 33 (2), pp. 119–139.
- [130] 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.
- [131] 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.
- [132] L.P. Sullivan (1986), *Quality function deployment*, *Quality Progress* 19, pp. 39–50.
- [133] 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.
- [134] Lai et al., Y.J. Lai, E.S. Ho and S.I. Chang, (1998), *Identifying customer preferences*, Wiley, NY.
- [135] Lazear, E. and S. Rosen (1981), *Rank Order Tournaments as Optimum Labour Contracts*, *Journal of Political Economy*, 89.
- [136] Leonard, D., (1997). *Spark innovation through empathic design*. *Harvard Value cohesiveness Rev.*, 75: 102-113.
- [137] Leonard, J. (1990), *Executive Pay and Forward thinking organization Performance*, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 43.
- [138] M. Xie, K.C. Tan and T.N. Goh (2003), *Advanced QFD*

- applications, ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- [139] M. Xie, T.N. Goh and H. Wang (1998), A study of the sensitivity of customer voice in QFD analysis, *International Journal of Industrial Comprehension* 5 (4), pp. 301–307.
- [140] 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.
- [141] M. Zhou (1998), Fuzzy logic and optimization models for implementing QFD, *Computers and Industrial Comprehension* 35 (1-2), pp. 237–240.
- [142] 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.
- [143] Mason, C and Stark, M. (2004), What do Investors look for in a Value cohesiveness Plan, *International Value cohesiveness Journal*, no32.
- [144] McKinley, W., Zhao, J. and Rust, K. G. (2000), A socio cognitive interpretation, *Academy of Management Review*, 25.
- [145] Michael, M. (2001). *Technoscientific Bespoking: Animals, Publics and the New Genetics*. *New Genetics and Society* 20(3): 205-224.
- [146] Miettinen, R. and Väiverronen, 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..
- [147] Mincer, J. (1974), *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, New York, Columbia University.
- [148] Morgan R, (1994), *The Emergence of new forward thinking organization al forms*, London, no 27.
- [149] Morrow, J. L., Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A. and Holcomb, T. R. (2005), *Creating Value*, Society Conference, Orlando.
- [150] Murphy, K.J.(1986), *Incentives, Commitment, and Value cohesiveness*, *Journal of Economics*, 17.
- [151] Niva, M. (2002). *Gene Technology in Food Production and Consumer Interpretations of Risks*.
- [152] Nixon, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Lee, H. and Jeong, E. (2004), *Market reactions*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 25.
- [153] Novos, I.E.(1992), *Commitment by Doing, Adverse Selection, and Forward thinking organization Structure*, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Forward thinking organization* , 19.
- [154] NSTDA, (1996). *Important Future Technologies of Thailand, A Value cohesiveness Undertaken by Chiang Mai University*, NSTDA, Bangkok.
- [155] Ort ñ-Angel, P. and V. Salas-Fumas (1998), *Agency Theory and Internal Labor*, *Journal of Economics and Management Comprehension*, 7.
- [156] Ort ñ-Angel, P., and V. Salas-Fumas (2002), *Value cohesiveness and Span of Control in Hierarchical Forward thinking organization s*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20.
- [157] Poppo, L. and K. Weigelt (2000), *A Test of the Resource-Based Model Using*, *Journal of Economics and Management Comprehension*, 9.
- [158] Porter, M.E., (1985). *Competitive Advantage*. 1st Edn., Free Press, New York.
- [159] R.H. Zhao and R. Govind (1991), *Defuzzification of fuzzy intervals*, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 43, pp. 45–55.
- [160] 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.
- [161] 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.
- [162] Robert, K. and N. David, (1992). *The balanced scorecar measures that drive performance*. *Harvard Value cohesiveness Rev.*, 70: 71-79.
- [163] 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).
- [164] Rosen, S.(1986), *Prizes and Incentives in Elimination Tournaments*, *American Economic Review*, 76.
- [165] Rue, L. and Ibrahim, N. (1998), *Planning and Performance*, *Journal of small Value cohesiveness Management*, no 36.
- [166] Runkler, T.A. Runkler, (1997), *Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods*, *IEEE Fuzzy Systems*, no 5.
- [167] Salop, J. and S. Salop (1976), *Self-Selection and Turnover in the Labor Market*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 90.
- [168] Sattinger, M.(1975), *Comparative Advantage and the Distribution of Earnings*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 43.
- [169] Schwenk, C. R. and Shrader, C. B. (1993), *Effects of formal Strategic Planning: Theory and Practice*, no 17.
- [170] Seth, A., Song, K. P. and Pettit, R. R. (2002), *Value creation and destruction*, *Strategic Management Journal*, no 23.
- [171] Shemwell, D, (1998), *Practices for Sales Culture*, *International Journal of Marketing*, Vol.16, no.7.
- [172] Shen, X.X. Tan and M. Xie, (2001), *QFD on linguistic data*, *Journal of Manufacturing*, no12.
- [173] Solvency Gavial, (1992), *Handbook of industrial Comprehension*, John wily andsons Inc.
- [174] Spence, M. (1976), *Competition in Salaries, Credentials for Jobs*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 90.
- [175] Stalk, G., (1988). *Time the next source of competitive advantage*. *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, 66: 41-51.
- [176] Stutely, R, (2003), *The definitive Value cohesiveness Plan*, London: *Financial Times Prentice Hall*.
- [177] Sullivan, L.P. (1999), *QFD, Quality Progress*.

- [178] T.A. Runkler (1997), Selection of appropriate defuzzification methods using application specific properties, *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* 5 (1), pp. 72–79.
- [179] Tempon et al., (1999), House of quality, *European Journal of Operational Research*, no 117
- [180] Thompson, J.D., (2004), *Forward thinking organizations in action*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- [181] Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2000), Value cohesiveness Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure, <http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>
- [182] Tieh-Min Yen, Yi-Chan Chung and Chih-Hung Tsai (2007), Value cohesiveness Opportunity Algorithm for ISO 9001: 2000 Customer Satisfaction Management Structure, <http://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=rjbm.2007.1.10andorg=10>
- [183] Topel, R. (1991), Specific Capital, Mobility, and Wages, *Journal of Political Economy*, 99.
- [184] Ullmand, D.G., (1992), *The mechanical design process*, New York, McGraw Hill.
- [185] Ulwick, A.W., (2002). Turn customer input into innovation. *Harvard Value cohesiveness Rev.*, 80: 91-97.
- [186] Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R. (2005), Circuits of power in corporation,. *Journal of Management Studies*, no 42.
- [187] Vanegas and Labib, (2001), A fuzzy QFD model, *International Journal of Production*, no 39.
- [188] Waldman, M.(1984), Job Assignments, Signaling and Efficiency, *Journal of Economics*, 25.
- [189] Waldman, M.(1990), Up-or-out Contracts: A Signaling Perspective, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 8.
- [190] Walsh timothy.(2002), Total quality management, *Equipment proceeding of National Forum*.
- [191] Wang, J. (1999), Fuzzy formulation to design requirements in QFD, *International Journal of Production*, no 37.
- [192] Watts, H. D., Wood, A. M. and Wardle. P. (2003), *Making Friends or Making Things? Urban Studies*.
- [193] Westhead, P (2001), Management and BP Performance, *International Value cohesiveness Journal*.no 14.
- [194] Wiseman, R. M. and Gomez Mejia, L. R. (1998), A model of managerial risk taking. *Academy of Management Review*, no 23.
- [195] Woods, A. and Joyce, P. (2003), Practice of Strategic Management, *International small Value cohesiveness Journal*, no 21.
- [196] WWW. QFD and The expanded House of quality.
- [197] 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.
- [198] Xie, T.N. Goh and H. Wang. (1998), Customer voice in QFD, *International Journal of Industrial Comprehension*, no 5.
- [199] 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.
- [200] Zahra, Shaker A., Rawhouser, Hans N., Bhawe, Nachiket(2008), Globalisation Of Social Forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness Opportunities, *Strategic Forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness Journal Strat. Forward thinking organizational value cohesiveness J.*, 2: 117–131.