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ABSTRACT

In these paper it shows that the one of most vital factor in organizations, institutes and companies is customer's satisfaction and citizen, citizen, customer honoring. In this Field of captivity customer expectations are important but how to answer to this demanding are play extremely vital role in one company there for we try to explain how to answer for customer's expectation in this article. Customer's satisfaction are the Newest and Factor of the company, organization or institute operation and it's servicing quality.

INTRODUCTION

Present era is the fast changeless technology era. Changes that if don't control them it will destroy the organization or institute all economic plane. therefore this company should match them self to this fast changeable technology by haring a special specification named continuous change and application ability', the other mean 21 century's company- organizations and institutes eternity due to make them self math with this fast change.

The change to answer it's change would destroy and make disaster. Nowadays the changer wares in different Field like global policy, technology, social surfaces, economic and problem's deficiency, customer's expectations and customer's satisfaction test are really extensive and complicated than past especially in the field of growing speed of changes. on of the successful policy and strategy of all the companies and organizations and customer's demands are customer honoring and arrest the customer's satisfaction.

The organizations that deny their customer's demands and only think about the production instead of customer's demands slowly omitted from competition. These days customer's honoring don't belong to only private sectors, also from recent years by using and declaring customer's honoring, citizen honoring in public sectors. Studding understanding of customer's satisfaction and customer satisfaction's test are crucial and have vital role of their working. Reseauzhs show the organizations that make their customer pleased from them self guarantee them self.

Way of studding by example:

The Ford Motor Company and the Avanti Motor Company both produce automobiles. You know about Ford. It builds about three million cars a year. worldwide, on an assembly-line basis. A typical Ford production line turns out forty to fifty cars per hour. In contrast, you may not have ever heard of Avanti Motors. Operating out of a plant in South Bend, Indiana, it makes high-performance luxury cars based on a twenty-five-year-old Studebaker design. Avanti hand builds each car to order, one at a time, and it turns out about thirty cars a month. Although both companies are in the automobile-manufacturing industry, they use dramatically different technologies to build their vehicles. Forgetting for a moment that Ford's size overwhelms Avanti-the former making more cars in ten minutes worldwide than the latter produces in a year-you would expect these differences to affect the structures of their respective organizations. For instance, the last, that employees do highly routine and specialized at Ford and quite loose, flexible, and interchanging at Avanti-should have a significant influence on each one's structure. And, of course, it does.

This example illustrates that the way in which an organization converts its inputs to outputs has some hearing on structure. Is it the dominant determinants of a structure or is it merely a determinant? It can be both.
As usual, however, let us begin by clarifying what we mean by the term. As with so many concepts in OT, the way in which it is defined and measured has a great deal to do with the consistency of the research surrounding it and the confidence we have in generalizing from this research. There is probably no construct in OT where diversity of measurement has produced more incompatible findings and confusion than the research on technology.

**Defining of technology:**

As long as we stay at a relatively abstract level, there is general agreement among OT researchers that technology refers to the information, equipment, techniques, and processes required to transform inputs into outputs in the organization. That is, technology looks at how the inputs are converted to outputs. There is also agreement that the concept of technology, despite its of organizations. All organizations turn inputs into outputs. Regardless of whether the organization is a manufacturing firm, a bank, a hospital, a social service agency, a research laboratory, a newspaper, or a military squadron, it will use a technology of some sort to produce its product or service.

The problem begins when we move from the abstract to the specific. At issue is basically the question, How does one measure technology? Researchers have used a number of technology classifications. A partial list would include operations techniques used in the workflow activities; characteristics of the materials used in the workflow; varying complexities in the knowledge system used in the workflow; the degree of continuous, fixed- sequence operations; the extent of automation; and the degree of interdependence between work systems. Each of these measures of technology is a bit different, and you would expect them to obtain different results even if they were applied to the same organization.

But this introduces several additional problems: varying types and sizes of organizations and different levels of analysis. Some studies have been limited to manufacturing firms. Others have included only very large organizations. Still others have been directed at the organizational level, yet tile researchers attempt to compare their findings with studies conducted at the work unit or job level. Not surprisingly, these efforts to compare apples with oranges, under the guise of fruit, or generalizing to all organizations from samples that are highly limited, might be expected to end up producing conflicting, results. And that is exactly what has happened.

**The question appeared by changes:**

Where does this leave us? To minimize confusion, we still restrict our discussion to only tile landmark contributions to the technology-structure debate. We present the three paradigms cited most frequently and evaluate the research undertaken to test their validity. The three take very different perspectives on technology, but they will give you the basics for understanding what we know about how technology affects structure. After reviewing these three positions, we tie them together, ascertain where we stand today on tile technological imperative, and determine what specific statements we can make accurately as to the impact of technology on structure.

**Personal management in technology change:**

The historical excursion permits the approach which preceded the development of specialist personnel management to be included in the model. The ‘Pre-Personnel Management’ (PPM) approach, which is still extant in many small-scale enterprises, depends upon a simple ability to recruit appropriately skilled and motivated labor from, and to return it to, the external labor market in response to the exigencies of business. Effective utilization in this phase turns upon using selection as the main mechanism of control.

The approach of the ‘mass production’ (or universal service) enterprise develops away from this, insofar as the success of the business strategy becomes dependent upon securing worker compliance with a host of work governing rules as the means of achieving ordered production of standardized products or services. This is the arena of Traditional Personnel Management (TPM), those specialists in designing rules and procedures and in securing their dissemination to, and acceptance by, the work force. It is also the arena of supervision, the process by which the rule-bound system is policed in the interests of securing the targeted levels of performance.

Organizations using this approach remain dependent upon the ability of the external labor market to supply the workers they need, even if the kind of workers sought differs. The niche-market enterprises, by contrast, depend upon the creation of an adequate labor supply by training personnel recruited at the lowest ports of entry to the teams or job hierarchies. The form taken by the labor-control strategy may, however, differ according to whether the business strategy relies mainly on cost or on differentiation considerations: in the one case, a human resource strategy which emphasizes the development of flexibility may be considered appropriate; in the other, the human resource strategy may stress the aim of developing a less differentiated team with broad problem-solving and creative capacity.

The making of a distinction of this kind seems to be warranted because few organizations can be found which have planned and implemented a long-term interventionist strategy of developing flexibility with the
dedication of IBM, Hewlett Packard, or Marks & Spencer—organizations which tend to provide the role models of FIRM. In such organizations, the 1-IRNI strategy is defined by its tendency to redefine the character or ethos of the work roles of both managerial and non-managerial employees. The widely used terms, culture, core values, and innovative performance, imply that workers are expected to display considerable autonomy in performing their work, not to react as automata to rules, procedures, and programs. These workers begin it) look more like the steady reliable artisans of a former era hired to ply their craft under minimal direction and supervision, although their crafts are now more closely related to decision taking or even managing rather than to manual operations.

Other organizations (including, for example, ICI, Unilever, BP and Shell) have adopted this approach in respect of limited occupational categories, such as managers or researchers, without necessarily extending it to cover all employees. But many more have limited their actions to increasing operational and working flexibility by providing additional training to their employees and improving the flow of information to them. The aim is to inculcate new values and new work habits in employees, but with proportionally less investment in the process and lower expectations of returns. These organizations seek a greater degree of functional flexibility, not a radically new relationship.

**Conclusions:**
1) Compliance is still an important ingredient of strategy in the field of sustainer's satisfaction, even if it is sought at a higher level.
2) If the company or organization operation in less and range lower than customer's expectation it make that institute unsuitable and slowly it will be omitted from competition.
3) Making of a distinction of this kind seems to be warranted because of organizations and in situations plane and strategy of flexible marketing.
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