



Study the extent and rating f. Rules (based on russel ikof model) (Case study: organization of Education, General Department of cooperation, work and social welfare (GDCWS), General Department of Technical and vocational Education (GDTV) and organization of Industry, Mine and Business (OIMB) of Chahrmahal & Bkhtiari)

*Imad Eghbal Saidi**

Student of M.A degree in Governmental management Revolution management approach in Islamic Azad University Dehaghan Branch, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25 Jan 2018

Received in revised form 28 May 2018

Accepted 15 July 2018

Keywords:

Error,

Descriptive,

Rating the error of managers,

Ch&B,

Likert spectrum.

ABSTRACT

Objective: Error and mistake are an integral part of man life and in the other hand, importance and extent of mistakes is a necessary category. In fact, position of the individuals determines the extent of the mistakes. Managers are a stratum of the society who should take mistakes less than other people, because their mistake can damage wide variety of people. In the present age because of wide and rapid dynamics and also of disturbed elevate governed on the functions, it is so necessary for the organizations to have the leaks test and error in their managerial area. **Methodology:** The aim of the present paper is to study the extent and rating of F. rules (common errors among the managers of organizations of Education, GDCWS, GDTV and OIMB of Ch&B). **Results:** The research is in descriptive and scaling method; measurement tool is a researcher- made question are including 67 question in term of 5-item Likert spectrum. Data was analyzed in descriptive and inferential levels. **Conclusion:** Results showed that the extent of error resulted from command other than request, extent of error resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching, error resulted from attention to the errors of personnel, error resulted from excess attention to refining and control, error resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills and error resulted from inability to standards among the governmental managers of Ch&B is more than medium and errors resulted from equal management on the individuals, lack of employing counselor and recourse of personnel, lack of confidence in personnel, emphasis on minor issues and unequal submission of the works to the persons are less than medium.

1. Introduction

Successful people are those who because of having adequate information about various aspects of intended issue, benefit from correct and timely decision-making skill. Certainly, decision making process depends on necessary and required information. More this information be complete, new and up to date, more is the possibility of correct and timely decision making. Then, sensitive and significant role of decision- making in the human beings can't be ignored. Meanwhile, decision- making role of the managers in the organizational area shouldn't be rejected because their decision- making is closely related to cultural, political, social, administrative, technical and economic issues is micro- and macro – levels. Then, their role in decision making is more sensitive and important.

According to practical and field observations in the government body especially in general departments and organizations of Ch&B, Iran, it seems that one of the major effective factors on underdevelopment of this province is weak efficiency of administrative departments and governmental institutes.

* Corresponding author: ie.saidi@iranmail.edu

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24200/jsshr.vol6iss03pp7-15>

Managerial system efficiency is the most significant factor. Because of presence of common mistakes and errors among the managers, some destructive and wrong procedures have been changed in to necessary to- do- unwritten cultures which repeal are damaging the function of the organizations and institutes, finally resulting in decreased productivity in whole society. In this respect, it is necessary to identify and rate the extent of the most important common errors and mistakes among the managers of this province based on F rules (common errors among the managers of administrative departments) to present the practical suggestions, prevent this errors from reoccurrence among experienced managers and also present a suitable guideline for young managers of these organizations.

Today, management is one of the basic elements to manage the societies since suitable combination of the available factors and coordinating them is obtained from correct decision-making for attaining at intended aim. Basic essence of management is decision making. For fulfilling his tasks, including planning, organizing, managing, coordinating and controlling, each manager should make decisions. Decision- making means selection in all everyday life condition of the man (Naghavi et al., 2012). Decisions were made for attaining the aims and with regarding to the available resources. Decision – making determines the type of the aims and manner of their realization. Then, decision- making is a mechanism which includes all organizational activities and effects on organizational members as individually or a member of group (Seryasat et al., 2014).

Price (2010) introduced 13 common mistakes among the managers. These mistakes include:

1. Lack of responsibility,
2. Inability to make the required bed for flaring the talents of personnel,
3. Excess attention to refining and controlling the activities and less attention to the effective factors on the functions,
4. Joining a unsuitable group,
5. Equal managing the individuals without considering different conditions and talents of the personnel,
6. Ignoring the importance of benefit,
7. Emphasis on minor issues instead of organizational aims,
8. Expression of dual behavior in the manager,
9. Inability to make standards,
10. Failure in training the personnel,
11. Ignoring the deficiency of the personnel (as results).
12. Appreciate only the prominent personnel and disregarding the other personnel,
13. Attempt at governing on the others.

Rodríguez et al. (2012) have introduced 10 common mistakes among human resource managers and personnel which result in mistake in performance evaluation and presented a pattern about avoiding these common mistakes. They include:

1. Spend more time for evaluating the performance in relation to performance planning,
2. Compare the personnel which results in vengeance,
3. Disregarding this fact that the aim of evaluation is development other than blame,
4. Believe that evaluation rate form is an objective and reflective mean for the reality,
5. Mere using the evaluation for determining the rights of personnel,
6. Believe that they are in a position to correctly perform the evaluation,
7. Delay of ability the evaluation meetings,
8. Measure or evaluate the minor issues,
9. Exciting the personnel during the evaluation,
10. Believing the evaluation of all personnel and jobs in a single method.

According to an international survey, around half of managers before charging the managerial posts haven't passed special training courses of management, in Iran this statistic is probably very higher than this value. Azimi has introduced a list of common mistakes in new comer managers as the following.

1. They suppose that know everything.

This wrong conception is resulted from lack of information about the new work. Awareness of the people about management on the man isn't complete. In managing the man, it is necessary to being ready for hearing the new statements of the surrounding people and power.

2. They attempt at showing the others. Who is the manager?

To affirm management, action and showing (affirming) the prestige of management isn't required. This is one of the most common mistakes of new comer managers specially managers of third world.

3. They attempt at changing everything. New comer managers change everything. They use on previously available method or procedure in their press series to show that all future successes are merely the product of their actions and change everything.
4. Lack of self-confident

Managers who receive their job promotion not in their own will but by their superior managers confront with lack of self-confident and fear decision – making.

5. Lack of time spent to identify workforce. Technical persons who become manager suppose that they need higher technical knowledge because of job promotion and then, try to promote the technical knowledge. While a manager should have the ability to communicate with human source
6. Don't let they do normal things.

Among the managers, this wrong conception is common that as they are managers, they should be different and shouldn't, for example, smile and express their feelings like other people this mistake may be a little less common (Jalilian et al., 2012).

7. Don't support the persons.

Human force of various units usually is accused of taking mistakes or may be criticized. Manager should support them. Abandoning them in these conditions, diminish their belonging feeling. In this respect, some managers take some mistakes and in fact in such conditions, don't support the personnel under their supervision (Wellman et al., 1982).

Tan et al. (1998) believe that some managerial skills are acquired, has studied some common mistakes among the managers, to prevent crime commitment and positively effect on their function improvement, by introducing and identifying them for the managers. These mistakes are based on the opinions of an experienced manager.

Alipour & hallaj Mohammadi (2011) introduced 10 silly errors of the managers and presented some suggestions to prevent them. They include.

1. give awards to the individuals,
2. make the things,
3. humiliate the personnel,
4. hoard the power,
5. spend very little cost in training and developing human resources,
6. spend much time in problematic factors,
7. catch the persons who destroy the affairs in act,
8. complete satisfying the customers,
9. spend very much time in work office and,
10. lack of confidence in personnel.

Robert Don ham, manager of Motorola computer systems and founder of international plan of administrative manager training, listed 14 clear mistakes of superior managers disregarding the type of industry. They include (Gertman & Blackman, 1994):

1. lack of attention to discourses of personnel,
2. Extravagance in commitment or training "dead heroes" (training the personnel who just positively answer the requests of their manager in any conditions).
3. Content with statistics and figures,
4. An obscure and unknown agreements and lack of clear standard for creating and accepting commitment and its management,
5. Considering the customer as the last priority,
6. Fear and unwilling to performance evaluation,
7. Making teams only in apparent from,
8. Managers aren't equipped with required skills and abilities,
9. Command instead of request and commitment making, 10. Inability to crating confidence,
11. Lack of clear work plan.
12. High faction severity (based on command and destroys the power and joy of the organization),
13. Lack of commitment to learning and, 14. Pessimism and fault-finding the management. According to the culture governed on this province, it seems that mistake No. 14 is so faint or may not exist in this province. Then in the present study, all cases except 14 will be used as ingredients of research conceptual model.

Them, according to the studies done by Marchant (1971), Hedayatpanah (2011), Amini & Mortazavi (2012) 13 common mistakes are used the variables constituting the conceptual model of the present study.

2. Materials and methods

The method is descriptive in scaling type. Since this investigation study the present conditions, is considered as descriptive research and since it studies the extent and rating F rules (above mentioned organizations), is in scaling type. Statistical society of the investigation includes all personnel of organization of education, GDCWS, GDTV and OIMB of Ch&B, Iran. Required sample number in this study is 169. Out of them, 150 questionnaires were returned back with return rate 88%.

Sampling method in this investigation in cluster sampling proportional to the volume, Sample number was proportional to the volume of statistical society in all 4 considered departments and randomly distributed and collected.

2.1. Methods and tools for gathering the data

Measurement tool in this investigation is questionnaire. Measurement scale of this study is likert- spectrum. Questionnaire was compiled proportional to pattern elements. Answers were ranked in likert spectrum from completely disagree to completely agree.

Questionnaire has been compiled in two parts. Part A includes demographic data and part B include specialized questions about the assumption of the investigation. This questionnaire contains 31 demographic questions and 67 specialized questions.

2.2. Methods of statistical analysis

For obtaining the results the data obtained from questionnaire, it is necessary to employ available statistical methods and techniques in the statistical software. In this study, descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used for analyzing the data. SPSS software was used. Analyzing the data was done in descriptive and inferential statistics levels.

In descriptive statistics level, redundancy, percentage, mean and standard deviation and in inferential level, Kalmogroph Smirnof, one- variable to and Heling were used.

3. Discussion and results

LiteratureCompare the mean error score resulted from command instead of request with assumption mean 3 (direct director or manager).

Table 1. Compare the mean error score resulted from command (direct director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from command instead of request | 3.37 | .973 | 4.73 | .001 |

According to the above table, observed t is significant in $P < .05$, then it seems that extent of the error resulted from command instead of request among the managers of Ch&B, Iran is more medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from command instead of request with assumption mean 3 (indirect director or manager).

Table 2. Compare the mean error score resulted from command (indirect director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from command instead of request | 3.24 | .964 | 3.16 | .002 |

According to the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that extent of error resulted from command instead of request among administrative managers of Ch&B, Iran is more than the medium.

Compare error score resulted from equal managing the individuals with assumption mean 3 (direct director or manager).

Table 3. Compare error score resulted from equal managing (direct director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from equal managing the individuals | 2.76 | 0.827 | -3.43 | 0.001 |

According to the results of above table, observed t isn't significant in $P < 0.05$ level. Then it seems that extent of error resulted from equal managing the individuals among administrative managers of Ch&B, Iran is less than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from equal managing the individuals with assumption mean 3 (indirect director or manager).

Table 4. Compare error score resulted from equal managing (indirect director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Error resulted from equal managing the individuals | 2.76 | 0.827 | -3.43 | .001 |

According the results, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it that extent of error resulted from equal managing the individuals among the administrative managers of CH&B, Iran is less than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from not- using advisor and discourse with assumption mean 3 (direct director manager).

Table 5. Compare mean error score resulted from not- using advisor (direct director manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Error resulted from not-using advisor and discourses | 2.73 | .718 | -4.49 | .001 |

According to results, of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that the extent of this error in administrative managers of Ch&B, Iran is less than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from not-using advisor and discourses with assumption mean 3 (indirect director or manager).

Table 6. Compare mean error score resulted from not- using advisor (indirect director manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Error resulted from not-using advisor and discourses | 2.89 | .875 | -7.70 | .091 |

According to the results, observed t isn't significant in $P < 0.05$. then it seems that extent of this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching with assumption mean 3 (indirect director or manager).

Table 7. Compare mean error score resulted from lack of commitment (indirect director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching | 3.15 | .844 | 2.25 | .025 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. then, it seems that extent of the error resulted from lack of commitment among administrative managers of Ch&B Iran is more than the medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching with assumption mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 8. Compare mean error score resulted from lack of commitment (indirect director or manager)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching | 3.05 | .763 | .952 | .343 |

According the results of the above table, observed t isn't significant in $P < 0.05$. then, it seems that extent of the error resulted from lack of commitment for learning and teaching among the managers of Ch&B is in medium level.

Compare the mean error score resulted from mere attention to the of the personnel with assumption mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 9. Compare the mean error score resulted from mere attention (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|---|------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Error resulted from mere attention to the errors of the personnel | 3.23 | 1.07 | 2.71 | 0.007 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. then it seems that the error resulted from mere attention to the errors of the personnel in administrative managers of Ch&B, Iran is more than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from mere attention to the of the errors of the personnel with assumption mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 10. Compare the mean error score resulted from mere attention (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|---|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from mere attention to the errors of the personnel | 3.06 | 1.15 | .367 | .525 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t in $P < 0.05$ is significant. then it seems that extent of the error resulted from mere attention the errors of the personnel among the managers of Ch&B, is in medium level.

Compare the mean error score resulted from excess attention to refining and controlling with assumption mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 11. Compare the mean error score resulted from excess attention (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from excess attention to retiming and controlling | 3.30 | .927 | 4.03 | .007 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that this error among administrative managers of Ch&B, is more than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from excess attention to refining and controlling with assumption mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 12. Compare the mean error score resulted from excess attention (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|------|
| Error resulted from excess attention to refining and controlling | 3.17 | 1.06 | 2.05 | .041 |

According to the results of the above results, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that the extent of this errors among administrative managers of Ch&B, is more than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from lack of confidence in the personnel with hypothetical mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 13. Compare mean error score resulted from lack of confidence (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|---|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from error lack of confidence in the personnel | 2.57 | .941 | -5.58 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that error resulted from lack of confidence in the personnel among administrative managers of Ch&B, is less than medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from lack of confidence in the personnel with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 14. Compare mean error score resulted from lack of confidence (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|---|------|--------------------|-------|------|
| Error resulted from lack of confidence in the personnel | 2.51 | .932 | -6.41 | .001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that the extent of the error among the administrative managers of Ch&B, is less than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from emphasis on minor issues with hypothetical mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 15. Compare the mean error score resulted from emphasis on minor issues (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from emphasis on minor issues | 2.86 | 0.888 | -1.80 | 0.074 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t in $P < 0.05$ isn't significant. Then it seems that the error resulted from emphasis on minor issues among the administrative managers of Ch&B, Iran is less than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from emphasis on minor issues with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 16. Compare the mean error score resulted from emphasis on minor issues (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from emphasis on minor issues | 2.67 | 0.821 | -4.91 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that the extent of this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills with hypothetical mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 17. Compare the mean error score resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|---|------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Error resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills | 3.29 | 1.09 | 3.33 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. then, it seems that this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is more than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 18. Compare the mean error score resulted from lack of required knowledge and skills (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Error resulted from lack of knowledge and skills | 3.40 | 1.08 | 4.61 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that the extent of this error among the managers of Ch&B is more than the medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from inability to make standards with hypothetical mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 19. Compare the mean error score resulted from inability to make standards (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Error resulted from inability to make standard | 3.25 | 1.12 | 2.73 | 0.007 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that this error among the managers of Ch&B is more than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from inability to make standards with hypothetical mean 3.

Table 20. Compare the mean error score resulted from inability to make standards (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|------|-------|
| Error resulted from inability to make standard | 3.35 | 1.11 | 3.89 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above tables, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. then, it seems that the extent of this error among the managers of Ch&B is more than the medium.

Compare mean error score resulted from looking for own survival in disagreements with hypotheatrical mean 3 (direct manager or director).

Table 21. Compare mean error score resulted from looking for own survival in disagreements (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from looking for own survival in disagreement | 2.59 | 0.957 | -5.18 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that the extent of this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from looking for own survival in disagreements with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 22. Compare mean error score resulted from looking for own survival in disagreements (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from looking for own survival in disagreement | 2.57 | 0.975 | -5.37 | 0.001 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that the extent of this error in the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than the medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from contenting with statistics and figures unequal (direct manager or director).

Table 23. Compare the mean error score resulted from contenting with statistics and figures (direct manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|--------|-------|
| Error resulted from contenting with statistics and figures | 2.93 | 0.956 | -0.786 | 0.433 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t isn't significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that the extent of the error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than the medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from contenting with statistics and figures with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 24. Compare the mean error score resulted from contenting with statistics and figures (indirect manager or director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from contenting with statistics and figures | 2.81 | 0.928 | -2.42 | 0.016 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then, it seems that the extent of this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than the medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from unequal submitting the work to the individuals with hypothetical mean 3 (direct manager of director).

Table 25. Compare the mean error score resulted from unequal submitting the work (direct manager of director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from unequal submitting the work to the individuals | 2.81 | 0.919 | -2.50 | 0.013 |

According to the results of the above table, t observed is significant in $P < 0.05$. then, it seems that this error among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than the medium.

Compare the mean error score resulted from unequal submitting the work to the individuals with hypothetical mean 3 (indirect manager or director).

Table 25. Compare the mean error score resulted from unequal submitting the work (indirect manager of director)

| | Mean | Standard deviation | t | p |
|--|------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Error resulted from unequal submitting the work to the individuals | 2.80 | 1.09 | -2.15 | 0.033 |

According to the results of the above table, observed t is significant in $P < 0.05$. Then it seems that this result among the administrative managers of Ch&B is less than the medium.

4. Conclusion

As shown in the results of statistical data, 6 out of 13 common mistakes among the managers were seen in the managers of the mentioned departments. Generally seen, it is known that most these mistakes are existed among the managers in every generation. In the other word, managers of an organization tend to follow the methods and procedures of the precedent managers and less try to present modern methods for confronting the problems and developing the organization. Unfortunately, today managerial positions of the organizations are filled with regard to the relations between higher ranks and having required skill and knowledge and adequate experience for management position is less considered. Managers are usually outcome oriented and merely look at the outcome of their personnel performance while if the method of doing work is more considered, mistakes will be rapidly identified, preventing unacceptable outcome. Also, while implementing the thesis and with regard to the opinion of the personnel, researcher noticed that the managers usually look at their personnel from up to bottom in fact they consider their position as superior than the other and most of times state their request in an imperative manner, resulting in rancor climate and lack of confidence between the boss and employee.

Ours manager can't mostly make the required standard of their organization lack of knowledge and adequate in formation, makes the ground for their inability to make standards and satirical and linear model. Finally, it can be concluded that manager only consider controlling the personnel as their task. While if they try to consider themselves as an employee and work along with him, extent of the mistake will severely be decreased and employees are so willing to perform their functions.

4.1 Suggestions

Command instead of request among the managers of the mentioned departments is one of the errors to which the personnel have given more than medium score. In fact, one of the communicative means to which all we as human being should be equipped is request skill, so that our addresser feels desirable. In this respect, following methods are proposed:

1. Selectivity and have power and authority to do or not do an action.
2. Percept the conditions of the addresser: express a statement implying we percept his/her fatigue or lack of time.
3. Detente term "task": It is better to avoid this statement that it is the task of our addresser.

REFERENCES

- Alipour, M., & hallaj Mohammadi, M. 2011. The effect of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) on achieving competitive advantage of manufacturing tractor. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(5).
- Amini, A., & Mortazavi, S. 2012. Effectiveness of psychological capital on mistake management culture as a resource for learning in organization. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(2), 339-353.
- Gertman, D. I., & Blackman, H. S. 1994. *Human reliability and safety analysis data handbook*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hedayatpanah, A. 2011. Fuzzy approach to Likert Spectrum in Classified levels in Surveying researches. *Journal of Mathematics and Computer Science*, 2(2), 394-401.
- Jalilian, Y., Jalilian, O., Hasani, S. R., Jalilian, H., Jalilian, H., & Gharb, I. 2012. Examining the relationship between activities (components) of quality management and their impact on quality outputs (case study of industrial estate Company of Kermanshah province). *Life Science Journal*, 9(4).
- Marchant, M. P. 1971. Participative management as related to personnel development.
- Naghavi, M. A. S., Asri, G. M., Ezzati, M., Zar, M., & Hosseini, S. A. 2012. Performance assessment at Irans electric power distribution company: A study based on Kanjis business excellence measurement system (KBEMS). *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(29), 8539-8547.
- Price, D. 2010. *Human error management* (Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University).
- Rodríguez, I. R., Saldana, D., & Moreno, F. J. 2012. Support, inclusion, and special education teachers' attitudes toward the education of students with autism spectrum disorders. *Autism research and treatment*, 2012.
- Seryasat, M. R., Salmani, M., Zamani, H., Karimian, T., & Seryasat, H. R. 2014. Analysis of factors affecting tourism marketing rural marketing mix model (P7) case study: district Baraghan. *Advances in Environmental Biology*, 1810-1820.
- Tan, K. C., Kannan, V. R., & Handfield, R. B. 1998. Supply chain management: supplier performance and firm performance. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 34(3), 2.
- Wellman, J. D., Dawson, M. S., & Roggenbuck, J. W. 1982. Park managers' predictions of the motivations of visitors to two National Park Service areas. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14(1), 1-15.

How to Cite this Article:

Saidi I.E., Study the extent and rating f. Rules (based on russel ikof model) (Case study: organization of Education, General Department of cooperation, work and social welfare (GDCWS), General Department of Technical and vocational Education (GDTV) and organization of Industry, Mine and Business (OIMB) of Chahrmahal & Bkhtiari), *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research* 6(3) (2018) 7–15.