Introduction

One of the main topics in the analysis of rural issues is the management of these communities. Historically, the concept of quality of life is dependent on income and education. In modern western societies people think differently about what they needed for their own welfare than the nineteenth century or the people who live in remote areas where they are expressed. Although cultural factors as living standards in a specific period of play, but economic factors are more important. When income increases, people tend to find that other elements apart from the money. What is considered in location and quality of life in rural areas are reducing exclusion, geographical reach minimum living facilities for villages that have little facilities. The variety of natural, social, economic, and spatial - physical features caused every rural area have the characteristics, capabilities, talents and limitations and its own limitations. Fundamental elements of quality of life, is influenced by four main categories of economic, social and cultural dimensions and environmental and physical. The aim of aim economic financing management is to supply capital, preventing the outflow of capital, create employment, entrepreneurship, providing markets for the sale of goods and services produced and controlled consumption and management of supply and demand. Therefore, the aim of rural management, in terms of the social concepts are empowerment, creating partnerships, community mobilization, improving laws and policies among villagers collaboration with government and business affairs of the village in order to achieve a healthy life and social justice. Approximately % 31.5 of the population live in the rural areas of the country. In the planning process is important, it is important to respect and protect the rights of the quality of life of rural management tasks, planners and administrators. Kersef village is one of the 4 districts in central Khodabandeh city that has 22 rural settlements of which 10 villages have rural municipality administrator and the rest do not have. This study seeks to assess the impact of rural municipality administrators on the quality of life Kersef residents.

Research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Do the rural municipality administrators in rural areas; affect the quality of people's lives?

2. Is there any difference between the quality of life of the villages that have no rural municipality administrators with those who have?

Materials and methods

The choice of research method is to determine what method is necessary for evaluating the subject. The choice of method depends on the research objectives and the nature of the subject and its facilities are operating. Considering the object and purpose of the study, the analytical method is used. Data collection methods, using a library of books and articles and has been used to refer to Internet-based information. For information and field questions from the questionnaire package with item 5 item Likert format was used. Two questionnaires were designed for the people and the authorities. In order to analyze the data from Excel and Spss software field has been used. According to the hypothesis of analytical and operational variables, measures have been taken which is based on the rural municipality administrator's classification performance goals quality of life in rural areas. The collected information with regard to the research hypotheses was tested. To test the hypothesis that the quality of life in villages without rural municipality administrators rural municipality administrators Yvman Whitney test was used for analysis.

Finding and results

Information obtained about ten villages rural municipality administrator's shows that 8 of them are male and 2 are female. Age, between 25-34 years, n = 7, two young people between 35-44 years and one of them is between 45-54 years old. In terms of education, 7 of them hold a diploma, and two associate degrees, and a bachelor's degree. In the following, the summary of research findings on various parameters is discussed.

. Environmental Quality

In order to assess the environmental quality of the 10 items was used. In this regard, a comparison of the mean level of environmental quality that is equal to 2/76 SD 0/5 is accept. Based on the ideas of community, environmental quality is estimate good.

. Quality of education

Having proper training and good educational facilities including new schools with good quality is one of basic rights of every human. In this regard, a comparison of educational quality, equal to 2/42 SD 0/79 comments can be accepted based on the quality of education is estimated to be moderate.

. Quality of Health and Safety

In order to assess the quality of the health and safety of the 11 items was used. In this regard, the comparison of the quality of health and safety is equals 3/06, with a standard deviation of 0/54. Suitability can be assessed above average of health and safety dim quality.

. Quality of leisure and recreation time

In this regard, a comparison of the mean survival time and quality time is 1/77 with a standard of 0/85. Comments can be accepted based on the quality of the economy are estimated to be lower than average.

. Quality of Social Networks

3 items used to measure the quality level of social networks. In this regard, a comparison of the mean level of quality residential environment with 2/01 SD is 0/84. Comments can be accepted based on the quality of the social networks on average much lower than estimated.

. Economic quality

To measure the economic quality of the 9 items used. In this regard, a comparison of the economic quality with 51/2 SD is 0/71. Comments can be accepted based on the quality of the economy are estimated to be moderate.

. Quality of infrastructure

9 items to measure the quality of the infrastructure used. In this regard, a comparison of the average level of quality infrastructure with 2/52 SD is 0/49 . Quality infrastructure in the medium was assumed to be appropriate.

. Quality of residential environment

In order to assess the quality of the residential environment of the four items are used. In this regard, a comparison of the mean level of quality residential environment with 2/96 SD is 0/79. Comments can be accepted based on the quality of the residential environment on average, slightly higher than estimated.

Non-parametric Mann-Whitney u-test at a significance level of 0/05 showed that the overall quality of life in villages without Rural municipality administrators rural municipality administrators there is a significant difference (p=0/000).

Conclusion

The new rural development programs based on the above two principles: empowerment and poverty alleviation of rural villagers. Based on the studies and the results of two major villages and quality of life assessments were discussed.

That "the quality of life in rural villages with no municipality there is no difference" hypothesis test showed that the overall qualities of life in rural areas have a higher quality of life in rural municipality is no administrators.

It seems that the village has a population of more attention rural municipality administrator's rural municipality and sparsely populated rural areas are lacking. It

stated that the villages are populated with more and more people rural municipality administrators and government support are also important.

The quality of life in rural with rural municipality administrators in infrastructure quality, environmental, health and safety, environment, housing, economic, social is better of villages with no rural municipality administrators. Only in spend quality leisure time, there was no significant difference between the two kinds of villages. The authorities pay more attention to the detailed planning and organized to give vitality to reach rural communities.

Infrastructure in the villages rural municipality administrators and there is no significant difference rural municipality administrators (p=0.005). This indicates that the subscales of the quality of life for people in rural villages with rural municipality administrators compared rural municipality administrators villages without the infrastructure of the village is less problematic.

The environmental sector is also a significant difference between villages rural municipality administrators and there is no rural municipality administrators (p=0.001). This indicates that the people in the surrounding villages than in villages without rural municipality administrator's are fewer problems in their village.

Health and Social Security subscales of quality of life, between the villages rural municipality administrators and there is no significant difference rural municipality administrators (p=0.000). This indicates that the quality of life of people in villages than in villages without rural municipality administrators of better quality.

In the economic sector, the difference between the quality of life in rural villages without rural municipality administrators is significant (p=0.000).

- It is clear that the villagers are able to play an active and not shared effectively. For this purpose, in order to provide the necessary training to their activities, the expansion of villagers in rural areas of capacity building, strengthening of social capital as well as enabling villagers to take place.

- Conservation of renewable natural assets, such as land, water, forests, exploitable;

- Improve the quality of life of rural people by strengthening production and increase competencies for social and political organization.

- Development of social services in rural areas and increased access to basic needs such as food, shelter, clothing and health measures that make the whole concept of quality of life research.

- Creating the appropriate context for public participation.

- Identify and actualize the potential in the region.

- improve the background of administrative and organizational structures.

- Construction of sports facilities in rural areas to encourage young people to exercise and avoid the tendency of the drug.