

# SERVANT LEADERSHIP, INNOVATIVE ORGANIZATION, EMPLOYEE COMPETENCY, MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE OF ORGANIZATIONS IN THAILAND ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

SURACHART KITTIKWANGTHONG <sup>1</sup>, TANAPOL KORTANA <sup>2</sup>,

THANAKORN THANATHANCHUCHO <sup>3</sup> and TEERAPONG PONGPENG <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Suan Sunadha Rajabhat University, Thailand.

E-Mail: <sup>1</sup>s61484945014@ssru.ac.th, <sup>2</sup>tanapol.ko@ssru.ac.th, <sup>3</sup>dr.thanakorn@gmail.com,

<sup>4</sup>teerapong.po@ssru.ac.th

## Abstract

During 2022 – 2023, it is expected that the expansion of Thailand electronics industry will be recovered and developed to cope with 5G technology and smart vehicles that will be as the transition of hi-tech products to be connected to various devices via internet network. The technology of Thailand electronics industry has been tardily developed and supported and cannot catch up with the rapid change of technology. Additionally, high wage rate of Thai labors causes an increase to the production cost of the electronics products and loss of competitiveness when compared with neighboring countries. Consequently, this research study aims to 1) examine significance level of the following variables; servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation and job satisfaction affecting the performance of organizations of Thailand electronics industry, 2) examine the influence of the variables; servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation and job satisfaction towards the performance of organizations in Thailand electronics industry, and 3) develop the successful model of the performance of organizations in Thailand electronics industry. The mixed research methodology was applied between quantitative and qualitative terms. In view of the quantitative term, the sample group consisted of the executives in primary level of electronics industry in Thailand industrial estates, totally 480 persons. The sample group size was based on 20-time criteria of the observed variables conducted by the multi-stage sampling. Data collection was conducted through questionnaires that were later analyzed by the structural equation modelling. For the qualitative term, an in-depth interview was undertaken with the target group of 22 informants; executives in high and middle levels of electronics industry in Thailand industrial estates. The findings revealed that 1) the variables; servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation, job satisfaction and performance of organizations were all at a high level, 2) servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation and job satisfaction affected the performance of organizations of Thailand electronics industry at statistical significance level of .05, and 3) the successful model of the performance of organizations in Thailand electronics industry as developed by the researcher was called SMICJ-PE Model (S = Servant Leadership, M = Motivation, I = Innovative organization, C = Employee Competency, J – Job Satisfaction, PE = Performance of Organizations in Thailand electronics industry). Moreover, the qualitative findings also indicated that to succeed in the performance of organizations in Thailand electronics industry, the entrepreneurs should place an importance on applying the management innovation of the smart electronics model to their productions that will be on demand in the future such as electric vehicle (EV), autonomous car or self-driving car, digital robot & artificial intelligence, diagnostic tools, aircraft parts and S-curve industries as per the government policy. In addition, concerned authorities can further apply the findings of this research for policy determination to promote and develop entrepreneurs and related personnel in electronics industry for future upgrading their sustainable potential.

**Keywords:** Electronics Industry / Servant Leadership / Performance of Organizations.

## INTRODUCTION

In the current situation, business competition has become more intense in line with globalization. Organizations must adapt to keep up with changing situations (Peng et al., 2022). As a result, there are increasing challenges in today's business operations. Corporate executives, thus, focus on the performance of the organization in accordance with important goals. Business drive and development must continue in order to gain a competitive advantage in the global market. This includes continually responding to the limitless needs of customers (Gupta, 2018).

Wong and Davey (2007), therefore, corporate executives must find new ways to drive the most effective and valuable organization's performance. Many organizations are aware of and pay attention to various factors that influence the performance of the organization as follows:

- 1) **Servant Leadership**; the organization has the expectation that the characteristics of the leader will help stimulate cooperation, trust, foresight, listening to problems and using power ethically, including developing knowledge and empowering subordinates (Peng et al., 2022).
- 2) **Innovative Organization**; the ability to innovate depends on the creativity of employees; internal operation plus being aware of organizations' strengths and weaknesses must be promoted for innovative growth and sustainable organization; choosing the most appropriate method as well as creating and assorting knowledge are a source of competitive advantage (Gupta, 2018).
- 3) **Employee Competency**: knowledge, necessary job skills, values, and motivation affect organizational effectiveness with the important aim of developing knowledge through training in both necessary skills and creating motivation or shared values in the organization (Peng et al., 2022).
- 4) **Motivation**; motivation influences the work of employees; satisfaction and happiness make the employees loved and liked in the work as well as proud of their duties so that they are attentive and committed to work for achieving objectives (Gupta, 2018).
- 5) **Job Satisfaction**; a positive attitude towards the work of employees is caused from the needs that have been met at the level that the person expected in terms of returns, work environments, supervisors, and job security (Matimu & Esther, 2018).

All of these things have a direct impact on employees, also known as human resources, who are the main force that leads the organization to success according to the goals. They help organizations gain a competitive advantage in the long term (Porter, 1990).

From the important issues and problems mentioned above, the researchers wanted to study servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation and job satisfaction affecting the corporate performance in Thailand Electronics Industry. The results of this study were directly obtained from the opinions of middle management in companies in the electronics industry in Thailand to be used as a guideline for developing organizations' competitiveness and increasing opportunities for entrepreneurs to consider additional investment.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Corporate Performance

Achieving successful operations requires a strategy and logic of operations. Performance achievement includes the output, impact, and outcome indicators (Peng et al., 2022). Performance that reflects the quality of operations and the success of operations should comprise the efficiency of operations and the effectiveness of operations and satisfaction of those involved (Russell & Stone, 2002; Kerdpitak et al., 2023). Management in organizations has an important aim in order to achieve the results that the organization desires (Russell & Stone, 2002). The management cycle for success must therefore consist of setting clear objectives and standards for success, operational planning, acting, monitoring results and evaluating work to achieve desired results (Ahmed et al, 2019; Covey, 2002).

### Servant Leadership

Servant leadership affects organizational efficiency in terms of employee performance to meet the goals. Good leadership results in the most efficient use of available resources (Covey, 2002). It can also bring out the true potential of personnel, rather than using authority to command (Daft, 2002). Most organizations in the electronics industry emphasize work that uses creativity rather than labor to produce goods and services. The new era of leadership focuses on the behavior of leaders who must lead organizational change without using authority to enforce or directing subordinates. Instead, it uses a method that focuses on stimulating and using various techniques to achieve long-term and sustainable change (Daft, 2002; Covey, 2002).

Servant leaders emphasize providing subordinates with services, including supporting operations with the belief that servant leadership is influential and can change organizations and society. It is a driving force for good in both individuals and organizations with a service heart (Daft, 2002). For example, the concept of Russell & Stone (2002) believes that servant leaders are different from general leaders in that they are the center of the minds of people in the organization and create good expectations without force or giving orders like a dictator. They also give importance to morality, including being a good role model, and have a truly relationship with followers. They, moreover, provide support and create a good working atmosphere with the organization. This is consistent with the concept of Wong & Davey (2007), which believes that in modern organizations all personnel are highly educated. There is high competition in the market. Therefore, the management style of leaders in organizations must emphasize being a service provider. Leaders must focus on teamwork, create cooperation with the community, adhere to the principles of making decisions based on morality, pay attention to the work of others, and encourage others to develop their potential in various fields.

### Innovative organization

Innovation is the invention of new things. It is the making of existing things into new things, but they cannot be substituted in every case (Trott, 2005). The starting point of innovation comes from the ability to use knowledge, creativity, skills, expertise and experience in creating

new products, processes, or services (Daft, 2002). Science and technology play an important role in transforming ideas into tangible concrete by inventing innovation (Tuan et al., 2016). Innovation is the result of applying inventions to commercial results in order to increase the value of the market or organization (Freeman, 1982; Rickards, 1985; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1972). The development of new ideas, new services, new products creation, new operating process and inventions accepted by the market bring economic benefits. In addition, new things that are developed for use in the organization and are accepted by people in the organization can be considered organizational innovation (Damanpour & Koparakeshnan, 2001).

### **Employee Competency**

Good managers must use both science and art in their work to achieve the goals they have set. Therefore, executives must have leadership and art to winning people's hearts to motivate people to be willing to cooperate or provide support. They are a facilitator of understanding for all parties and manage interpersonal conflicts and coordinate benefits for the organization by adhering to the principles of morality and ethics in management without bias. When punishing subordinates, punishment must be done with mercy without personal anger. They must know how to sacrifice personal interests for the common good, be based on reason and correctness, with clear principles, and be able to make accurate decisions to solve various problems (Zwell, 2000).

Creative leaders must be a good thinker and analyst to make things possible. They have integrative ability to solve problems effectively, have vision, and are able to see the future (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). They have managerial skills in making decisions and knowledge in using modern information to make decisions correctly and timely (Spencer & Spencer, 1993; Daft, 2002). They know and understand their powers and responsibilities in order to correctly and appropriately perform roles according to authority and duties.

They do not interfere with other people's responsibilities and have the courage to make decisions. Good executives must have strategies as an important factor that will lead the organization to success. The important qualities of the executives mentioned above will help drive, push and lead the organization to success according to the goals. Therefore, the development of executive competency is an extremely important initial process that will lead the organization to success in competition in every factor (Rosemary & Sparrow, 1992; Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

### **Motivation**

Motivation consists of three important components: 1) motivation that involves stimulating individuals to behave as desired, 2) motivation involves pushing for desired behavior to achieve an objective, and 3) motivation that tells management that what support leads to the desired behavior. Theories of work motivation are divided into 2 forms: 1) Content Theory describing the content of work and focusing on challenges, progress, opportunities, and responsibility for employees' work duties, and 2) Process Theory describing the work process and focusing on perception and understanding of work decisions (Rash & Tosi, 1992).

## **Job satisfaction**

Satisfaction is one of the important factors affecting the success of work that effectively achieves the goals set as a result of being responsive to individual motivations or needs, such as a work environment, work process, relationships with people in the organization, and compensation which affects persons (Spencer & Spencer, 1993; Jeong, Aejoon & Nian, 2014). These cause enthusiasm for work, good morality, and strivings to create the organization for maximum efficiency (Locke, 1976; Jeong, Aejoon & Nian, 2014).

Job satisfaction is results of having many values which is consistent with the needs of the person. Those important values that affect job satisfaction include: 1) a sense of challenge in the job being performed, 2) a person's direct interest in the task, 3) a task that is not very physically tiring, 4) a reward from the work performance which is consistent with the needs of the person, 5) a work environment which is in line with the physical needs of the person, 6) a feeling in the worker that he or she is valuable, and 7) an agency helping to make the worker feel that the work is valuable (Iranmanesh, 2017; Locke, 1976).

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study was an explanatory sequential mixed methods research that emphasized quantitative research as the main method. When processed and received answers from quantitative research, the qualitative research was conducted with key informants to find in-depth answers to confirm the results and provide additional explanations to complement the quantitative research. The quantitative research was started by reviewing documents, literature and related research on servant leadership, innovative organization, employee competency, motivation and job satisfaction. Then, the data was synthesized and summarized to be the definition of research terminology as well as indicators of variables according to the research framework were determined.

After that, a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire was created. Its validity and reliability of the measure were tested before collecting data from first-level executives in electronics industry companies in Thailand. The data was analyzed using structural equation modeling technique. For qualitative research, in-depth interviews were used with key informants, including senior executives and middle management in electronics industry companies in Thailand from the research question to find information according to research objective for practical implication.

The qualitative research complemented the qualitative results to provide additional knowledge about the supplementary variables that affect the performance of organizations in the electronics industry in Thailand and to confirm the findings by using data from many sources to drive quantitative research and support it with qualitative research.

## RESULTS

The normal distribution of the 24 observed variables studied in the structural equation model was examined, using the chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ). If it was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level, it means that such variables were non-normally distributed. On the other hand, if it was found to be not statistically significant (P-value > .50), it means that such variables were normally distributed.

**Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Coefficient of Variation, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Chi-square of Empirical Variables**

(n=480)

Variable	M	S.D.	%CV	Sk	Ku	$\chi^2$	P-value
VLOT	3.79	0.62	16.36	-8.199	0.158	67.241	0.000
DVLO	3.81	0.66	17.32	-9.147	1.533	86.023	0.000
RPBL	3.82	0.61	15.97	-8.731	0.964	77.168	0.000
MRET	3.80	0.66	17.37	-8.887	0.981	79.945	0.000
PDIN	3.73	0.62	16.62	-6.736	-3.772	59.600	0.000
PCIN	3.84	0.59	15.36	-8.696	0.028	75.627	0.000
MNIN	3.84	0.57	14.84	-8.643	0.039	74.698	0.000
MKIN	3.79	0.62	16.36	-8.251	0.217	68.118	0.000
ATBD	3.82	0.60	15.71	-8.705	0.964	76.714	0.000
PFMM	3.76	0.65	17.29	-7.800	-0.543	61.142	0.000
CRDV	3.71	0.71	19.14	-7.612	-1.365	59.811	0.000
KLDV	3.84	0.57	14.84	-8.590	-0.020	73.796	0.000
RETU	3.69	0.67	18.16	-6.794	-2.138	50.727	0.000
CRPT	3.77	0.61	16.18	-7.337	-2.555	60.353	0.000
WKEV	3.76	0.67	17.82	-7.944	-0.251	63.176	0.000
RESP	3.71	0.64	17.25	-6.487	-4.574	63.002	0.000
RMRT	3.52	0.70	19.89	-4.501	-3.372	31.632	0.000
OPTP	3.27	0.97	29.66	-4.073	-8.311	85.653	0.000
MNGR	3.59	0.72	20.06	-5.701	-3.477	44.593	0.000
STBL	3.89	0.60	15.42	-10.263	3.269	116.023	0.000
FINC	3.82	0.63	16.49	-8.831	1.152	79.322	0.000
INTP	3.64	0.71	19.51	-6.499	-3.097	51.821	0.000
INVT	3.68	0.67	18.21	-6.400	-5.796	74.554	0.000
LRNG	3.68	0.68	18.48	-6.750	-2.025	49.664	0.000

Note: chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) with statistical significance (P-value <.05) indicates a non-normal distribution

The construct validity of latent variables was checked using the confirm factor Analysis technique by considering standardized factor loading of greater than 30 to indicate that the empirical variable is a good factor of latent variable. In addition, the reliability of empirical variables was considered from the  $R^2$ . Moreover, construct reliability ( $\rho_c$ ) of latent variables greater than or equal to .60 and average variable extracted ( $\rho_v$ ) greater than or equal to .50 were tested (Diamantopoulos and Siguaw, 2000) as follows.

**Table 2: Confirm Factor Analysis**

(n = 480)

Variables	Factor Loading ( $\lambda$ )	Error ( $\theta$ )	t	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Servant Leadership (SVLS)</b>				
Valuing Others (VLOT)	.83	.32	21.82	.68
Developing Others (DVLO)	.93	.14	26.28	.86
Responsibility (RPBL)	.91	.18	25.31	.82
Morality and Ethics (MRET)	.84	.29	22.59	.71
<b>Innovative Organization (INOGR)</b>				
Product Innovation (PDIN)	.85	.28	21.89	.72
Process Innovation (PCIN)	.82	.33	20.71	.67
Management Innovation (MNIN)	.88	.23	23.01	.77
Marketing Innovation (MKIN)	.69	.52	16.05	.48
<b>Employee Competency (EMPP)</b>				
Attributes and Desires (ATBD)	.83	.32	21.5	.68
Performance Management (PFMM)	.93	.14	24.94	.86
Career Development (CRDV)	.90	.19	23.61	.81
Knowledge Development (KLDV)	.81	.34	20.93	.66
<b>Work Motivation (MOTIV)</b>				
Return (RETU)	.77	.41	17.89	.59
Career Path (CRPT)	.75	.44	17.93	.56
Work Environment (WKEV)	.82	.32	20.26	.68
Responsible Job (RESP)	.86	.26	21.19	.74
<b>Job Satisfaction (JBST)</b>				
Remuneration (RMRT)	.74	.45	15.49	.55
Opportunity and Progress (OPTP)	.75	.43	14.37	.57
Manager (MNGR)	.82	.33	16.83	.67
Stability (STBL)	.60	.64	12.69	.36
<b>Corporate Performance (CPRP)</b>				
Finance (FINC)	.81	.35	19.93	.65
Internal Process (INTP)	.81	.34	20.00	.66
Innovation and Technology (INVT)	.76	.42	17.51	.58
Learning and Growth (LRNG)	.84	.29	20.94	.71
$\rho_c = .88$ $\rho_v = .65$				
Chi-Square=0.00, df=0, P-value=1.00000, RMSEA=0.000				

**Table 3: Direct Effect, Indirect Effect, and Total Effect in the adjusted equation model (n=480)**

Dependent Variables	R <sup>2</sup>	Effects	Independent Variables				
			Innovative Organization (INOGR)	Employee Performance (EMPP)	Work Motivation (MOTIV)	Job Satisfaction (JBST)	Servant Leadership (SVLS)
Innovative Organization (INOGR)	.84	DE	-	-	-	-	.92*(20.42)
		IE	-	-	-	-	-
		TE	-	-	-	-	.92*(20.42)
Employee Performance (EMPP)	.51	DE	-	-	-	-	.72*(15.46)
		IE	-	-	-	-	-
		TE	-	-	-	-	.72*(15.46)
Work Motivation (MOTIV)	.51	DE	-	-	-	-	.72*(15.18)
		IE	-	-	-	-	-
		TE	-	-	-	-	.72*(15.18)
Job Satisfaction (JBST)	.92	DE	.48*(10.92)	.54*(9.03)	.48*(8.02)	-	.44*(11.97)
		IE	-	-	-	-	.37*(4.73)
		TE	.48*(10.92)	.54*(9.03)	.48*(8.02)	-	.81*(12.67)
Corporate Performance (CPRP)	.97	DE	.40*(10.27)	.30*(9.05)	.42*(9.10)	.71*(9.53)	.47*(10.93)
		IE	.34*(9.55)	.51*(8.46)	.44*(8.46)	-	.30*(4.68)
		TE	.74*(12.55)	.81*(8.73)	.86*(12.00)	.71*(9.53)	.77*(14.03)

$\chi^2 = 413.50$  df = 211 p-value = .00000,  $\chi^2 / df = 1.95$ , RMSEA = .048, RMR = .043, SRMR = .049, CFI = .98, GFI = .94, AGFI = .91, CN = 212.86

\*statistical significance at the .05 level

Note: In parentheses, they were the t-value. If the value was not between -1.96 and 1.96, it was statistically significant at the .05 level. DE=Direct Effect, IE=Indirect Effect, TE=Total Effect

The adjusted structural equation model of the effects was fit to the empirical data, considered from the following fit indexes as:  $\chi^2 = 413.50$  df = 211 p-value = .00000,  $\chi^2 / df = 1.95$ , RMSEA = .048, RMR = .043, SRMR = .049, CFI = .98, GFI = .94, AGFI = .91, CN = 212.86 From such fit indexes, it concluded that the estimation of parameters in such model was acceptable.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the adjusted structural equation model of Servant Leadership, Innovative Organization, Employee Competency, Motivation and Job Satisfaction Affecting the Performance of Organizations in Thailand Electronics Industry was fit to the empirical data at an acceptable level, considered from the following fit indexes as:  $\chi^2 = 413.50$ , df = 211, p-value = .00000,  $\chi^2 / df = 1.95$ , RMSEA = .048, RMR = .043, SRMR = .049, CFI = .98, GFI = .94, AGFI = .91, CN = 212.86.



The estimation was found in the structural equation model as follows.

- 1) Servant leadership (SVLS) has a direct effect on corporate performance (CPRP) with an effect coefficient of  $.47^*(10.93)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 1, servant leadership has a positive direct effect on corporate performance, is accepted.
- 2) Innovative organization (INOGR) has a direct effect on corporate performance (CPRP) with an effect coefficient of  $.40^*(10.27)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 2, innovative organization has a positive direct effect on corporate performance, is accepted.
- 3) Employee competency (EMPP) has a direct effect on corporate performance (CPRP) with an effect coefficient of  $.30^*(9.05)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 3, employee competency has a positive direct effect on corporate performance, is accepted.
- 4) Motivation (MOTIV) has a direct effect on corporate performance (CPRP) with an effect coefficient of  $.42^*(9.10)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 4, motivation has a positive direct effect on corporate performance, is accepted.
- 5) Job satisfaction (JBST) has a direct effect on corporate performance (CPRP) with an effect coefficient of  $.71^*(9.53)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 5, job satisfaction has a positive direct effect on corporate performance, is accepted.
- 6) Servant leadership (SVLS) has a direct effect on innovative organization (INOGR) with an effect coefficient of  $.92^*(20.42)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 6, servant leadership has a positive direct effect on innovative organization, is accepted.
- 7) Servant leadership (SVLS) has a direct effect on employee competency (EMPP) with an effect coefficient of  $.72^*(15.46)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 7, servant leadership has a positive direct effect on employee competency, is accepted.
- 8) Servant leadership (SVLS) has a direct effect on motivation (MOTIV) with an effect coefficient of  $.72^*(15.18)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 8, servant leadership has a positive direct effect on motivation, is accepted.
- 9) Servant leadership (SVLS) has a direct effect on job satisfaction (JBST) with an effect coefficient of  $.44^*(11.97)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 9, servant leadership has a positive direct effect on job satisfaction, is accepted.
- 10) Innovative organization (INOGR) has a direct effect on job satisfaction (JBST) with an effect coefficient of  $.48^*(10.92)$  and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 10, innovative organization has a positive direct effect on job satisfaction, is accepted.

- 11) Employee competency (EMPP) has a direct effect on job satisfaction (JBST) with an effect coefficient of .54\*(9.03) and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 11, employee competency has a positive direct effect on job satisfaction, is accepted.
- 12) Motivation (MOTIV) has a direct effect on job satisfaction (JBST) with an effect coefficient of .48\*(8.02) and statistical significance at the .05 level. Thus, hypothesis 12, motivation has a positive direct effect on job satisfaction, is accepted.
- 13) Innovative organization (INOGR), employee competency (EMPP), motivation (MOTIV), job satisfaction (JBST), and servant leadership (SVLS) can jointly predict corporate performance (CPRP) by 97 percent.

### References

- 1) Ahmed A., Ashraf, Z., Fakhrol, A. B., & Abdul K. (2019). Competency Identification of Officials in Omani Civil Service for Improving Government Performance. **International Journal of Business and Social Science**, 10(11), 148-157.
- 2) Covey, S.R. (2002). **Servant leadership: A journey in to the nature of legitimate power and greatness**. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist.
- 3) Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. **Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**, 4, 202-205.
- 4) Daft, R. L. (2002). **Leadership Theory and Practice**. Forth Worth, TX: The Dryden Press.
- 5) Damanpour, F. & Gopalakrishnan, S. (2001). The Dynamics of the Adoption of Product and Process Innovations in Organizations. **Journal of Management Studies**. 38(1), 65-84.
- 6) Freeman, C. (1982). **The economics of industrial innovation** (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 7) Gupta, M. (2018). The Innovation Process from an idea to final product: a review of the literature. **International Journal of Comparative Management**, 1(4), 400-421.
- 8) Iranmanesh, M., Zailani, S., Moeinzadeh, S., & Nikbin, D. (2017). Effect of green innovation on job satisfaction of electronic and electrical manufacturers' employees through job intensity: personal innovativeness as moderator. **Review of managerial science**, 11, 299-313.
- 9) Jeong R. J., Aejoon L., & Nian, C. (2014) **Effect of competency at work on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the restaurant industry**. (May 2014), 11-15.
- 10) Kerdpitak, C., Kerdpitak, N., Tirastittam, P., Aunyawong, W., & Chantranon, S. (2023). Innovation performance of Thai drugs making industry in Thailand. **International Journal of Multicultural Education**, 25(2), 224-238.
- 11) Locke, E.A. (1976). **The nature and causes of job satisfaction**. In MD. Dunnette (Ed), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, 1297 – 1349. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- 12) Matimu, W., F., & Esther, G. (2018). Effects of Job Satisfaction on Performance of Civil Servants in the Directorate of Immigration and Registration of Persons in Nyeri County, Kenya. **International Journal of Current Aspects in Human Resource Management**. 2(2), 78-87.
- 13) Tuan, N.P., Nhan, N., Giang, P, &Ngoc, N. (2016). The Effects of Innovation on Firm Performance of Supporting Industries in Hanoi – Vietnam. **Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management**, 9(2), 413-428.

- 14) Peng, J., Samad, S., Comite, U., Ahmad, N., Han, H., Ariza-Montes, A., & Vega-Muñoz, A. (2022). Environmentally Specific Servant Leadership and Employees' Energy-Specific Pro-Environmental Behavior: Evidence from Healthcare Sector of a Developing Economy. **International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health**, **19**(13), 1-16.
- 15) Porter, M.A. (1990). **Competitive Advantage**. New York. USA. Free Press.
- 16) Rahamah M., Ong C., H., & Ong, S. Y., (2018). **International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences**, **8**(7), 665-675.
- 17) Rash, J. R., & Tosi, H. L. (1992). **Managing Organizational Behavior**. New York: Harper Collins.
- 18) Rickards, T. (1985). **Stimulating innovation: A systems approach**. London: Frances Pinter.
- 19) Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. (1972). **Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach** (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- 20) Rosemary, B., & Sparrow, P. (1992). **Designing and achieving competency: A competency-based approach to developing people and organizations**. England: McGraw-Hill International (UK) Limited.
- 21) Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. **Leadership and Organization Development Journal**, **23**(23), 145–157.
- 22) Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). **Competence at work: Models for superior performance**. New York: Wiley.
- 23) Trott, P. (2005). **Innovation management and new product development** (3rd ed.). Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- 24) Wong, C. & Davey, M.A. (2007). **Best practice in servant leadership**. [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.regent.edu>.
- 25) Zwell, M. (2000). **Creating a Culture of Competency**. New York: John Wiley & Son.