THE INFLUENCE OF THAI EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE ON EMPLOYEES' KNOWLEDGE SHARING ATTITUDE IN A COMMERCIAL BANK IN THAILAND



THE INFLUENCE OF THAI EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE ON EMPLOYEES' KNOWLEDGE SHARING ATTITUDE IN A COMMERCIAL BANK IN THAILAND

A Dissertation Presented to

The Institute for Knowledge and Innovation Southeast Asia (IKI-SEA)

Business School of Bangkok University

In Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Knowledge Management and Innovation Management

Chanthawan Sathitsemakul

2017



© 2017

Chanthawan Sathitsemakul

All Right Reserved



Author: Chanthawan Sathitsemakul

Dissertation Committee:

Dissertation Advisor

(Dr. Francesco A. Calabrese – Bangkok University)

Dissertation Co-Advisor

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lugkana Worasinchai – Bangkok University)

Ph.D. KIM Program Director

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Wincent Ribière – Bangkok University)

Committee Member(s)

(Prof. Dr. Pote Sapianchai – Bangkok University)

CHE Representative





DECLARATION

In accordance with the Bangkok University Honor Code, I certify that my submitted work here is my own work, and that I have appropriately acknowledged all external sources that were used in this work.



Sathitsemakul, C. Ph.D. (Knowledge Management and Innovation Management), September 2016, The Institute for Knowledge and Innovation Southeast Asia (IKI-SEA), Business School - Bangkok University, Thailand

<u>The Influence of Thai Emotional Intelligence on Employees' Knowledge Sharing</u> <u>Attitude in a commercial Bank in Thailand (254 pp.)</u>

Advisors of dissertation: Francesco A. Calabrese, Ph.D.,

Assoc. Prof. Lugkana Worasinchai. Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Employees are perhaps the most important assets for success to any organization. The knowledge known, grown and shared by motivated employees in a culture nurtured for sharing of that knowledge can raise organizational innovation and performance to superior levels. Knowledge Sharing has become recognized as an important strategy in business. Many organizations invest a lot of effort in implementing sharing practices in order to maintain their competitive advantage by utilizing the best knowledge of their employees. Employees can be motivated to participate in activities to share and collect knowledge to deliver better ideas, and innovate in product and process improvements. However, the actual act of sharing can be influenced positively or negatively by both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors.

But employees' attitude toward knowledge sharing contributes one of the most important predictors to actual knowledge sharing behavior; hence the interest in emotional intelligence. Emotional Intelligence (EI) impacts how individuals perceive situations both professionally and personally, and it is also known to be an influential factor in shaping individuals' attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, it was hypothesized that emotional intelligence would play a major role in stimulating a positive attitude towards knowledge sharing in a Thai Commercial Bank.

Financial institutions are a type of organization that continuously responds to higher market performance expectations and demands for new products and services. Consequently, financial institutions, especially commercial banks, have gradually transformed into knowledge-intensive firms. Knowledge within and outside of the organization is gathered and used to enhance overall performance. Achieving elusive, demanding, and effective knowledge sharing has become an important performance parameter in leveraging knowledge as a key intangible asset, yet very little research exists using the constructs exercised in this study.

This research provides evidence of how the employees' emotional intelligence influences a positive attitude towards knowledge sharing. Furthermore, it shows how perceived motivational factors are also positively influenced in their attitude toward knowledge sharing. The hypotheses are tested on data collected from employees of a Thai commercial bank. The research instruments are an emotional intelligence survey tool specifically developed by Thailand's Department of Mental health, and a knowledge sharing motivation questionnaire on individual and organization factors. SPSS software is used for the descriptive statistics, and relationships among variables are analyzed by structural equation modeling using Lisrel software.

The data analysis revealed that the Thai emotional intelligence independent variable has direct, positive influence on employees' knowledge sharing attitude. Moreover, it also has a positive impact on attitude toward knowledge sharing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors inherent in the composition of the dependent variables on individual and organizational motivation.

The limitations of this research are the self-reporting instrument, which could have a bias based on the respondents' honesty and awareness of their feelings. Also, it has been studied with employees in only one of the 14 Thai Commercial Banks. Therefore, recommendations for future research are to develop a more in-depth instrument, and expand the group of respondents to more financial organizations in the 10 country ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) and to a variety of industries/services.

Regardless of some limitation of the research, the findings reveal that high emotional intelligence enhances employees' attitude toward knowledge sharing leading to greater success in actual knowledge sharing behavior in organizations.

Keywords: Attitude towards knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing motivation factor, Thai emotional intelligence, Thailand Commercial Bank, IQ, EQ, EI, XQ, Structural Equation Model, ASEAN Economic Community.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Francesco Calabrese for the continuous support of my Ph.D. research. Dr. Calabrese was always willing to help. I would also like to thank him for his patience, motivation, and immense knowledge. He consistently steered me in the right direction. His guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. Without him this thesis, would never have been able to finish, I could not wish for a better or friendlier advisor.

Besides my advisor, I would like to thank all Ph.D. Knowledge Management and Innovation Management's professors, staff and students, especially, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vincent Ribière and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Lugkana Worasinchai for their input, comments, cooperation and encouragement.

I would also like to acknowledge Ms. Katharine Dill, Mr. Daniel Etulain and Ms. Wendy Farrell as the second reader of this thesis, and I am gratefully indebted for their valuable comments on this thesis.

And finally, last but by no means least, I would like to thank my family for supporting me spiritually throughout writing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACTv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT viii
LIST OF TABLESxv
LIST OF FIGURES
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION
1.1 Rationale and Problem Statement1
1.2 Objectives of Study
1.3 Scope of Study
1.4 Research Questions
1.5 Significance of the Study4
1.6 Definition of Terms
Emotional Intelligence6
Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing7
Commercial Banks in Thailand7
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW9
2.1 Related Literature and Previous Studies
History of Emotional Intelligence9

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW (Continued)
Emotional Iintelligence Models – Western Culture
Emotional Intelligence Models - Thailand35
Motivation46
Challenges by Employees to Knowledge Sharing49
EI, Individual Motivation (IM) and Organization Motivation (OM) and Attitude
towards Knowledge Sharing (AS)52
Independent Variable Emotional Intelligence53
Dependent Variables IM, OM, and AS57
2.2 Theoretical Framework
EI (TEIST) – intrinsic and/or extrinsic Motivation Factors
Individual - intrinsic Motivation Factors (IM)78
Organizational - extrinsic Motivation Factors (OM)79
Knowledge Sharing
Determinants of Knowledge Sharing
Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)
Knowledge sharing in commercial banks in Thailand
2.3 Related Theories
Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS) and Intention to Share Knowledge
Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)87
Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)87

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW (Continued)
Knowledge Sharing Intention
2.4 Hypotheses
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY92
3.1 Research Design
3.2 Phase 1 – Methodology Research Relationships Model
3.3 Phase 2 – Affirm that the eventual Survey Instrument would encompass all
Data required to test the Hypotheses
(H1) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Individual Motivation
(IM)
(H2) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Organizational
Motivation (OM)
(H3 and H4) Antecedents of Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS)100
(H5) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Attitude towards
Knowledge Sharing101
3.4 Phase 3 – Thai Financial Sector Profiles and Research Subject Bank102
3.4.1 Profile Aspects Thai 14 Commercial Banks105
3.4.2 Research Selected Bank – Profile106
Knowledge Sharing in the selected Bank111
3.4.3 Respondent Pool – Demographic Attributes

Page

xii

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY (Continued)

3.5 Phase 4 – Survey Instrument, Pre-Test, Data Collection and Demographics
Structure and Summary115
3.5.1 Research Instrument
3.5.2 Instrument Pretest126
3.5.3 Data Collection Procedure128
3.5.4 Respondents' Demographics Structure
3.5.5 Summary of Demographic Data131
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS
4.1 Overview
4.2 Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)133
4.3 Goodness of Fit Conceptual Model136
4.4 Results of the Hypothesis Testing138
Confirmatory Factor Analysis
4.5 Hypotheses Proof139
Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Individual Motivation (IM)140
Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Organizational Motivation (OM)140
Individual Motivation (IM) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)140
Organizational Motivation (OM) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

Page

xiii

CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS (Continued)
Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)141
4.6 Statistical and Analytical Summaries142
4.6.1 Statistical Summaries
4.6.2 Human Capital Demographic Categories143
4.6.3 Workforce Analytical Templates147
4.6.4 Demographic Comparison Tables151
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION159
5.1 Hypotheses Summary159
5.2 Research and Practical Findings162
5.2.1 Literature Overview Findings Discussion
5.2.2 Research Findings and Practical Discussion
5.3 Recommendation for Further Application
5.4 Recommendation for Further Research
5.5 Limitations of the Study198
5.6 Originality/Value of the Study200
BIBLIOGRAPHY
APPENDIX

	Page
BIODATA	253
LICENSE AGREEMENT OF DISSERTATION PROJECT	254



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Thailand Commercial Banks 7
Table 2 Emotional Intelligence Models Comparison
Table 3 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Motivation and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing
Table 4 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Interpersonal Trust and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing60
Table 5 Summarization of Selected Literature, which Supports the Linkages between
Organizational Commitment and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing63
Table 6 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Self-
efficacy and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing65
Table 7 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Knowledge tools and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing67
Table 8 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Management Support and Commitment and attitude toward Knowledge
Sharing
Table 9 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Rewards and Incentives and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing72
Table 10 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Organizational Culture and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing76
Table 11 Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between
Attitude towards and Knowledge Sharing Intention

 Table 12 Thai Financial Sector Attribute Profiles
 103

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table 13 The number of the full-time employees in each division 113
Table 14 The Thai Emotional Intelligence Scale Items 116
Table 15 The Interpersonal Trust Scale Items 119
Table 16 The Organizational Commitment Scale Items 120
Table 17 The self-efficacy (se) Scale Items
Table 18 The Knowledge Sharing Tools (OMT) Scale Items 122
Table 19 The Management Support and Commitment (OMM) Scale Items
Table 20 The Rewards and Incentives (OMR) Scale Items
Table 21 The Organizational Culture (OMC) Scale Items 124
Table 22 The Organizational Culture (OMC) Scale Items 125
Table 23 The Cognitive Component (ASC) Scale Items 126
Table 24 The Behavioral Component (ASB) Scale Items 126
Table 25 Pilot Testing Corrected Item-total Correlation and Cronbach's Alpha128
Table 26 Frequency Distribution of Sample in Relation to Division 129
Table 27 Direct Effect Result of Structural Equation Model 139
Table 28 Data Elements for the Comparable Female Respondents
Table 29 Data Elements for the Comparable Male Respondents 150
Table 30 Demographic EI by Gender and by Age
Table 31 Demographic EI by Gender within the 31-50 Years Age Group
Table 32 Demographic EI by Education Levels 154
Table 33 Demographic EI by Years with the Organization 155
Table 34 Demographic EI by Position within the Organization 156

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Page
Table 35 Demographic EI by Location
Table 36 Leadership by Division
Table 37 Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions
Table 38 Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions
Table 39 Summaries of Research and Practical Findings
Table 40 Summaries of Research and Practical Results 176
Table 41 Summaries of Research and Practical Results – Retail Business Division 180
Table 42 Summaries of Research and Practical Results – 5 Divisions 396 Respondents
Table 43 Summaries of Research and Practical Findings – EI Sub Variables Total
Responses
Table 44 Foreign Bank Branches of Thai Banks 194
Table 45 Demographic EI by Gender
Table 46 Demographic EI by Age 245
Table 47 Demographic EI by Gender within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents
Table 48 Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents
Table 49 Demographic EI by Years with Organization within the 18-30 Years
Respondents
Table 50 Demographic EI by Position within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents
Table 51 Demographic EI by Office Location within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table 52 Demographic EI by Gender within the 31-50 Years Respondents
Table 53 Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 31-50 Years Respondents
Table 54 Demographic EI by Years with the Organization within 31-50 Years
Respondents
Table 55 Demographic EI by Position within the 31-50 Years Respondents
Table 56 Demographic EI by Location within the 31-50 Years Respondents
Table 57 Demographic EI by Gender within the 51 Years and Above Respondents 250
Table 58 Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 51 Years and Above
Respondents
Table 59 Demographic EI by Years with the Organization within the 51 Years and
Above Respondents
Table 60 Demographic EI by Position within the Organization within the 51 Years
and Above Respondents
Table 61 Demographic EI by Office Location within the 51 Years and Above
Respondents

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Hypothesized relationships between the EI, IM, OM and attitudes towards
knowledge sharing4
Figure 2 Sub-dimensions of Emotional Intelligence:11
Figure 3 Summarized Emotional Intelligence Models-Macro Level Relationships of
Non-Thai specific to Thai (EQ/EI) Models45
Figure 4 Refined Theoretical Research Model
Figure 5 Theoretical Narrowed Research Model
Figure 6 Hypotheses Relationships Linkages Model90
Figure 7 Methodology Research Relationships Model94
Figure 8 Thai Commercial Bank Attribute Profiles106
Figure 9 Respondent Population Characteristics
Figure 10 The Relationship between each Variable in the Statistical Model
Figure 11 Coefficient Values between Variables
Figure 12 Distributions of Respondent Characteristics142
Figure 13 Distributions of Respondent Characteristics144
Figure 14 Comparison between Respondent in Retail Business Division and others
Characteristics146
Figure 15 Hypotheses Relationships Linkages Model160
Figure 16 DISPLAY: All Variables – total Data Base for 421 Respondents
Figure 17 DISPLAY: Demographics of AGE Gender (Female-Male)166
Figure 18 DISPLAY: Demographics of Educational Level
Figure 19 DISPLAY: Demographic of Years with the Organization

LIST OF FIGURES (Continued)

Figure 20 DISPLAY: Demographics Position in the Organization
Figure 21 DISPLAY: Retail Business Division and Gender
Figure 22 DISPLAY: 5 Divisions 396 Respondents
Figure 23 DISPLAY: 5 Divisions 396 Respondents (Female/Male)185
Figure 24 DISPLAY EI and its Sub-Variables EI-Virtue, EI-Competence, EI-
Happiness
Figure 25 The Age of Optimized Hiring198
Figure 26 This figure displays the 421 respondents' data set238
Figure 27 This figure displays the 421 respondents' data set, and a comparison with
the 314 respondent Retail Business Division data set
Figure 28 This figure shows a distribution by the physical number of employees in
Retail in comparison to all others using the percentage allocations from
Figure 12
Figure 29 Data elements for the comparable female respondents
Figure 30 Data elements for the comparable male respondents

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale and Problem Statement

Employees are one of the most important factors in every successful organizational strategy, especially with regards to knowledge sharing (KS). In fact, without employee participation, most knowledge sharing, collaboration, and culture management environments will be doomed to fail (McDermott & O'Dell 2001). Participation is the key success factor for knowledge connection as the employees can ultimately choose whether or not to share their knowledge. Therefore, it is important to develop a further understanding of what influences employee attitudes towards knowledge sharing in an organizational context.

Felipe de Sequeira Rocha, (2008) stated that a strong organizational structure supporting knowledge sharing is essential for a strong knowledge management system. However, to positively affect employee involvement, factors such as trust, incentives, and management support are essential. The combination of organizational structure and employee involvement will lead to a culture favorable to knowledge sharing.

Al-Alawi et al. (2007) summarized that knowledge sharing in organizations has a significant relationship with trust, information system, rewards and organizational culture.

Hsu (2006) studied manufacturing companies in Taiwan and found that organizational structures that benefit employees' knowledge sharing are management commitment, knowledge management systems, and an existing knowledge sharing climate. Davenport (1997) urged that the innate idea of sharing knowledge could be counterintuitive in the workplace. Most employees do not want to share knowledge as they feel they might be giving up something of value by doing so, devaluing their own position. However, trust building in an organization and other motivating factors such as rewards, incentives, positive relationships, strong leadership, and a culture of sharing can positively influence employees to share more knowledge.

The literature references summarized in this Background and the extensive literature reviewed for this research indicate that motivations supporting an Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS) are strongly influenced by multiple intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Osterloh & Frey, 2000; Vallerand, 2000; Wasko & Faraj, 2000; Bock et al, 2005). The emergence of Emotional Intelligence (EI) in the last 25 years has added support for EI as potentially both an intrinsic and extrinsic influence (Mayer & Salovey 1990; Karkoulian et al., 2010; Chen, 2011; Gurbuz & Araci, 2012). For example, individuals can be intrinsically motivated by their EI attributes toward an Attitude for KS for their own achievement and satisfaction. Conversely EI's attributes for creating an organizational culture fusing emotional, personal and social sharing attributes can act as an extrinsic influence, creating a high performance motivational supporting culture favoring Knowledge Sharing (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991; Svyantek, 2003; Zeidner, Matthews & Roberts, 2004; Momeni, 2009).

PROBLEM FOCUS: this research proposes to study, understand, demonstrate and describe how EI profiles may or may not influence employees' Attitude(s) for Knowledge Sharing (AS). Focusing on emotional intelligence as both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to maximize employee attitude for knowledge sharing has the

advantage that it can be developed and significantly improved toward that focus through coaching and training (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel & Hooper 2002).

1.2 Objectives of Study

The objectives of this study are three:

First, to determine the relationship between employees' EI (Independent Variable) profiles in a Thai Commercial Bank and the intrinsic influences on the dependent variable of Individual Motivation (IM) toward Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS).

Second, to determine the extrinsic/intrinsic relationships of the EI respondents' profiles on the dependent variable of an Organization Motivation (OM) environment which influences employees' Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS).

Third, to determine the direct effect of the respondents collective EI profiles on the dependent variable Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS).

1.3 Scope of Study

Figure 1 graphically portrays the research scope encompassed by the stated study objectives. The literature reviewed, the methodology applied to achieve respondent inputs and the statistical findings evolve the research scope to its focus on employees' attitude toward sharing and not the actual results of implementing knowledge sharing activities.



Figure 1: Hypothesized relationships between the EI, IM, OM and attitudes towards knowledge sharing.

1.4 Research Questions

This study for determining Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing was guided by the following research questions:

1) In what ways does Thai emotional intelligence influence the

individual motivation of employees in a commercial bank in Thailand?

2) In what ways does Thai emotional intelligence influence the

organizational motivation of employees in a commercial bank in Thailand?

3) In what ways does individual motivation influence employees' knowledge sharing attitude in a commercial bank in Thailand?

4) In what ways does organizational motivation influence employees'

knowledge sharing attitude in a commercial bank in Thailand?

5) In what ways does Thai emotional intelligence directly influence employees' knowledge sharing attitude in a commercial bank in Thailand?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study proceeds in logical sequence to provide:

 An extensive Literature Review on Emotional Intelligence supplemented by related material on motivational influences affecting individuals Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing.

 The methodology followed by the researcher to elicit statistically acceptable and organizationally representative data sets from respondents of the object Bank is documented.

3) Statistical tests and proof on measures of fit for the relationships between the Research Model independent and dependent variables follows. That is supplemented by statistical and analytical findings with practical, social and organizational implications captured in statements of Hypotheses and their nulls.

4) The results are summarized in Chapter 5 with discussions on multiple implications of the findings to include significant future applications and research at the Thai national and AEC regional levels. It concludes with perceived limitations.

5) The study concludes with statements on the originality and value contributed to the Body of Knowledge. The last 25 years of high profile visibility on emotional intelligence applications has not seen comparable interest and progress in the Financial Services entities of the public, private and academic fields. This study offers qualitative and quantitative constructs supporting EI as a positive influence and booster for Attitudes toward Knowledge Sharing. Strong, positive attitude is seen as a significant predictor of actual behavioural commitment. The benefit of innovation and greater competitive success in product, process, and

economics can enhance the Thai National Financial sector alone (~208,000 employees and 240,000-million-baht net profits annually).

1.6 Definition of Terms

Emotional Intelligence

Western emotional intelligence: Mayer and Peter Salovey (1990) defined EI as "the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions."

Goleman (1995) defined "EI as the ability to identify, assess, and control one's own emotions and others emotions."

The definitions by western scholars indicated that emotional intelligence is individual ability related to emotions as Sibia, Misra, and Srivastava (2005) summarized that emotional intelligence involves being independent of others, selfcontained, and autonomous, and expressing one's unique characteristics and organising actions around one's own thoughts, feelings, and motives.

Thai emotional intelligence: Boonprakob (2002) defined emotional intelligence in Thai context as the use of intelligence in order to regulate emotional expression.

Turapan (2005) defined emotional intelligence in Thai context as the knowledge and ability to be aware of and express emotion according to age and one's position in society which leads an individual to be a good, valuable and happy person.

The definitions provided by Thai scholars indicated that in Thailand Emotional Intelligence focuses on how individuals regulate their emotional expression and whether it is appropriate to each individual's status, i.e. age, position, culture, gender, type of work activities. The Thailand version of EI, therefore, focuses on virtue, competence and happiness and it is the way we evolve with the research.

Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing

Literally, attitude towards knowledge sharing means what an individual is thinking or feeling about knowledge sharing. This study is specifically interested in how motivation factors influence how employees think or feel toward knowledge sharing within the organization. It also seeks to demonstrate the type of influence; UNIL Intrinsic, Extrinsic, or a Hybrid.

Commercial Banks in Thailand

The term Commercial Bank means a public limited company licensed to undertake commercial banking business, including a retail bank, a foreign commercial bank's subsidiary and a foreign commercial bank's branch.

Within the financial industry, commercial banks are the most competitive. They operate in the private sector, and they have evolved the need to pay attention to knowledge practices in order to innovate, enhance productivity and deliver acceptable net profits. This is especially relevant with regards to the financial products and services used to acquire new customers while retaining the existing customer base.

Table 1: Thailand Commercial Banks

4 Largest Commercial Banks: represents approximately 28% of Thai Commercial banks but almost 72% of employees and assets of the total 14 listed **Banks.**

- Bangkok Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Kasikornbank Public Company Ltd.

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued): Thailand Commercial Banks

4 Largest Commercial Banks: represents approximately 28% of Thai Commercial
banks but almost 72% of employees and assets of the total 14 listed Banks.
- Krung Thai Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Siam Commercial Bank Public Company Ltd.
10 Additional Commercial Banks
- Bank of Ayudhya Public Company Ltd.
- CIMB Thai Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (Thai) Public Company Ltd.
- Kiatnakin Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Land and Houses Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Standard Chartered (Thailand) Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Thanachart Bank Public Company Ltd.
- Tisco Bank Public Company Ltd.
- TMB Bank Public Company Ltd.
- United Overseas Bank (Thai) Company Ltd.
OCNDED 1962



CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1995 Daniel Goleman's international bestseller "Emotional Intelligence (EI)" forever changed the concept of "being smart," showing that how we handle ourselves and our relationships (through EI) can determine life success more than IQ (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002). During the latter 1990's, the catch phrase "...it's about EQ, not IQ..." seemed to convey the idea that EQ (i.e. EI) was singularly a unique human trait neatly defined by Goleman's 1995 framework. Over the ensuing 20 years, there have been a growing number of adaptations by social psychologists and others documenting a variety of "models" or "frameworks" seeking to define the multifaceted manifestations of EI. Those manifestations encompass the influence of age, position, culture, gender, type of work activities etc., and identify many determinates reflected by the extensive literature reviewed and analyzed for this research. A large number of the various EI framework/models are narrated in this chapter. They, coupled in the final portion of this chapter with motivational driver, help set the logical linkages relating the EI framework contents of the EI independent variable to the dependent variables. Those are described by the individual motivation and organizational motivation environments presented within the research model and framed by the methodology discussion in Chapter 3.

2.1 Related Literature and Previous Studies

History of Emotional Intelligence

Thorndike (1920) was the first to identify emotional intelligence and placed its root in the concept of social intelligence. He defined social intelligence as, "The ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls - to act wisely in human relations." Examining individuals interacting as a means to measure social intelligence is much more difficult than measuring the cognitive abilities. Despite the challenges, researchers made efforts to measure social intelligence. Thorndike and Stein (1937) reviewed these attempts and concluded social intelligence was composed of three components: attitude toward society, social knowledge, and degree of social adjustment.

In 1983, Gardner expanded the concept of social intelligence by adding the concept of multiple intelligences, which became his multiple intelligences theory. He focused on the personal and interpersonal intelligence as an important standard of intelligence. He defines them as follows:

Interpersonal intelligence is the ability to be interested in others and their differences: what motivates them, how they work, how to work cooperatively with them. Successful individuals in different careers are all likely to have high degrees of interpersonal intelligence.

Intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to be aware of one's own intelligence and other personal skills as they relate to relationships with others. It is a capacity to form an accurate and truthful model of oneself and to be able to use that model to operate effectively in life.

By the early 1990s, which is the emphasis for this study, emotional intelligence came to be defined as the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). In 1995, after the popular book Emotional Intelligence by Goleman appeared in the market, with much literature reviewed and additional research on emotions and brain and social behavior, emotional intelligence became widely known outside academia. It attracted both business and academia as it is considered an important predictor of success in one's endeavors.

The emotional intelligence and knowledge-sharing model introduced by Othman and Abdullah (2011) presented the sub-dimensions of emotional intelligence; understanding emotions, using emotions and managing emotions. Furthermore, it shows how these factors have an effect on teamwork and increase organizational citizenship behavior of team members.



Figure 2: Sub-dimensions of Emotional Intelligence:

Reprinted from the Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Tacit Knowledge Sharing in Service Organizations by Othman Abdul Kadir and Hazman Shah Abdullah. (2011), in M. Al-Shammari (Ed.), Knowledge Management in Emerging Economies: Social, Organizational and Cultural Implementation, 171-185.

The definition of emotional intelligence varies as defined by researchers depending on the aspect of emotional intelligence that they focus on.

Mayer and Salovey (1997) defined emotional intelligence as a set of abilities that account for the fact that people's emotional perception and understanding varies in their accuracy. It is the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others.

Bar-on (1997) defined "emotional intelligence as an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures."

Goleman (1995) defined "emotional intelligence as the ability to self-control, zeal, persistence, and motivate oneself."

Department of Mental Health of Thailand (2000) stated that emotional intelligence refers to the emotional abilities that help people to live creatively and happily. According to this conceptualization, emotional intelligence consists of a range of emotional competencies (Virtue, Competence, Happiness) that help people to understand themselves, to understand others, and to manage internal and external conflict.

The above definitions have influenced this study to emphasize emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive emotions and cognitive processes such as reasoning with emotions; understanding their meaning; and assimilating and locating relationships between the emotions. They also focus on the aspect of skills involved in using this information during interpersonal interactions.

Emotional Iintelligence Models – Western Culture

As defining the concept of emotional intelligence gained added interest in the first decade of this century, theoreticians have continued to conceptualize emotional intelligence into different models. Zeidner et al. (2004) reviewed literatures and

mediated that emotional intelligence models can be classified into two model types; ability models and mixed models. However, there is also much literature discussing definitions of ability models, trait models and mixed models.

Pérez et al. (2005) stated that trait EI and ability EI are different in construction and impact on operationalization of the measurement. The ability EI is measured through tests of maximal performance, while the trait EI is measured through self-reporting questionnaires. Whereas ability and trait EI can be distinguished by the method used to measure EI, the difference between mixed and ability models are based on a theoretical model and whether or not it mixes cognitive abilities and personality traits.

Petrides et al. (2004) affirmed that trait EI is a self - reporting measurement based on personality traits concerning emotions related to self-perceptions. They referred trait EI or emotional self-efficacy as a group of behavioral dispositions and self-perception regarding the ability to recognize, process, and utilize emotion-laden information. Trait measures include a very large array of non-cognitive abilities related to success.

Ability EI or cognitive-emotional ability is the maximum performance measurement concerning emotion-related cognitive abilities, which refer to one's actual ability to synthesize emotion-laden information (Brannick et al., 2009).

Brannick et al. (2009) summarized that ability EI measurements relate to emotional capacity as the range between reason and feeling. Tools used to measure this include showing a person a picture of a face and asking what emotion the pictured person is feeling. They are then scored by comparing the participants' response to a key emotion.

Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2002) proposed two alternative conceptions of emotional intelligence: an ability model and a mixed model. Ability models, in which emotion and thought interact in meaningful and adaptive ways, are seen as emotional intelligence. Mixed models blending various aspects of; personality traits, dispositions, skills, competencies, and abilities are also labeled as emotional intelligence - "mixed".

At present there are three accepted primary models of emotional intelligence – Ability, Trait and Mixed. Nonetheless, multiple ambiguities and cultural nuanced 12 Ep modifications continue to emerge.

Ability Models of Emotional Intelligence

These models emphasize the individual's ability to perceive, to use, to handle, to interpret and to regulate emotions in themselves and others (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The ability-based model views emotions as tools that if used properly can help individuals negotiate properly in a social environment. The Salovey-Mayer model is a sample of ability model, developed by Peter Salovey and John Mayer who perceive EI as a form of pure intelligence. They identified that emotional intelligence is a cognitive ability which consists of four skills; perceiving emotions; using emotions to facilitate thought; understanding emotions; and managing emotions in a way that enhances personal growth and social relations.

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT): In 1997, Peter Salovey and John Mayer collaborated to synthesize the concept of EI. They defined EI as "human abilities such as the capacity to know one's own emotions, to manage emotions, to be self-motivating, to recognize and respond to emotions in

others, and to handle interpersonal relationships." They developed their EI model based on an understanding of cognitive intelligence that focused on specific mental aptitudes for perceiving and regulating feelings. They have worked to evaluate and refine the EI model into four dimensions of mental processes; perception and expression of emotion, assimilating emotion in thought, understanding and analyzing emotion, and reflective regulation of emotion. In order to remove the ambiguities, social traits or talents are distinguished from EI abilities. They emphasized that EI can be learned, be developed in individuals over time, and be measured through an ability test (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000; Mayer et al., 2004).

The MSCEIT assessment is an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence that consists of 141 items and takes 30-45 minutes to complete. It measures four related abilities:

- Perceiving Emotions; the ability to correctly identify how people are feeling
- Using Emotions to Facilitate Thought; the ability to create emotions and to integrate your feelings into the way you think.
- Understanding Emotions; the ability to understand the causes of emotions
- Managing Emotions; the ability to create effective strategies that use your emotions to help you achieve a goal, rather than being influenced by your emotions in unpredictable ways (Mayer & Salovey, 1997)

Each of these four abilities is measured in two different ways by the MSCEIT.

These sub-sections of the MSCEIT are called tasks. There are eight such tasks:

- Perceiving Emotions—Faces and Pictures
- Faces Task: respondents are asked how likely it is that certain emotions listed are present in a photograph of a person's face. It measures how accurately they can predict how people feel based on facial expression alone.
- Pictures Task: respondents are asked to identify emotions that are conveyed through various pictures and designs. It measures the ability to identify emotion in objects.
- Using Emotions—Facilitation and Sensations
 - Facilitation Task: this set of questions measures respondents' ability to determine how different moods impact thinking and decision-making

Sensations Task: respondents are asked to identify or describe the direction and degree of their feelings, using the continuum provided

- Understanding Emotions—Changes and Blends
 - Changes Task: this set of questions measures respondents' ability to understand how emotions change over time.
 - Blends Task: this set of questions measures respondents' knowledge of the complex emotions that people may experience
- Managing Emotions—Emotion Management and Emotional Relationships
 - Emotion Management Task: this set of questions measures respondents' ability to select effective emotional strategies

 Emotional Relationship Task: this set of questions measures respondents' ability to get to a certain emotional outcome in social situations

The Ability Test of Emotional Intelligence (TIE): Śmieja, Orzechowski, and Stolarski (2014) developed an ability scale based on a theoretical model developed by Peter Salovey and John Mayer to be an alternative ability model of emotional intelligence. They aim to create a valid and reliable instrument to tap the multidimensional construct of EI, which uses less time to administer, is easy to use for scientific and practical purposes and is based on a different cultural context.

The TIE consists of four subtests represented consecutively: Perception, Understanding, Facilitation, and Management of emotions. The test consists of two parts. First part regarding Perception and Understanding, participants are asked to think about the feelings and thoughts of people who were involved in described situations. They are asked to evaluate, on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from a "very bad answer" to a "very good answer". In the second part, for Facilitation and Management, participants are asked to give the best action that a protagonist should implement in order to solve a problem. The task is to judge, on a similar 5-point Likert scale, the level of appropriateness of each of the three actions described on the answer sheet, ranging from "very ineffective" to "very effective."

Trait Models of Emotional Intelligence

Petrides (2007) proposed that trait EI is "a constellation of emotional selfperceptions located at the lower levels of personality". It refers to an individual's self-perception of his or her own emotional abilities. It is a self-reporting measurement within the dimension of an individual personality framework. Trait EI essentially refers to people's own perceptions of their emotional abilities, alternatively known as trait emotional self-efficacy.

Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue): The TEIQue was developed by Petrides with the supervision of Furnham and Frederickson. It is a scientific instrument used to provide comprehensive coverage on the trait EI theory and model, which measures emotional intelligence as a personality trait (Petrides & Furnham, 2000, 2001, 2003). The forms for adolescent and older consist of 15 facets with 15 subscales and provide scores on four factors. The 15 facets were derived from a comprehensive content analysis of prominent EI literature (Petrides & Furnham, 2001):

- Adaptability: High score individuals are willing to change and adapt to new environments and conditions.
- Assertiveness: High score individuals are straightforward and frank.
- Emotion appraisal (self and others): High score individuals believe that they are clear about what they feel and able to interpret others' emotional expression.
- Emotion expression: High score individuals are able to communicate own emotions to others.
- Emotion management (others): High score individuals can influence other people's feelings.
- Emotion regulation: High score individuals believe that they are able to take control over their own emotions.

- Impulsiveness (low): High score individuals believe that they think carefully before acting
- Relationship skills: High score individuals have fulfilling personal relationships that positively affect their productivity and emotional well -being.
- Self-esteem: High score individuals have a positive view of themselves and their achievements.
- Self-motivation: High score individuals believe that they are driven by a need to produce high quality of work.
- Social competence: High score individuals believe that they have excellent social skills.
- Stress management: High score individuals can handle pressure calmly and effectively.
- Trait empathy: High score individuals believe that they are able to see and understand other people's needs.
- Trait happiness: High score individuals tend to be cheerful and feel good about themselves.
- Trait optimism: High score individuals tend to look on the bright side and view things from a positive perspective.

The 15 facets listed share the same interpreting factor scores. It consists of four factors; well-being, self-control, emotionality and sociability. Numbers of items are varied and response to 7-point Likert scale. There are many versions and forms (Petrides, 2009) available as follow:

- TEIQue version 1.50 is the latest TEIQue long form. It consists of 15 facets, which are assessed through 15 subscales. It provides scores on four factors and global trait EI.
- TEIQue-SF: The short form of TEIQue consists of 30 items designed to measure global trait EI.
- TEIQue-AF: The adolescent form of TEIQue consists of 153 items, 15 subscales with 4 factors. It is designed to measures global trait EI for ages 13-17.
- TEIQue-ASF: The adolescent short form of TEIQue consists of 30 items used to measure global trait EI for ages 12-17.
- TEIQue 360°: This form is for peer or 360 degree ratings on the 153 items of the TEIQue. It is used for contrasting self and observer rating on trait EI.
- TEIQue 360° SF: The short form of TEIQue 360° consists 15 items;
 this form is for peer or 360 degree ratings on the 15 subscales of the TEIQue.

The Self-Reporting Emotional Intelligence Test (SSEIT): The SSEIT is a 33item self-reporting measure of emotional intelligence developed by Schutte et al. (1998) aimed to map onto Salovey and Mayer's original concept of emotional intelligence. The items are ranked on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5(strongly disagree). Items of the test relate to the three aspects of EI:

- Appraisal and expression of emotion
- Regulation of emotion
- Utilization of emotion

The Trait Meta-Mood Scale (TMMS): The TMMS by Salovey et al. (1995) is a 30 item self-reporting measure used to assess adolescents' emotional beliefs and attitude towards emotional experience. The TMMS is composed of three cognitive components of individuals' emotional structures;

- Attention to feelings: the perceived attention that individuals pay to their inner moods and emotional states
- Clarity of feelings: the perceived ability to understand and discriminate among feelings
- Mood repair: the perceived ability to regulate moods and repair negative emotional experiences

The Self-Reporting Emotional Ability Scale (SEAS): The SEAS was developed by Freudenthaler and Neubauer (2005) used for self-assessed emotional abilities both intra and interpersonal. It composed of six subscales and two composite scales. The intrapersonal scale is related to perception, control and regulation individuals' own emotions. The interpersonal scale includes 17 items related to perception and regulation of others' emotions. "I can tell immediately if a friend is worrying about something" and "Even in strangers I have no trouble recognizing insincere expressions of emotion" are examples of items. The scale includes 49 items, which are rated on a 6-point Likert scale.

Mixed Models of Emotional Intelligence

These models define emotional intelligence as "... an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one's ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures" (Bar-On, 1997). These models include

abilities, personalities and characteristics into the same phenomena. They combine motivation, states of consciousness, social activity and ability to understand and conduct emotions together. Emotional intelligence mixed models are used more broadly by researchers compared to other models. They are also used in popular Baron and Goleman Emotional intelligence models.

The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI / ECI 2.0): The model introduced by Daniel Goleman (1998/2001) is the most popular and accepted mixed model that focuses on EI as a wide array of competencies and skills that drive employees' performance. The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI) is a measure of emotional intelligence based on Goleman emotional intelligence competencies, mixed between cognitive ability and personality aspects. Goleman (1995) emphasized that EI plays a critical role in life outcomes and success at home, school, and workplace. EI is a key to develop and sustain interpersonal relationships and the capacity of individuals to be effective team members. In the workplace, EI builds the employees' technical skills and intelligence quotient for their jobs at all levels (Goleman, 1995). The Emotional Competency Inventory is a multi-rater (360 degree) instrument that provides self, manager, direct report, and peer ratings on a series of behavioral indicators of emotional intelligence. There were a number of psychometric properties of the ECI that needed to be improved; the competency scales showed inter correlations that were too high and there are too many items (110 items), therefore ECI 2.0 has been developed to increase reliability, validity and reduce number of items (Wolff, 2005).

The ECI 2.0 model includes four clusters and eighteen emotional competencies, which can be categorized into four categories;

1) The recognition of emotions in oneself

Self-awareness; the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions, consists of

- Emotional Awareness; the ability to recognize own emotions which affect performance
- Accurate Self-Assessment; the ability to know own strengths and limitation
- Self-Confidence; the ability to sense own capabilities
- 2) The regulation of emotion in oneself

Self-management; the ability to control one's emotions and adapt to changing conditions, consists of

- Emotional Self-Control; the ability to maintain effectiveness under stressful situations
- Transparency; the ability to maintain integrity
- Adaptability; the ability to handle changes
- Achievement; the ability to determine to meet or exceed a standard of excellence
- Initiative; the ability to be ready to act on opportunities
- Optimism; the ability to see the positive in people, situations, and events more often than the negative
- 3) The recognition of emotions in others

Social awareness; the ability to sense, understand, and react to other's

emotions, consists of

- Empathy; the ability to sense and understand others' feelings and perspectives

- Organizational Awareness; the ability to read a group's emotional

currents and power relationships

- Service Orientation; the ability to anticipate, recognize and meet customers' needs
- 4) The regulation of emotion in others
 - Relationship management; the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict, consists of
 - Developing others; the ability to take an active interest in others' development needs and strengthen their abilities
 - Inspirational Leadership; the ability to inspire and guide individuals and groups
 - Change Catalyst; the ability to initiate and manage change
 - Influence; the ability to persuade or convince others to gain support
 - Conflict Management; the ability to negotiate and resolve conflict
 - Teamwork and collaboration; the ability to work with others towards a shared goal

The ECI 2.0 contains 72 items whose response is measured on a 6-point scale reflects one's observation of the frequency with which the person being assessed demonstrates the behavior or nature of the item ranging from 1 (never) to 6 (don't know). Items are composed into ratings for each of the competencies (Wolff, 2005). The respondent is left with two ratings for each competency: a self-rating and a total other rating (made up of an average of all other ratings; Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000).

The Cooper and Sawaf's Emotional Intelligence Model: The Cooper and Sawaf's emotional intelligence model (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997) consists of four aspects, emotional literacy, emotional fitness, emotional depth, and emotional alchemy.

- 1) Emotional literacy is individual efficacy which can be measured through
 - Emotional honesty
 - Emotional energy
 - Emotional feedback
 - Practical intuition
- Emotional fitness is individual capability in handling and managing conflict which can be measured through
 - Authentic Presence
 - Trust radius
 - Constructive discontent
 - Resiliency and renewal
- Emotional depth is individual emotional intensity and potential to develop which can be measured through
 - Unique potential and purpose
 - Commitment
 - Applied integrity
 - Influence without authority
- 4) Emotional alchemy is individual creative and problem-solving capabilities

which can be measured through

- Intuitive flow

- Reflective time-shifting
- Opportunity sensing
- Creating the future

The Bar-On Emotion Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): One of the most well-known models is a model of emotional intelligence by Reuven Bar-On (1997). Reuven Bar-On is director of the Institute of Applied Intelligences and a consultant in Israel. He wondered why some individuals are more able to succeed in life than others. He thoroughly reviewed factors that he thought to be prerequisite for success in general and found that many individuals with high cognitive intelligence fail in life, while many with less cognitive intelligence succeed; therefore, predicting success factors is not always based on cognitive intelligence (Bar-On, 1988). Bar-On believes that individuals with higher emotional quotient (EQ) are more competent in coping with the demands, challenges and pressures of everyday life, which leads to success in life

Bar-On has developed measures of emotional intelligence called the Bar-On Emotion Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). Believing that emotional intelligence can be developed over time, EQ-i is an excellent means to identify potential areas for improvement and to measure the effectiveness of individual and organizational development programs (Palmer, Manocha, Gignac, & Stough, 2003; Stys & Brown, 2004; Zeidner et al., 2004).

The EQ-i is a self-reporting measure of emotional intelligence for individuals sixteen years of age and over. It is available in several languages. It is one of the most widely used measures of EI in literature. Bar-on also developed various versions of the Emotion Quotient Inventory to be used with different populations and situations. For example, the EQ-interview is completed after the self-report.

- The EQ-i Short Version is a 52-item version of the original EQ-i,
- The EQ-i:125 is a 125-item version of the original which excludes the negative impression scale,
- The EQ-i Youth Version was developed for individuals between 7-15 years of age,
- The EQ-360 Assessment is a multi-rater instrument used in conjunction with the regular self-reporting EQ-i to provide a more indepth analysis by having observers who work closely with the individual provide information as well (Bar-On, 2002).

The EQ-i focuses on emotional and social competent behaviors, which related to performance and success both in life and the workplace (Bar-On, 2002). There are 5 components and 15 sub-components of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997) as listed below.

- 1) Intrapersonal:
 - Self-Regard; the ability to perceive positive and negative aspects of oneself as well as limitations and possibilities
 - Emotional Awareness; the ability to recognize one's own feelings and understand the genesis for said feelings.
 - Assertiveness; the ability to express feelings, beliefs, and thoughts and defend one's right without threatening others
 - Independence; the ability to be self-reliant in own thinking and actions
 - Self-Actualization; the ability to realize own potential capacities
- 2) Interpersonal:

- Empathy; the ability to understand and care about others' feelings and be able to read other people
- Social Responsibility; the ability to be a cooperating and contributing member of social groups
- Interpersonal Relationship; the ability to create and maintain mutually satisfying relationships
- 3) Adaptability:
 - Reality Testing; the ability to see things as they are
 - Flexibility; the ability to adjust own emotions, thoughts, and behavior in changing situations and conditions
 - Problem Solving; the ability to identify and define problems as well as to generate and implement potentially effective solutions
- 4) Stress management:
 - Stress Tolerance; the ability to manage bad events and stressful situations through active and positive coping techniques
 - Impulse control; the ability to cope with frustration without loss of control
- 5) General mood:
 - Optimism; the ability to look at the brighter side of life and to maintain a positive attitude, to have hope when facing difficulty
 - Happiness; the ability to feel satisfied with own present life

The EQ-i contains 133 items whose response is measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very seldom/not true for me) to 5 (very often/often true of me). It takes approximately 40 minutes to complete (Bar-On, 2006). Total raw scores are

converted into standard scores with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15 (Bar-On, 2002). The EQ-i has a built-in correction factor that automatically adjusts the scale scores based on scores obtained from two of the instrument's validity indices (Positive Impression and Negative Impression). This is an important feature for selfreporting measures in that it reduces the potentially distorting effects of response bias thereby increasing the accuracy of the results.

Bar-On's model connects emotional intelligence to positive psychology, which contributes significantly to individuals' happiness and psychological wellbeing in life (Bar-On, 2006; Bar-On, 2010). The model results indicate that individuals who have higher EQ than average are more successful in problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. In contrary, individuals who lack emotional intelligence can mean failure in handling situation and pressures. Bar-on stated that emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence equally impact individuals' general intelligence, which will lead to potential life success (Bar-On, 2002).

The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS): WLEIS is well known among Asian researchers. It was developed by Wong and Law (2002), which was developed in response, to differences between Chinese cultures and Western cultures. This measurement consists of 16 items with 4 subscales each.

- Appraisal and expression of one's emotion relates to a person's ability to become aware of their emotions and express emotions naturally
- Appraisal and recognition of emotions in others relates to a person's ability to perceive and understand the emotions of others

- Regulation of emotion in oneself relates to a person's ability to monitor and adapt his or her emotions, and to enable a more rapid recovery from psychological distress.
- Use of emotion to facilitate performance relates to the ability to utilize emotions by directing them towards constructive activities and personal performance.

This measure uses a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagreement) to 5 (strong agreement). It was designed to be used for self and other ratings (Law et al., 2004; Song et al., 2010). Previous research has found support for the underlying four-factor structure, reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity of the WLEIS scores (Law et al., 2004; Law, Wong, Huang, & Li, 2008; Shi & Wang, 2007; Wong & Law, 2002). The WLEIS scores have also shown validity for predicting life satisfaction, academic performance, job performance, and job satisfaction (Law et al., 2008; Song et al., 2010; Wong & Law, 2002).

The Genos Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Genos EI): The Genos EI is a 360° measure of emotional intelligence specifically designed to use within workplace setting. It is provided through Self Assessments, Multi-Rater Assessments, Group Assessments, and Recruitment Reports. It measures the frequency with which an individual may display emotionally intelligent workplace behavior using a taxonomic seven-factor model of emotional intelligence identified by Dr. Palmer and Professor Stough (2001) from Swinburne University.

There is an online assessment involving a 70-item inventory and includes report rating from managers, peers, and customers. It uses a five-point Likert scale, from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always". The seven subscales of the Genos EI cover the ability to manage emotions in an appropriate, professional, and productive manner at work.

- Emotional Self-Awareness; the ability to perceive and understand own emotions.
- Emotional Expression; the ability to effectively express own emotions.
- Emotional Awareness of Others; the ability to perceive and understand others' emotions.
- Emotional Reasoning; the ability to utilize emotional information in decision-making.
- Emotional Self-Management; the ability to perceive and understand own emotions.
- Emotional Management of Others; the ability to effectively manage the emotions of others
- Emotional Self-Control; the ability to effectively control strong emotions experienced

Jordan & Lawrence (2009) stated that despite all the differences in emotional intelligence models and instruments, there are some common categories that include in emotional intelligence measures. Specially, the ability to be aware and express emotions, the ability to perceive others' emotions, and the ability to control own emotions are categories that appear in almost every emotional intelligence measure. However, cross-cultural evidence is giving less attention from the developers in describing the construct of emotional intelligence that supports their theoretical positions. Maddocks (2011) conducted a study covering a decade of emotional intelligence to define trends and implications from the JCA Occupational Psychologists, Ltd. (JCA) individual effectiveness questionnaire. The individual effectiveness questionnaire was distributed between 2001 and 2010 to examine the trends and implications of data from over 12,000 working individuals, aged 16 to 50 and above, in different job sectors across the countries in seven continents. With 360° feedback solution, the questionnaire developed results to improve self-awareness, individual effectiveness and performance. This reference provided both a recent and historically relevant wealth of results related to many of the areas identified for this Thai EI focused research. By measuring fifteen aspects of emotional intelligence within four components, the questionnaire used helps to provide a framework for coaching and leadership development. To do this affectively it addresses personal productivity, performance, resilience and job satisfaction

- 1) Core attitude scales consisting of:
 - Self-regard: measuring the degree individuals accept and value themselves.
 - Regards for others: measuring the degree individuals accept and value others as people, and distinguishing that from liking or approving of what they may do.
- 2) Awareness scales consisting of:
 - Self-awareness: measuring the degree to which individuals are in touch with their body, feelings and intuitions.
 - Awareness of others: measuring the degree individuals are in touch with the feeling states of others.

- 3) Self-management scales consisting of:
 - Emotional resilience: measuring the degree to which individuals are able to pick themselves up and recover when things go badly
 - Personal power: measuring the degree individuals believe that they are in charge of, and take responsibility for the outcome in life
 - Goal directedness: measuring the degree individuals' behavior is related to their long-term goals.
 - Flexibility: measuring the degree individuals feel free to adapt their thinking and their behavior to match the changing situations of life.
 - Personal connectedness: measuring the extent to which individuals' make, and the ease with which they make significant connections with other people.
 - Invitation to trust: measuring the degree individuals invite the trust of others by being principled, reliable and consistent
- 4) Relationship management scales consisting of:
 - Trust: measuring the degree to which individuals are ready to trust others, but only to the extent of looking after themselves and their interests.
 - Balanced Outlook: the degree individuals tend towards optimism, but being sure to check out your hopes against reality.
 - Emotional expression: measuring the degree individuals are free to express their feelings, but also in control of whether, and control: how and when to do so.

- Conflict handling: measuring the degree individuals is to be assertive, standing up for their wants and needs, but staying calm and respecting others while doing so.
- Interdependence: measuring the degree individuals is taking themselves and others into account.
- Reflective learning: measuring the degree individuals enhance their emotional effectiveness by reflecting on what they and others feel, think and do, noticing the outcomes these produce, and altering their patterns as necessary.

Maddocks explained that emotional intelligence "is about intelligent use of our emotions. This requires being aware of our feelings and the feelings of others in order to manage our behavior and relationships effectively. Underpinning all aspects of EI is our core attitude towards ourselves (self-regard) and others (regards for others)" (Maddocks, 2011, p. 2).

The decade of studies identified the different levels of emotional intelligence among individuals in different job levels, gender, and age (Maddocks, 2011).

The job levels range from director, senior manager, middle manager, supervisor, non-managerial, to admin/support. They found that senior leaders (Directors and Senior Managers) scored higher on nearly all aspects of EI excepted personal connectedness. The results suggest that senior managers need to develop their self-management to progress to director level, while middle managers need toughed-mindedness to progress to senior managers. In overall, managerial group scored significantly higher than non-managerial groups. In gender difference aspect, there is no significant difference between men and women. Women have a more submissive mindset with lower self-regard and higher regard for others, which resulted, to the higher scores of women on most relationship EI scales and men scored higher on most self-management EI scales (Maddocks, 2011; Van Rooy, Dilchert, Viswesvaran, & Ones, 2006).

Most aspects of EI are particularly low in young adults (16 to 29), but increase consistently with age, especially between twenties and thirties (Bar-on, 2000; Bradberry & Greaves, 2005; Kafetsios, 2004; Singh, 2006; Stein, 2009). It asserts that unlike personality trait and IQ, EI can be developed and changeable (Fariselli,Ghini, & Freedman, 2006).

Emotional Intelligence Models - Thailand

In Thailand, there are several EI measurements modified by researchers who adopt the EI concepts from western models of EI.

The Emotional Intelligence Inventory (Kwanmuang et al., 1999): This measure developed based on EI concept of Bar-On (1997), Cooper and Sawaf, (1997), and Goleman (1998) to assess EI level among university students. The author compared the three measurements and selected the correlated components to use in her models. The model consists of two main components, intrapersonal EI and interpersonal EI.

- 1) Intrapersonal consists of
 - Emotional Awareness
 - Self-regard
 - Independence
 - Adaptability

35

- Self-control

- Intentionality
- Optimism
- 2) Interpersonal consists of
 - Empathy
 - Social Responsibility
 - Assertiveness
 - Conflict Management
 - Interpersonal Relationship

The 60-item (five items for each of the twelve sub-components) scale responses to the 5-point Likert scale, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

The Emotional Intelligence for Thai Adolescent (Intasuwan et al., 2003): The Emotional Intelligence for the Thai adolescent is a scale to measure EI based on Buddhist Principles for Thai university students and generated benchmark scores. The EI definition covers three aspects of life; self-happiness, getting along with others, and work success.

- Self-happiness refers to personal characteristics, including lovingkindness, compassion, sympathetic joy, self-control, good mental health, good emotions, self-confidence, optimism, and flexibility.
- Getting along with others involves good relations with others; refers to interpersonal relationship characteristics, including being sincere, generous, forgiving, unity, empathy, gratitude, and human respect.
- Having work success refers to team work characteristics, including honesty, vision, being punctual, work planning, perseverance, being appropriately assertive, exhibiting collaborative working behavior, job

satisfaction, listening to other opinions, not being selfish, and showing inquisitive learning behavior

Eighty-four open-ended situational items were constructed; each item had three questions. The items responded to a 5-point Likert scale.

The Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test (TEIST): The TEIST developed by the Department of Mental Health, Ministry of Public Health of Thailand (DMH, 2000) addressed a belief that western measures may not appropriately measure Thai people emotional intelligence. Among the few EI instruments developed in Thailand, TEIST is the tool that is most widely used to assess the EI of Thai individuals by Thai researchers. The TEIST was developed by selecting 6,900 Thai people who live in Bangkok, Chiang Mai, Songkhla, Nakhon Sawan, and Ubon Ratchathani as representative of the major areas for all of Thailand. The independent variables are age, gender, marital status and working status (executive or lower level). The EI in this screening test described the desirable behavior possessed by emotionally mature individuals. The authors developed this tool from western EI concepts, mental health concepts, and Buddhism in order to make an appropriate EI assessment for Thai people. The measure consists of three categories each with three subscales as listed below:

1) Virtue: the ability to deal with self and social awareness, contains three subscales as follows with 18 items (DMH, 2000). The descriptions of the three subscales are:

- Emotional self-control; the ability to understand and manage one's own feelings, needs, and behaviors especially in unpleasant situations.
- Empathy; the ability to empathize with other feelings and behaviors.

- Responsibility; the ability to make decisions and act independently based on the Buddha's teachings and social acceptability.

2) Competence: the ability to deals with self-regulation, motivation, decision making and relationship management, contains three subscales with 18 (DMH,

2000). The descriptions of three subscales are:

- Self-motivation; the ability to know oneself and make an effort to do something successfully.
- Problem solving; the ability to think carefully with mindfulness and clear comprehension to live and work with others.
- Interpersonal relationship; the ability to assert oneself and use social skills when dealing with others.

3) Happiness; associated with self-efficacy and self-acceptance, along with the ability to manage one's emotions, contains three subscales with 16 items (DMH, 2000). The descriptions of three subscales are:

- Self-esteem; respect for and self-confidence in oneself.
- Life satisfaction; the ability to handle and regulate oneself in a creative way when meets unexpected situations.
- Peace; the ability to relax oneself, and reduce tensions.

In total, the Thai EI screening test consists of 52 response items in the form of short sentences using a 4-point Likert scale for the scaling technique. The form of sentences contains both negative and positive connotations so that the researchers established the reverse scoring criteria of each item (DMH, 2000).

Emotional intelligence scales developed by Western sources focus on achievement prediction, capability, ability, and motivation to achieve a target. TEIST, on the other hand, was developed by Thai psychiatrists and psychologists based on Thai culture. It emphasizes goodness, mindfulness, peace, happiness and competency. TEIST is a well-accepted EI tool in Thailand, which has been used for assessment of EI among various groups of Thai adults. The concepts of the TEIST model are closely connected with culture and the way of life among Thai people who focus on a harmony of life. The essential findings include the analysis of the discrimination index of all 52 test items showed that they were able to differentiate between persons with low and high EI scores. The test has distinguished between the level of EI among male and female subjects; young age group and older age group; married status and single status; and the executive working status and the lower level. However, the preceding discussion and table were presented as a means of demonstrating that the broad base of non-Thai research was relevant to the ultimate construct of Thai based models.

Goleman (1995) stated that EI could be learned and developed through life experience; therefore, emotional intelligence varies from culture to culture. The interpretation and study of emotional intelligence throughout the world may also differ.

Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test (TEIST) is an instrument developed specifically to explain and understand emotional intelligence from a Thai cultural perspective. Nonetheless, in order to bring a more focused model for use in the Research Model (Chapter 3), it seems most logical that this measurement will be a strong fit when used to assess emotional intelligence of Thai respondents in this study.

Em	otional Intelligence Models	Key Attributes	TEIST
	Mayer-Salovey-Caruso	Perceiving Emotions	• Self-Control /
	Emotional Intelligence Test	• Understanding	Empathy
	(MSCEI) by Mayer and	Emotions	• Empathy
	Salovey, 1997	Managing Emotions	
		• Using Emotions	• Self-esteem
			• Responsibility /
	OK	UN	Problem-
	G		solving
	The Ability Test of	• Perception of	• Self-Control /
	Emotional Intelligence (TIE)	emotions	Empathy
	by Śmieja, Orzechowski, and	• Understanding of	• Empathy
	Stolarski, 2014	emotions	
		• Facilitation of	• Self-esteem
		emotions	• Responsibility /
~	XUN	• Management of	Problem-
Ability		emotions	solving
	Trait Meta-Mood Scale	• Attention to feelings	• Self-Control
	(TMMS) by Salovey et al.,	• Clarity of feelings	• Self-esteem
Trait	1995	Mood repair	• Peace
			(Continued)

Emotional Intelligence Models	Key Attributes	TEIST
The Self Report	• Appraisal and	• Self-Control /
Emotional Intelligence	expression of	Empathy
Test (SSEIT) by Schutte	emotion	
et al., 1998	• Regulation of	• Self-esteem
	emotion	• Responsibility /
	• Utilization of	Problem-solving
10	emotion	
Trait Emotional	• Self-control and	• Self-Control
Intelligence Questionnaire	emotionality	2
(TEIQue) by Petrides and	• Sociability	• Interpersonal
Furnham, 2001	• Well-being	• Life satisfaction /
		Peace
Self-report emotional	• Perception	• Self-Control
ability scale (SEAS) by	individuals' own	
Freudenthaler and	emotions	Self-Control
Neubauer, 2005	Control individuals'	
	own emotions	• Self-esteem
	• Regulation	
	individuals' own	
Trait	emotions	
		(Continued)

Table 2 (Continued): Emotional Intelligence Models Comparison

Emotional Intelligence Models		Key Attributes	TEIST
	Individual effectiveness	• Relationship	• Self-motivation /
	questionnaire by	management	Responsibility /
	Maddock, 2011		Interpersonal
			• Self-Control /
			• Self-esteem,
			Empathy/
Trait	LO	KUND	Interpersonal
	Bar-On Emotional	• Intrapersonal	• Self-Control
	Quotient Inventory (EQ-	• Interpersonal	• Interpersonal
	i) by Reuven Bar-On,	• Stress management	• Life satisfaction /
	1997	• Adaptability	Peace
		• General mood	• Peace
			• Life satisfaction /
		VDED 190	Peace
	The Cooper and Sawaf's	Emotional literacy	Problem Solving
	emotional intelligence	Emotional Fitness	• Interpersonal
	model by Cooper &	• Emotional Depth	• Peace
Mix	Sawaf, 1997	• Emotional Alchemy	• Empathy

Table 2 (Continued): Emotional Intelligence Models Comparison

(Continued)

Emoti	onal Intelligence Models	Key Attributes	TEIST
	Emotional Competence	Self-Awareness	Self-Control
	Inventory (ECI) by	Social Awareness	• Empathy
	Daniel Goleman, 2001	• Self-Management	• Self-esteem
		• Social Skills	• Interpersonal
	The Genos Emotional	• Emotional Self-	Self-Control
	Intelligence Inventory	Awareness and	• Empathy
	(Genos EI) by Palmer	Emotional	• Self-Control
	and Stough, 2001	Expression	• Interpersonal
		Emotional	• Responsibility /
		Awareness of Others	Problem-solving
		• Emotional Self-	
		Management and	
	$\langle O_{I} \rangle$	Emotional Self-	× /
		Control	r
		Emotional	
		Management of	
		Others	
		• Emotional	
Mix		Reasoning	

Table 2 (Continued): Emotional Intelligence Models Comparison

43

(Continued)

Emoti	onal Intelligence Models	Key Attributes	TEIST
	Wong and Law	• Appraisal and	• Self-Control
	Emotional Intelligence	expression of one's	• Empathy
	Scale (WLEIS) by Wong	emotion	• Self-esteem
	and Law, 2002	• Appraisal and	• Responsibility/
		recognition of	Problem-solving
		emotion in others	
	L.	• Regulation of one's	
	6	emotion	
		• Use of emotion to	S
		facilitate	
Mix		performance	\prec
		VDED 196	

Table 2 (Continued): Emotional Intelligence Models Comparison



Figure 3: Summarized Emotional Intelligence Models-Macro Level Relationships of

Non-Thai specific to Thai (EQ/EI) Models

Motivation

Several theories attempt to explain motivation and its benefits. The most popular explanations of motivation are based on the needs, first developed by Maslow (1968). Maslow's theory refers to how an individual's needs can be grouped into five essential needs. He created a pyramid demonstrating the needs that were called the "hierarchy of needs". Physiological needs are at the bottom of the pyramid since they are basic needs, the higher order levels are security needs, belongingness needs, recognition needs, self-actualization, status, and power needs respectively. The theory was expanded by Alderfer (1972) who believed the five clusters should be folded into existence, relatedness, and growth.

In 1987, McClelland stated that "based on his experience in management circles, the individuals' need for affiliation, need for achievement and need for power are very important motivation factors in working life". This research adds the significance of motivational effects in equal measure to the history of EI model(s) evolutions as presented in this second half of literature researched in the quest for determining attitude toward knowledge sharing in the respondents to this study. Intrinsic motivation: Among the many researchers who have conducted empirical studies on motivation to categorize the motivating features, Ryan and Deci (2000) studied and declared that there are two types of motivation; intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

According to self-determination theory, intrinsic motivation is based on innate needs for competence and self-determination of individuals. Intrinsically motivated individuals engage in an activity when they find the activity interesting and enjoyable which increases energy towards the activity. Moreover, Grabner and Speckbacher (2009) specified that intrinsic motivation not only increases energy, but also influence on individual behavior. Regarding the Academic Motivation Scale (Vallerand, 1997), intrinsic motivation created on the basis of the self-determination theory, there are 3 types of intrinsic motivations; knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation.

- Intrinsic motivation to acquire knowledge happens when individuals are involved in pleasant or satisfying activities and also are able to learn or acquire knowledge.
- Intrinsic motivation for accomplishment happens when individuals are involved in activities and the pleasure or satisfaction experienced is a result of them reaching the aimed target.
- Intrinsic motivation for stimulation happens when individuals are involved in activities because of their pleasant sensations.

Extrinsic motivation: Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, originates from extrinsic factors. Individuals are extrinsically motivated when they are interested in separable outcomes such as rewards and recognition (Ryan & Deci, 2000), rather than for the inherent satisfaction of being involved in the activity itself. There are 4 types of extrinsic motivations (Weinberg & Gould, 2003): Integrated regulation, Identified regulation, Interjected regulation, and External regulation.

- Integrated regulation happens when individuals are involved in activities to benefit different aspects of life, rather than for the pleasure of performing itself.
- Identified regulation happens when individuals are involved in activities because the activity is considered important.

- Interjected regulation happens when individuals are involved in activities because of pressures.
- External regulation happens when individuals are involved in activities because they feel that it is an obligation, or they may get a reward.

Role of Motivation in knowledge sharing

Motivation has been investigated to find its role in knowledge sharing. Researchers found that it raises knowledge sharing behavior even when individuals are reluctant to share their knowledge (Shyh et al., 2006). In other words, motivation stimulates knowledge sharing and lack of motivation has negative effects on knowledge sharing (Raghu & Vinze 2007).

Lin (2007) identified that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators impact knowledge sharing intentions and attitudes, however, the effects of intrinsic factors were more than extrinsic factors, as "expected organizational rewards" could not significantly predict employee's attitude, behavior, or intention. The employees, organizational factors and knowledge sharing technology were analyzed and the impact on knowledge sharing process was determined. Enjoyment in helping others and knowledge self-efficacy, as individual factors and top management support, as an organizational factor were shown to firmly improve knowledge-sharing processes.

Similarly, Prodromos and Vrimaki (2009) stated that motivation is not only essential for knowledge sharing behavior but also for an individual's intention to share knowledge; therefore, it affects the intention to share knowledge.

Yang and Chen (2007) categorized the knowledge sharing motivation factors into three categories: organizational, individual and knowledge level. Organizational and individual factors are focused in this study. They proposed that organizational culture, technologies, incentive for employees, and management support for knowledge sharing factors belong to the organizational category, while interpersonal trust, organizational commitment and self-efficacy fall into the individual category.

Akhavan, Rahimi and Mehralian (2014) combined the knowledge sharing motivation factors from previous research with factors that were introduced in motivational theories to find how the factors affect knowledge sharing. The study found that motivational factors are not all equally important. The important intrinsic motivation factors are friendly and intimate relationships, interpersonal trust, success, honesty, responsibility, commitment and loyalty, religious beliefs, respect, selfmanagement, organizational justice, social status, compliance with the demands, learning, growth and improvement of the organization, the usefulness of knowledge sharing and enjoyment of helping others. The important extrinsic factors are job promotion, autonomy of work, managers' quality, non-financial rewards, challenge of work, financial rewards, management support, recognition, and reputation.

Challenges by Employees to Knowledge Sharing

Though employees acknowledge the advantages of knowledge sharing, researchers found employees restrain from sharing their knowledge with others (Davenport & Harris, 2007). There are many reasons for employees not to share their knowledge. Some of the reasons include a lack of relationship between the source of knowledge and the receiver of the knowledge, a lack of rewards and motivation, insufficient time, a lack of knowledge sharing culture, inadequacy in understanding what to share with whom, limited willingness to share, and finally a fear of acquiring false knowledge can even lead to employees abstaining from accepting shared knowledge (Smith & McKeen, 2003).

The challenge in organizations then is to convince employees to create, share, use, and reuse knowledge within and outside of the organization faster than competitors in order to achieve sustainable competitive advantages. A major knowledge management strategy focuses on creating and sharing knowledge (Othman & Abdullah, 2011). Using knowledge-based assets effectively enables organizations to preserve their important information and knowledge embedded in employees. Knowledge sharing is expected to lead the organization to respond to customer needs faster and increase cooperation and collaboration among team members (Jackson, Hitt & Denisi, 2003). In order to know the key factors that influence employees to share their knowledge, series of researches have been developed. Chatzoglou and Vraimaki (2009) found that knowledge sharing intention is mainly influenced by strong motivational support for the attitude towards knowledge sharing of employees and as an organizational strategy.

 Table 3: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

 Motivation and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Employee motivation has been identified as a major barrier to successful knowledge transfer initiatives (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000; Osterloh & Frey, 2000; Ruggles, 1998; Szulanski, 2000).

(Continued)

 Table 3 (Continued): Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages

 between Motivation and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Fenwick, R. & Olson, J. (1986) stated that from the perspective of work behavior research, extrinsic motivation has been shown to significantly affect worker participation. Hence, certain forms of <u>extrinsic motivation</u>, for example monetary incentives or praise and public recognition, may stimulate knowledge sharing.

Margit O. & Bruno S. F. (2000) indicated that increased <u>intrinsic motivation has been</u> associated with employee willingness to create a positive mood, resulting in increased learning and inclination to participate in voluntary knowledge sharing.

Stenmark (2001) recognized that knowledge worker's <u>motivation plays a critical role</u> in enabling sharing of tacit as well as explicit knowledge.

Employee motivation has been identified as a major barrier to successful knowledge transfer initiatives (Dyer & Nobeoka, 2000; Osterloh & Frey, 2000; Ruggles, 1998; Szulanski, 2000).

Fenwick, R. & Olson, J. (1986) stated that from the perspective of work behavior research, extrinsic motivation has been shown to significantly affect worker participation. Hence, certain forms of extrinsic motivation, for example monetary incentives or praise and public recognition, may stimulate knowledge sharing.

(Continued)
Table 3 (Continued): Summarization of selected literature supporting the linkages

 between motivation and attitude toward knowledge sharing

Margit O. & Bruno S. F. (2000) indicated that increased intrinsic motivation has been associated with employee willingness to create a positive mood, resulting in increased learning and inclination to participate in voluntary knowledge sharing.

Stenmark (2001) recognized that knowledge worker's motivation plays a critical role in enabling sharing of tacit as well as explicit knowledge.

EI, Individual Motivation (IM) and Organization Motivation (OM) and Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS)

This section evolves the Theoretical Research Model from Version 1 (Figure 1) to Version 2.0, Figure 4 below, which adds and discusses the sub-variables for EI, IM, OM and AS. The relationship of EI (Independent variable) with each of the three dependent variables is presented. That is then augmented with discussions on each dependent variable and its sub-variable, and capped with supporting data from key related theories.



Figure 4: Refined Theoretical Research Model

The Refined Theoretical Research Model figure reflects the linkages between The independent variable EI and the dependent variables IM, OM and AS as well as IM and OM as important influencers on AS. Further discussion of these linkages follows.

Independent Variable Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is seen as cooperation between intelligence and emotions to form the basis of behaviors for human competence in any activity (Mayer et al., 2004). EI has been claimed as a key factor to increase effectiveness at work, to support potential for promotion, and to enhance the objectives of career development (Cherniss, Boyatzis, & Elias, 2000). Organizations became interested in encouraging and promoting EI for enhancing their employees' potential, improving customer satisfaction, increasing workplace productivity, and facilitating cooperation among employees (Meyer et al., 2004). In both a "Research or Business Setting" motivation of the Individual and/or a supporting Organizational climate/culture carry the touted benefits of EI to heights of success.

EI - Individual Motivation (IM): High emotional intelligent individuals can perceive, understand and regulate their motivation and the motives of others; it makes EI an important factor for the success of interpersonal interactions in a workplace (Mayer et al. in Dulewicz et al. 2003). EI is not only the predictor of one's successes but also of teamwork effectiveness (Wong & Law, 2002). This is because EI encourages positive shared emotions, which can lead to group effectiveness through broadening and building interactions among group members (Rhee, 2005). Jordan and Troth in Frye et al. (2006) examined and found that teams with higher average levels of EI performed better on problem-solving tasks, and adopted collaboration as their preferred style of conflict resolution.

Emotional intelligence is significantly related to several indicators of quality social interaction (Lopes et al., 2003). Druskat and Wolff (2001) mentioned that team emotional intelligence creates trust and efficacy among team members and also builds an atmosphere that is favorable to the efficiency and creativity of teams. Literature suggests that **interpersonal trust** and safety within groups is correlated to interpersonal affective behavior. The strength of social ties and relationships within groups is directly related to emotional competency and it enhances knowledge sharing and learning opportunities (McAllister, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998).

EI has also proven to develop employees' commitment to the team's organization "home" (Wong & Law, 2002), which is a key success factor in shaping a positive attitude toward KS. Having high EI employees can ensure the achievement of knowledge sharing. A positive relationship between EI and organizational

commitment is established in many studies. For example, a study on direct health care workers by Humphreys, Brunsen, and Davis (2005) and a research conducted on public sector employees by Adeyemo (2007) both found EI is significantly related to organizational commitment. Also another study found that employees with high levels of EI have more capability **to maintain their organizational commitment** (Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002).

Research has shown that attitude toward knowledge sharing is not only likely to happen in a team with high emotional intelligence but also to be used as a valuable contributor to a common task (Sackmann & Friesl, 2007). Various studies that focused on the interrelation between EI and **self-efficacy** have suggested that EI is important to developing employees' self-efficacy. Furthermore, they suggest that EI has a significant relationship with perceived self-efficacy regardless of emotional intelligence measurements or models (Chan, 2004; Gürol, Özercan, & Yalçın, 2010; Rastegar & Memarpour, 2009; Schwarzer, 1993; Schutte et al., 1998; Kaur et al. (2006) and Belanger et al. (2007), in the same way, summarized that through cognitive-emotional processing, **higher emotional intelligence individuals are more likely to develop higher self-efficacy**.

EI - Organization Motivation (OM): Regardless of the high awareness of EI in the organization effectiveness and work efficiency, there have been few attempts made to understand the relationships of EI and organizational motivation. Yet each or both affect one's "Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing", a precursor to the actual act of Knowledge Sharing!! Jonathan and Gerald (2011) asserted that in the past psychologists viewed perception and emotion as separated phenomena and studied them in isolation. However, the processes of the brain and their relevant behavior

areas have increasingly been found to be highly interactive. Goleman (1995) suggested that people's judgment is influenced by the human mind, including both the rational mind and the emotional mind. Hales and Gough (2003) found that employees perceive organizational motivation factors differently because they perceive value in different ways. For example, an attractive reward for one employee might not be attractive to others.

EI – Knowledge Sharing (AS): Knowledge sharing is defined in several ways. It can be a process of transferring knowledge from one to another (Sharrat & Usoro, 2003) or making knowledge understandable and useable for others (Ipe, 2003). Basically, knowledge sharing is where individuals share their knowledge, thoughts, suggestions and experiences with others (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002). In organizations, knowledge sharing is the storage of employees' knowledge, as well as how to organize it, make it reusable and transfer it. It is about how to make knowledge available for others. Knowledge transfer is a variety of interactions between individuals and groups; within, between, and across groups; and from groups to the organization. Knowledge can be exchanged and discussed among internal and external team members of an organization, or with and between stakeholders with interests internally and externally when appropriate.

The objective of sharing knowledge can be for developing new knowledge from the existing or improving it by exchanging, integrating, and synergizing knowledge in order to maintain or enhance competitiveness of the organization (Chen et al., 2010; Christensen, 2007).

The benefits of knowledge sharing in organizations have been confirmed by many studies, cited in literature and agreed upon among business organizations and academia. The sharing of knowledge in organizations, between individuals, groups and departments, is considered to be a crucial process for managing knowledge effectively (O'Dell & Grayson, 1998; Osterloh & Frey, 2000). Knowledge sharing is also perceived as an important fundamental process for generating new ideas and developing new business opportunities (Muhammad, Nida, Kiran, & Adnan, 2011) and decreasing unnecessary learning efforts (Lin, 2007).

Empirical research increasingly presents evidence that effective knowledge sharing strategies translate into higher productivity and competitiveness for an organization in comparison to one embracing less effective knowledge sharing strategies (Lapre & Van Wassenhove, 2001). Wang and Noe (2010) also presented that knowledge sharing positively relate to reduce business operation cost, increase completion of new product development projects speed, improve team and organization performance, and enhance organization innovation capabilities, which lead to sales and revenue growth. Ultimately, the higher the EI profiles of the individuals, groups, organizational practices, policies, and support the greater the successful outcomes both for Knowledge Sharing and the "Business Goals" and objectives of the Enterprise.

Dependent Variables IM, OM, and AS

Individual Motivation (IM): Many studies have focused on the relationships between individual motivation factors and knowledge sharing. Cabrera, Collins and Salgado (2006) stated that self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and interpersonal trust between employees had positive effect on knowledge sharing. Trust and commitment is also mentioned by Gallie et al. (2001) as one of the key factors in relation to knowledge management. In addition, Tohidinia and Mosakhani (2010) found that

perceived self-efficacy, anticipated relationships and organizational climate positively influenced knowledge sharing of employees.

In sum, individual motivation has been widely highlighted as influencing knowledge sharing behavior. Individual motivation includes interpersonal trust, organizational commitment, and self-efficacy.

Interpersonal trust: Mayer et al. (1995) defined trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectations that the other will perform a particular action important to the trust or, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party".

Fukuyama (1996) defined trust as "an expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest and cooperative behavior, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community".

Among individual factors, focus was made on social trust (Chiu et al., 2006; Hsu et al., 2007; Watson and Hewett, 2006), relational social capital (Chow & Chan, 2008; Tiwana & Bush, 2005; Wasko & Faraj, 2005), and individual attitudes towards knowledge sharing (Kim & Ju, 2008), of which the last one was proposed by the researchers as an independent variable that could directly influence knowledge sharing. Most of the problems encountered in knowledge sharing can be traced back to a lack of trust among staff in an organization. Researchers have showed that most employees are often either unwilling or unable to share their knowledge and information with other colleagues, because of a lack of social trust among them (Chen & Huang, 2007). Therefore, the concept of social trust is the degree of one's willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another. Interpersonal trust is a trusting relationship among persons (McKnight et al., 1998). It has been identified as an important motivation factor to organizational achievement and essential for knowledge management as an antecedent or mediator of knowledge sharing (Ford, 2003; Lin, 2007; Rolland & Chauvel, 2000) because it is a key impact to how employees interact with each other.

Interpersonal trust is positively linked to knowledge creation and knowledge acquisition (Lee & Choi, 2003; Politis, 2003; Renzl, 2008). The tendency of concealing knowledge is higher when the trust is low because the uncertainty of the outcome of sharing. The trust culture and environment motivate innovation and risk taking in order to create new knowledge and utilize existing knowledge (Lopez et al., 2004). Renzl (2008). Furthermore, Ho et al. (2010) highlighted that trust can reduce the fear of losing one's value, which enhance knowledge sharing behaviors and at the same time increasing individual's willingness to share knowledge. Employees have more willingness to share knowledge to their colleagues when they trust one another (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005). Positive trust is one of the most important motivators for knowledge sharing practices (Ford, 2003; Rolland & Chauvel, 2000). Therefore, trust building in the workplace is a necessary ingredient for effective knowledge sharing.

The most common used literature to discuss and conceptualize trust is the Integrative Model of Organizational Trust by Mayer et al. (1995), which has been used to explain trust in organizations and references for research works (Davis et al., 2000). The model conceptualizes trust in three key dimensions; three factors of ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995).

- Ability refers to a set of skills and characteristics that enable the trustee to have influence within some specific domain. It can be defined by;
 Competent (skills and abilities) and Efficiency
- Benevolence is the degree that the trustor believed the trustee wants to do good for the trustor. It can be defined by; motives beneficial of the trustor, willingness to help of the trustor, and sensitivity to the needs and interests of the trustor.
- Integrity is the trustor's perception of the trustee's integrity. It can be defined by honesty, consistence, and fairness.

 Table 4: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

 Interpersonal Trust and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Al-Alawi et al., (2007) summarized that <u>knowledge sharing in organizations has a</u> significant relationship with trust, information system, rewards and organizational climate.

Hsu et al. (2007) presented the <u>influence of trust and self-efficacy in the employees</u>' willingness to share their knowledge and how they affect knowledge sharing behavior.

Hong-ping Sun and Xiang-yang Liu (2006) identified <u>that trust</u>, <u>subjective norms</u>, as individual motivators, are the predictors of intention to share knowledge of individuals.

60

(Continued)

Table 4 (Continued): Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Interpersonal Trust and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Many KM researches indicate that a <u>high level of trust helps to facilitate knowledge sharing</u>. <u>It is presented as moderator for knowledge to be exchanged smoothly. However, if</u> <u>employees have low trust, they will be uncertain with the outcome of sharing</u>. The tendency <u>to conceal their knowledge is higher when trust is low; therefore, trust building in the</u> <u>workplace is necessary for effective knowledge sharing</u>. (Ford, 2003; Rolland & Chauvel, 2000).

Organizational commitment: Allen and Meyer (1990) suggested that "A committed employee is one who will stay with the organization through thick and thin, attends work regularly, puts in a full day, protects company assets, and who shares company goals".

Steers (1977) explained that employees' commitment towards the organization strengthen the involvement in and identification with the organization. Researchers stated that employees with high levels of organizational commitment have more enthusiasm to perform extra effort for the benefit of the organization. When the organizational aim is to implement knowledge management, employees with organizational commitment will participate in the knowledge sharing activities without hesitation (Hislop, 2002; Jarvenpaa & Staples, 2001; Kelloway & Barling, 2000; Mahee, 2006; Scarbrough, 2000; Smith & McKeen, 2003). Organizations; consequently, needs commitment from their employees for the strong belief in and acceptance of organizations' objectives, and values (Mowday, Porter, & Dubin, 1974; Scholl, 1981).

Of the various dimensions of organizational commitment that have been identified, Meyer and Allen (1997) distinguished between three different kinds of commitment.

- Affective commitment: an emotional attachment to organization which leads to a feeling of wanting to continue to stay with the organization
- Continuance commitment: a feeling of needing to stay with the organization to avoid the high costs of leaving
- Normative commitment: a feeling of obligation to stay with the organization

Organizational commitment is important because employees with high levels of organizational commitment are less likely to leave, more likely to be highly motivated, and more willing to share their knowledge within the organization. As Meyer and Allen (1997) and Kelloway and Barling (2000) confirmed, affective commitment is positively related to individuals' willingness to provide more effort to their work. This is the kind of commitment which can be explained the willingness to share knowledge of employees. Table 5: Summarization of Selected Literature, which Supports the Linkages between

Organizational Commitment and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Storey and Quintas (2001) and Thomson and Heron (2005) suggest that the high levels of organizational commitment reduce the tendency of leaving the organization, resulting in motivating employees to share their knowledge.

Alvesson (2005), Lin (2006), McKenzie et al. (2001), and Scarbrough and Carter (2000), asserted that the success of <u>knowledge management implementing in</u> <u>organizations is greatly related to the levels of employees' organizational</u> <u>commitment</u> because the higher levels of organizational commitment reflects the higher willingness and motivation of employees to share their knowledge.

Self-efficacy: Alberto Bandura firstly introduced self-efficacy in 1977. Bandura (1982) defined self-efficacy as "people's belief in their capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives." It impacts decisions making and amount of effort when manage obstacles; hence, influences individuals' motivation and behavior (Bandura 1995). Various studies have focused on individual self-efficacy and found a positive link with work-related behaviors and achievement (Meng-Hsiang Hsu & Chao-Min Chiu, 2005).

Self-efficacy was defined as individuals' judgments of their capabilities to perform behaviors; to contribute to the organization, to help solve problems or to improve work efficiency in the work place (Constant et al., 1996; Hargadon, 1998; Pavlou & Fygenson, 2006). Self-efficacy has been applied in many areas to explore their predictive competency on task performance. Marakas et al. (1998) and Thompson et al. (2002) indicated that self-efficacy is an individual's awareness of the capability in executing specific tasks, which has a significant effect on an individual's performance.

Researchers have found that self-efficacy can motivate employees to share knowledge with colleagues (Bandura 1986; Kankanhalli et al. 2005; Wasko & Faraj 2005). Higher self-efficacy employees believe that they can contribute to organizational performance by sharing their knowledge; as a result, they have more positive attitudes toward and intentions regarding knowledge sharing.

Several self-efficacy measures are available. The most well-known measures are Sherer et al.'s General Self-Efficacy Scale (1982), Schwarzer and Jerusalem's General Perceived Self-Efficacy Scale (1995), and Chen et al.'s New General Self-Efficacy Scale (2001).

Sherer et al.'s General Self-Efficacy (GSE) Scale has been popular among organizational contexts (Chen et al., 2001). It is aimed to measure overall individual self-efficacy and social self-efficacy. It contains 17 items, which are response to a 5point Likert scale range from "agree strongly" to "disagree strongly" (Sherer & Adams, 1983).

Schwarzer and Jerusalem's General Perceived Self-Efficacy Scale was originally in German and has been widely used and translated into 28 different languages, including English (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). It aimed to measure an individual's capability in managing new and difficult situations in diverse environments. The scale consists of 10 items, which are response to a 4-point Likert scale range from "not at all true" to "exactly true".

Chen et al.'s New General Self-Efficacy Scale is the most recent GSE measure. This measure was designed to tap Eden's (2001) definition of GSE: "one's belief in one's overall competence to effect requisite performance across a wide variety of achievement situations" (p. 75). It consists of eight items which responses to 5-point Likert scale range from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

 Table 6: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Self

 efficacy and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Kuo & Young (2008) suggested that knowledge sharing can be predicted by selfefficacy.

Luthans (2003) suggest that self-efficacy influences knowledge sharing behavior. When employees believe that sharing their knowledge can contribute to organizational performance, they will have more positive attitudes toward knowledge sharing and will be more willing to share.

Wasko and Faraj 2000; Kankanhalli et al. 2005) stated that <u>motivational factors</u> which influence employees to share knowledge within the organization are <u>competence and self-efficacy</u>.

Organizational Motivation (OM)

Knowledge sharing tools: Information technology (IT) is much broader and more indeterminate than computer science. Tippins and Sohi (2003) defined information technology as a generic term used to refer to programs, computers and telecommunication. The effective use of IT has played a crucial role in managing knowledge by ensuring timely access and exchange of knowledge to facilitate the decision-making process through information communication technologies, which facilitate the decision-making process (Harrison & Daly, 2009; Nishimoto & Matsuda, 2007; Sridharan & Kinshuk, 2002). The role of knowledge management information technology, knowledge repositories and knowledge sharing tools play a bigger and increasingly significant role in enhancing organizational effectiveness (Markus, 2001). Knowledge sharing tools have been shown to enable employees to access the right knowledge sources thus facilitating the process of knowledge donation, storage, acquisition, distribution and utilization which enhance knowledge sharing among employees (Gottschalk, 2006; Lee & Al-Hawamdeh, 2002). Knowledge sharing tools also assists the knowledge sharing process. The tools are utilized to create knowledge assets, interpersonal communication, network capabilities needed for accelerating the speed of knowledge creation and transfer, which engages employees to share their knowledge. Knowledge sharing tools, consequently, are always considered as essential factors to achieve competitive advantage and success of knowledge sharing implementation (Christian, Lindgren, Nulden, & Pessi, 2002).

A number of organizations have been increasingly utilizing advance technology to promote a positive knowledge sharing culture among employees. Alam, et al. (2009) cited that organizations are creating ease of use databases also known as "knowledge repositories" for employees to donate and utilize knowledge and expertise effectively with the expectation that knowledge sharing will increase among the employees.

The utilization of information technology in the process of creating, organizing, locating, distributing and sharing knowledge, would increase the possibility of achieving successful knowledge management (Rasli, Madjid and Asmi, 2004). This is because it can facilitate and encourage employees to share and retrieve knowledge, that being said, the availability of technology alone, does not guarantee that knowledge-sharing tools will be utilized effectively (Cross and Baird, 2000). Akhavan, et al. (2006) identified critical success factors for knowledge sharing tools, both design and application, and implementation of knowledge management needed to be develop in integrated manner based on organization structure.

 Table 7: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

 Knowledge tools and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Fjermestad & Hiltz (2000) summarized that the use of collaborative tools in the process of sharing knowledge is the purposeful use of networking and collaboration technologies to support teams in the creation of shared understanding toward joint effect.

(Continued)

Table 7 (Continued): Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Knowledge tools and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Fliedner (2003) stated that the use of web-based technologies and group decision support systems are required to exchange information and knowledge to achieve a desired outcome.

Sarker (2002) asserted that one of the key prerequisites for enabling collaboration and communication among members with diverse backgrounds in terms of domain and levels of expertise is mechanisms to access knowledge.

Management support and commitment: Many researchers (Chong, 2005; Civi, 2000; Davenport & Pruksa, 1998; Gupta, 2008; Masrek et al., 2008; Moffett et al., 2003; Pemberton et al., 2002; Ryan & Prybutok, 2001; Salleh & Goh, 2002) highlighted management support and commitment as indicator of employees' knowledge sharing level in an organization. Management is key decision makers, who responsible for directing the organization policies, infrastructure, rewards and recognition program (Jager & Straub 1999). One specific role of management is to promote employees working together to either make things happen or prevent them from happening (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1993). Management also influences employees' within the organization, develops organization goals, and facilitates employees' achievement of those goals (Nahavandi, 2000).

Successful knowledge management implementation; hence, needs management to clarify and acknowledge its importance. A consistent communications strategy, especially from the management team, is needed to demonstrate their commitment and support in order to ensure that employees' also put their efforts to create a culture that supports knowledge sharing (Jarrar, 2002). It is necessary to provide employees' time to share and to codify knowledge. Furthermore, rewards and recognition systems are necessary for motivating employees to spend time and efforts to share their knowledge (O'Dell & Grayson, 1998).

King and Marks (2008) found that the existence of management support was a good predictor of the frequency of knowledge sharing as well as the knowledge sharing behavior of employees, which ultimately could lead to the success of knowledge management. Similarly, Sharma et al. (2012) found that the main driver of the successfulness of KM implementation is mainly influenced by management commitment and support, particularly in knowledge creating and culture sharing activities.

Harder (2008) affirmed that management support impacts employees' autonomous motivation to share knowledge. It also has positive relationships with knowledge sharing culture (Chiu et al., 2006; Connelly & Kelloway, 2003; Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006). The support of management and their encouragement of knowledge management, as perceived by employees, stimulate the willingness to share and increase knowledge exchange frequency, knowledge sharing quality, and commitment to knowledge sharing of employees. Thus, management support is recognized as an important factor in KM implementation and must be sustained throughout the KM process.

Table 8: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Management Support and Commitment and attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

The management support and commitment factor has been found to directly influence the extent of KMS use (Aurum et al., 2007; Butler et al., 2007; Kulkarni et al., 2007; Moffett et al., 2004; Vitari et al., 2007).

Kulkarni et al. (2007) indicated that <u>the management support and commitment affects</u> the quality of shared knowledge.

Lin (2007) reported that the support of management for sharing knowledge was demonstrated to be associated positively with the perception of the employees related to culture of knowledge sharing such as trust of employee and their desire to help other people as well as the eagerness for knowledge sharing.

Rewards and incentives: Many researchers have shown that rewards and incentives motivate employees' behavior and performance. Employees perform according to the perceived values and reciprocal benefits of the action. They will continue to perform the action as long as the perceived benefits are not less than the effort, otherwise it will stop (Kowal & Fortier, 1999; Vallerand & Rousseau, 2001).

Incentives: extrinsic rewards (i.e. promotion, bonus), and recognition are recommended to be used as a stimulator to encourage positive attitude towards knowledge sharing and to facilitate a knowledge sharing friendly culture (Haung et al., 2008; Kankanhalli et al., 2005; Wei, et al., 2012; Yao, Kam, & Chan, 2007). Employees who have a better perception of incentive systems, have a more positive attitude towards knowledge sharing and will be more likely to share and use knowledge (Cabrera et al., 2006; Kulkarni et al., 2006).

A formal, fair, and objective rewards system is crucial to motivate employee performance and create a supportive organizational culture which encourages employees to create new knowledge and increases the willingness to share knowledge (Alavi & Leidner, 1999; Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Gold et al., 2001; Kilmann, 1989; Leonard-Barton, 1998; Nadler & Tushman, 1998). The prerequisites to providing fair incentives are the recording of knowledge sharing behaviors and measuring the quality of knowledge shared.

Rewards can be categorized into extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Extrinsic rewards are tangible awards like trophies, promotions, and salary increases. Davenport & Prusak (1998) and Hargadon (1998) classified extrinsic rewards as monetary (increased salary and bonuses) and non-monetary (promotions and job security). Extrinsic rewards were proved to develop the knowledge sharing behavior, but it can only be used in a short-term basis. Employees withdraw the desired behavior when the rewards are taken away (Kohn, 1993).

Intrinsic rewards are intangible awards like acknowledgement, sense of achievement, or self-satisfaction. They usually occur from within an individual as a result of an activity or behavior. Empirical researches presented that intrinsic rewards are most appropriately used to facilitate knowledge sharing in organizations (Kankanhalli et al., 2005; Ko et al., 2005). They are found to be more effect to develop knowledge sharing behavior among employees and can be long lasting because it is difficult to change when employees are intrinsically motivated (Alam, et al. 2009; Kugel & Schostek, 2004).

Although, extrinsic rewards sometimes weaken intrinsic motivation, they can affirm competence of the employees that drives intrinsic motivation (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002). Moreover, intrinsic motivation is difficult to change and more uncertain outcome comparing to extrinsic motivation (Osterloh & Frey, 2000). Therefore, the balanced combinations of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are fundamental to the success of organizational knowledge sharing.

 Table 9: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

 Rewards and Incentives and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Research has emphasized the importance of rewards and incentives as an effective way to motivate knowledge sharing (Benbya and Belbaly, 2005; Kankanhalli et al., 2003; Moffett et al., 2004).

Nelson et al. (2006) asserted that the incentives such as rewards and recognition were suggested as the interventions which can make the knowledge sharing easy and also help to establish a supportive culture.

(Continued)

Table 9 (Continued): Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between Rewards and Incentives and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Yao, Kam, and Chan (2007) stated that the shortage of incentives was recommended to be the main obstacles for sharing knowledge in cultures.

Organizational culture: Bates and Plog (1990) defines culture as "the system of shared beliefs, values, customs, behaviors, and artifacts that the members of society use to cope with their world and with one another, and that are transmitted from generation to generation through learning."

Unesco (2001) defines culture as "the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and belief."

Kreitner, Kinicki, and Buelens (2001) stated that organizational culture is a consequence of society culture. The society culture influence organizational behavior through employees' customs and language, while, organizational culture effects individual's attitudes, values and expectation. The powerful culture with positive attitudes among individuals in the organizations range from top management to employees can assist the organization to its success. Like societal culture, organization cultures are difficult to change because they have developed into habits. That being said, these habits can be managed by changing the practices. Top management can decide to use the existing culture or change it; however, change will

be possible only with assistance of key individuals from different levels in the organizations (Jackson, 1995).

Organizational culture is a shared set of values, philosophy and mission of the organization that from the employees' point of view, frames their actions and behavior, and creates their perception of the organization (McDermott & O'Dell, 2001). The development of organizational culture is related to the how it reacts to situations, both internally and externally. Accordingly, each organizational culture is distinctive (Park et al., 2004). Organizational cultures also set expectations of employees. It defines what type of people will fit into the organization and it also affects the interactions among employees within and outside the organization.

In recent years, the need for knowledge sharing to be embedded in organizational culture has been emphasized by researchers and scholars (Alam et al., 2009). This is due to the fact that it is considered to play a major role in the success of knowledge sharing implementation (Hoof & Huysman, 2009; Huysman & Wulf, 2006; Janz & Prasarnphanich, 2003; Jarvenpaa & Staples, 2001). Janz et al. (2003) emphasized the importance of culture for effective knowledge management. They explained that the relationships between knowledge management activities, organizational and individual characteristics encouraged the creation of knowledge sharing. The knowledge flow in an organization depends on the trust among employees and between employees and organization. This emphasizes the need for organizations with a climate of trust and knowledge-friendly culture. Sveiby (2001) and Newell et al. (2002) urged that management of people must focus on assessing, changing, and improving employees' skills and behaviors in order to encourage employees' to share their knowledge. To adopt knowledge sharing into the organization requires assessing existing organizational culture. Organizational cultures which value trust, implement effective rewards, or promote interpersonal relationships among employees are mostly succeeding in managing knowledge (Zand, 1997). Consequently, literature has indicated that culture plays an important role in creating knowledge management along with successful knowledge sharing among employees' in the organization (Alam, et al. 2009). According to Delong and Fahey (2002), it is difficult to implement knowledge management in organizations without a knowledge sharing friendly culture. Attempts to do so will not result in achieving the maximum benefit from knowledge management. Therefore, knowledge acquisition and sharing must be values that are integrated into organizational culture (Gold et al, 2001).

McKenna (2000) categorized culture into four types; power culture, role culture, support culture and achievement culture. While, Kulkarni, Ravindran and Freeze (2007) believe that supportive and adaptive culture can enable knowledge management implementation and practices. Alavi, Kayworth and Leidner (2005) added that values of organizational culture, such as innovativeness, collaboration trust and autonomy, ultimately lead to effective knowledge management and are predictors of knowledge creation process. Nevertheless, Cameron and Ettington (1988) stated that there is no specific type of culture that is best for all organizations. It depends on adaptation function that organization must practice in order to overcome problem and business obstacle. Table 10: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

Organizational Culture and Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing

Desouza (2003) suggested that the <u>establishment of an organizational culture that is</u> in favor of knowledge sharing can help to overcome engineers' resistance to using and contributing knowledge to the KMS, thereby leading to an increased usage of the system.

Bock, Zmud, Kim & Lee (2006) firm with the culture focusing on more innovation will help the sharing of information in subjective norms which motivate sharing knowledge.

Schepers & Van den Berg (2007) mentioned that a firm's climate which concentrates on individual competition might show an obstacle for sharing knowledge and <u>the</u> <u>perceptions of the cooperative team aid the trust creation, a crucial situation for</u> <u>sharing knowledge.</u>

2.2 Theoretical Framework

As stated earlier the key to exploring Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing is heavily based on motivational influences of the employee. That motivation can be driven by intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The motivating factors of greatest impact in this study are discussed in greater detail below.

This section expands upon the Theoretical Research Model with greater detail for each of the contribution variables completing the Ontology and Epistemology facets of this study's research structure and processes presented in the remaining chapters. Intrinsic motivation factors differ for each employee according to their background. When employees are intrinsically motivated, they enjoy sharing knowledge for the satisfaction of educating others (Davenport, T. H. & Prusak, L., 1998; Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S., 2000; Kankanhalli, Tan & Wei, 2005). Examples of intrinsic factors are interpersonal trust, organizational commitment, and self-efficacy. Extrinsic motivation is defined as when a person is engaged in a task for some external reasons, i.e. for a reward, to avoid a punishment, to increase self-worth, or to reach a meaningful goal. Examples of extrinsic factors are knowledge sharing tools, management support, rewards and incentives and organizational culture.

EI (TEIST) - intrinsic and/or extrinsic Motivation Factors

Virtue (EIV): Little (1997) stated that the virtuous person has not mere moral beliefs but a complex of moral belief and outlook which will reliably move him/her to behave morally; virtue can be defined as a factor to motivate people to live their life with morality and ethics in order to peacefully live with others.

Competence (EIC): McClelland (1973) defined competence as "the knowledge, skills, traits, attitudes, self-concepts, values or motives directly related to job performance or important life outcomes and shown to differentiate between superior and average performers." Employees' competency in an organization was discussed by Sinnott et al. as an employee characteristic which contributes to successful job performance and achievement of organizational results. These include knowledge, skills, and attributes plus other characteristics such as values, motivation, initiative and self-control.

Happiness (EIH): Waugh & Fredrickson (2006) stated that when people are happy and excited, they tend to be more sociable. In the same way, Cropanzano and Wright (2001), discussed that happy employees are sensitive to opportunities, more helpful to co-workers, and more confident. Conversely, unhappy employees are more sensitive to threats, more defensive around co-workers, and more pessimistic. Happiness, therefore, has a great impact on employees' workplace contribution which will in turn relate to motivation of employees.

Individual - intrinsic Motivation Factors (IM)

Interpersonal trust (IMI): The volume of information exchange and process of cooperation can be improved by interpersonal trust. Interpersonal trust is a key success factor for knowledge sharing through formal and informal communication among employees. The higher level of interpersonal trust among employees motivates open discussion and increases effective communication in an organization (Chang & Chuang 2011). There are many studies that indicate a high level of trust helps to facilitate knowledge sharing (Ford, 2003; Moshabbaki & Jaha'nyan, 2009; Rolland & Chauvel, 2000; Scott, 2000). Trust is presented as a moderator for knowledge to be exchanged smoothly. Accordingly, if employees have low trust, they will be uncertain with the outcome of sharing. The tendency of concealing their knowledge is higher when trust is low; therefore, trust building in the workplace is necessary for effective and successful knowledge sharing (Ford, 2003; Rolland & Chauvel, 2000).

Organizational commitment (IMO): Human resource management beliefs are that commitment is a trait that is highly desirable in an employee and that individual commitment correlates to organizational commitment (Marchiori & Henkin, 2004; Stallworth, 2003). Employees with a high level of organizational commitment are more likely to stay with the organization and more motivated to put in the extra effort, including sharing knowledge, within the organization. When KS initiatives become the focus of organizations many researchers are interested in finding the key success factors which employees can adopt and practice. The relationship between the organizational commitment and KS adoption by the employees is a key factor that has been studied. There are large quantities of literature which illustrate that the level of organizational commitment of employees is closely linked to their attitude toward knowledge sharing and willingness to share their knowledge (Cabrera et al., 2006; Hislop, 2003; Hoof & Rider, 2004; Malhotra & Galletta, 2003; McKenzie, Truch & Winkelen, 2001; Robertson & Hammersely, 2000; Storey & Quintas, 2001).

Self-efficacy (IMS): Self-efficacy is the belief of an individual in their ability to handle difficult situations. Employees with a high degree of self-efficacy believe that they can solve problems in the work place and can help increase workplace efficiency (Constant et al., 1996; Hargadon, 1998). Self-efficacy plays a major role in employees' performance because it affects behavior directly (Bandura, 1997). When employees believe that sharing their knowledge can contribute to organizational performance, they will have a higher positive attitude towards knowledge sharing and will be more willing to share.

Organizational - extrinsic Motivation Factors (OM)

Knowledge sharing Tools (OMT): Information technology is seen as important to the foundation of KS success since it is a part of the necessary infrastructure needed to enable KS initiatives. Communication tools and technologies create interpersonal communication, which engages knowledge sharing with appropriate enabling tools. Organizations, therefore, invest in tools and technologies; however, the access to tools in itself does not necessarily mean that knowledge will be shared (Cross & Baird, 2000). But the availability of tools and their ease of use significantly affect a positive knowledge sharing attitude (King & Marks, 2008).

Management support and commitment (OMM): Management commitment influences knowledge-sharing attitudes through the employees' perception of organizational support by senior level employees. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), the perception of management engagement/support influences positive knowledge-sharing attitudes (Hislop, 2003). Employees perceive the support of their organization through the stated commitment of management on policies and believe it by follow through in practices.

Rewards and incentives (OMR): Bartol and Srivastava (2002) stated that there are three common rewards and incentives, which are monetary rewards, recognition, and promotion. Each of these can be incentives suited for different types of employees in organizations, some valued monetary rewards, while some preferred recognition. However, recording, measuring and "advertising" successful knowledge sharing activities are prerequisite to apply transparent incentive systems for motivating knowledge-sharing behavior (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002).

Organizational culture (OMC): Organizational culture directly and indirectly influences employees' knowledge sharing behavior and attitude. Knowledge sharing processes will not occur without a knowledge sharing friendly culture. Organizational culture helps to define types of people who will fit into the organization and affects how employees interact within an organization (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2000).

Knowledge Sharing

According to the literatures, there are different definitions on knowledge sharing.

Lin et al. (2009) defined knowledge sharing as "A social interaction culture, involving the exchange of employee knowledge, experience, and skills through the whole department or organization."

Harder (2008) defined knowledge sharing as "The voluntary social process to transfer, absorb and reuse the existing knowledge in order to serve an organizational end."

Sethumadhavan (2007) defined knowledge sharing as "A systematic process to create, acquire, synthesize, learn, share and use knowledge and experience to achieve organizational goal(s). This knowledge can be from an employee's mind or stored in paper form in filing cabinets and/or stored in electronic form". Similarly, Lin (2007) stated that "knowledge sharing is a process of capturing, organizing, reusing, and transferring knowledge".

Argote and Ingram (2000) defined knowledge sharing as "The process through which one unit is affected by the experience of another. In this respect, a unit can be an individual, a group or an organization".

Knowledge sharing is "the process where individuals mutually exchange their (tacit and explicit) knowledge and jointly create new knowledge." There are two knowledge sharing processes, knowledge donating, which is a process of communicating one's personal intellectual capital to others, and knowledge collecting which is a process of consulting others to get them to share their intellectual capital (van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004).

Knowledge sharing empowers new knowledge to be created and translated into innovative technologies and processes which converted into economic and competitive value for the organization (Joseph, Firestone & McElroy, 2005). Effectively leveraging knowledge in organizations is highly dependent on its employees, who actually create, share, and apply the knowledge. If the organization doesn't encourage their employees to share their knowledge with other employees, the organization is bound to lose knowledge when employees leave the organization (Gupta, 2000). Although, employees remain with the organization, without utilizing the knowledge of their employees by sharing with other employees, the organization loses an opportunity to maximize the benefit of existing knowledge. Therefore, it is worthwhile for organizations to develop a knowledge sharing climate to ensure that knowledge is converted into a form that can be understood, absorbed, applied by other employees and remains within the organization (Ipe, 2003).

Determinants of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing can be influenced by the properties of the knowledge itself, such as the articulation and aggregation degree of knowledge (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995) or by the management and managerial actions or interventions, such as coordination mechanisms, rewards and incentives (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002).

Both environmental and individual factors can influence knowledge sharing. Environmental factors, such as the organizational culture, available technology, and interpersonal relationships may influence individuals' willingness to share their knowledge (Wasko & Faraj, 2005, Hansen, 1999). Individual differences and abilities that influence whether employees intend to share knowledge, such as, tenure in the organization (Wang & Lai, 2006; Wasko & Faraj, 2005), attitude towards knowledge sharing, interpersonal trust (Levin & Cross, 2004), gender (Bock et al., 2005), and self-efficacy (Wang & Lai, 2006; Wasko & Faraj, 2005). Regarding individual psychological factors, literatures highlighted the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for knowledge sharing. Bock et al. (2005) stated factors such as the motivations for reciprocity, enjoying being of help, and reputation as considerations that influence knowledge sharing.

Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

Ajzen (1991) explained attitude as "the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation of the behavior in question".

Bock, Zmud, Kim and Lee (2005) and Huang, Davision and Gu, (2008) defined attitude as "individual's general feelings about behavior, which develop from beliefs and perceived possibility and judgment of resulting from behavior".

Bock et al. (2005) and So and Bolloju (2005) stated that "the favorable attitude toward knowledge sharing results in positively influencing the intention to share knowledge. In other words, employees will have higher intention to share their knowledge when they perceive knowledge sharing is favorable".

Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn (2000) described attitude as an expression of like or dislike toward a person, place, thing, or event which influences an individual's choice of action, and responses to challenges, incentives, and rewards. There are three components of attitude.

1) Affective component of attitude; the affective component of attitude is the underlying beliefs, opinion, or knowledge a person possesses which are likely to be translated into a certain type of behavior. For example, if people have a positive affective response toward knowledge sharing, it is likely they will be positive toward actual sharing.

2) Cognitive component of attitude; The cognitive component of attitude is related to how an individual would associate with an object in general. It refers to

the antecedents of opinion or judgment on the basis of available information and decides whether the person has a favorable or unfavorable opinion on the matter.

3) Behavioral component of attitude; The behavioral component of attitude refers to past behaviors or experiences regarding an attitude object. People tend to behave in a certain way based on their specific feelings or attitudes, and that ultimate behavior can result in an affirmative or obstructionist result.

Knowledge sharing is considered as a behavior which is influenced by attitude

toward knowledge sharing of individual (Yang and Wu, 2008), "The favorable attitude toward knowledge sharing results in positively influencing the intention to share knowledge. In other words, employees will have higher intention to share their knowledge when they perceive knowledge sharing is favorable" (Bock et al. (2005) and So and Bolloju, 2005). No matter, how organizations have applied a variety of knowledge sharing supporting tools to motivate the sharing of employees' knowledge, employees can be reluctant to share their knowledge if they have negative attitudes towards knowledge sharing, such as lack of trust or fear of loss of power (Szulanski, 1996; Riege, 2005). Understanding what triggers employee's attitude toward knowledge sharing, intention to share and overall knowledge sharing behavior, will improve the knowledge sharing capabilities and tendency to share knowledge of the employees (Hsu, 2006). Accordingly, organizations should pay considerable attention to employees' attitude towards knowledge sharing.

Knowledge sharing in commercial banks in Thailand

The Financial Sector is one of the most important business sectors in the economy of any country. After the financial crisis, the changes in the competitive

environment of the Thai financial sector are noticeable (Bank of Thailand, 2008). There are three forces of change in commercial banks in Thailand, which are: Emergence of new technology, liberalization and deregulation coupled with increasing customer sophistication (Bank of Thailand, 2008). Instead of expecting customers to come to the banks, the banks need to approach customers. Banks competitively offer new products, services and channels which are the right answer for customers' demands to acquire new and retain existing customers (Adeoye and Lawanson, 2012). Customer satisfaction has drawn the attention of all commercial banks to be customers' choice of banks (Firdaus et al., 2010).

In order to achieve high performance and their goals, banks need to: understand customers better, to be able to adjust and improve their operations, to respond more efficiently and effectively to customers' expectations, and to compete with their competitors in the financial sector (Kubo, 2006). The importance of knowledge sharing in commercial banks is increasingly crucial to be responsive to this competitive environment.

Based on personal/professional networks and the researcher's 10 years of experience in this market with the selected bank, the similarities of commercial banks are innovation, competitiveness. There are hundreds of products and services, therefore, the strategy of knowledge sharing practices is widely used in the Thai commercial banks. Some of those practices are: overt management support to knowledge sharing collaboration, availability of multiple knowledge tools, technologies, and business and social collaborative software, in Thai commercial banks enables their employees in practicing knowledge sharing. The management also encourages their employees to share their knowledge by initiating regular knowledge sharing sessions and providing rewards and recognition programs.

2.3 Related Theories

Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS) and Intention to Share Knowledge

To understand the antecedents of actual knowledge sharing, extensive literature was studied about attitudes towards and intentions to share knowledge as key predictors of actual knowledge sharing. Attitude towards knowledge sharing and the intention to share are used interchangeably in some literature. Some researchers identified that knowledge sharing attitude is represented as a direct influence on the knowledge sharing intention, attitude is formed from a collection of behavioral beliefs. Chow and Chan (2008) observed that individual attitude towards behavior is an enabler that influences the intention to engage in that behavior.

Chow and Chan (2008) observed that individual attitude towards behavior is an enabler that influences the intention to engage in that behavior.

Yang and Wu (2008) considered knowledge sharing as a behavior, which is influenced by an individual's attitude toward knowledge sharing. Employee's negative attitudes can obstruct knowledge sharing, especially, when they have an unwillingness to share because of the fear of losing power (Szulanski, 1996). In such a case employees tend to be insecure, fearing that if they share their knowledge, they will be ignored and ultimately passed over for job advancement or other opportunities (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002). Accordingly, organizations should pay considerable attention to employees' attitude towards knowledge sharing.

Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) and Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) are two major theories discussing an individual's knowledge sharing intent and actual knowledge sharing behavior within an organization. Both of the theories stated that behaviors are result of intention.

According to the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA); individuals' beliefs about knowledge sharing influence their attitude towards knowledge sharing and opinions of people in an individual's environment influence subjective norm, and the combination of attitude and subjective norm influence the intention to share. The intention to share leads to the actual behavior of said individual. TRA; therefore, is used to explain the relationship between individuals' intention and actual knowledge sharing behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Kolekofski & Heminger, 2003; Warshaw, 1980; Jogiyanto, 2007).

Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) is a more recent modification of TRA. It has the same basic structures as TRA with the addition of perceived behavioral control. The TPB states that intention and behavioral control influence behavioral achievement (Ajzen, 1991).

The resulting model combining attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control expanded the Theoretical Research Model is reflected in Figure 5 below:


12

Figure 5: Theoretical Narrowed Research Model

Knowledge Sharing Intention

According to the combined TRA and TPB theories, the subjective norm and perceived behavior control within the organizational climate are external motivation factors, which can be controlled by the organization (Bock et al., 2005; So and Bolloju, 2005). On the other hand, while one's attitude towards knowledge sharing may be influenced by external motivation factors, the effect can vary by employee because it is also based on internal individual (intrinsic) factors which may override external factors (Lin, 2007). Consequently, employees can and do ultimately make subjective choices of sharing or not sharing their knowledge thus adding a "hybrid" element to intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Understanding all these determinants of attitude towards knowledge sharing supports the focus in this study on "attitude towards" and not the intention or the act of actually sharing or not sharing knowledge. Table 11: Summarization of Selected Literature Supporting the Linkages between

Attitude towards and Knowledge Sharing Intention.

Rahab & Purbudi (2014) examined that <u>individuals' intentions to knowledge are affected</u> by knowledge sharing, organizational structure, attitude towards knowledge sharing and <u>subjective norms.</u>

Bashorat et al. (2012) stated that <u>attitude towards knowledge sharing</u>, <u>subjective norm</u>, and procedural justice mainly impact intention to share knowledge.

Chatzoglou and Vraimaki, (2009) asserted that <u>employee's attitude towards knowledge</u> sharing and subjective norms directly influence intention to share knowledge.

Yang's (2008) study confirmed the impact of individual attitudes toward knowledge sharing processes, such as sharing and storing knowledge, on organizational knowledge sharing.

Kuo & Young (2008) indicated that based on "Theory of Reasoned Action" and "Theory of Planned Behavior, the predictors of knowledge sharing intention behaviors are attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavior control.

2.4 Hypotheses

To examine the research model, Figure 6, portraying the explicit relationship linkages below, is followed by the proposed statements of Hypotheses and their nulls.



Figure 6: Hypotheses Relationships Linkages Model

Individual Motivation (IM)

- H1₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the individual motivation (IM)
- H1₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the individual motivation (IM)

Organizational Motivation (OM)

- H2₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)
- H2₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)

Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

H3₁: Individual Motivation (IM) has a positive relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)

- H3₀: Individual Motivation (IM) has no relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)
- H4₁: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has a positive relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H4₀: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has no relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H5₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H5₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)



CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The methodology and design in this study occurred in four phases:

Phase 1 - To gain comprehensive understanding of the relationships among variables, and to investigate sub variables where applicable.

Phase 2 – To expand validation of hypotheses H1 through H5 which were initially formulated at the end of Chapter 2. This was to affirm that the eventual survey instrument would encompass all data required to test the Hypotheses.

Phase 3 – To provide the description of the financial entities populating the Thai Financial Sector containing the subject bank studied for this research.

Phase 4 – To document the survey instrument designed for this research; the pre-test activities prior to distribution of that instrument; the data collection procedure used; and a summary of the demographic data structure and profile items sought from respondents for purposes of statistical analyses findings, near term and future applications and research.

3.2 Phase 1 – Methodology Research Relationships Model

3.2.1 Sub-variables of: Emotional Intelligence (EI): Independent Variable The measurement guidelines for the Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening

Test (TEIST) established to support the reliability and validity of the TEIST (DMH, 2000).

- Virtue (EIV): emotional self-control, empathy, responsibility
- *Competence* (EIC): self-motivation, problem-solving, interpersonal relationship
- Happiness (EIH): self-regard, life-satisfaction
- 3.2.2 Individual Motivation (IM): Dependent Variable

The addition of a second level of variables to the Individual Motivation; Dependent Variable, to extend and strengthen the data collection and response elements for statistical analyses.

- Interpersonal Trust (IMI): Ability (IMIA), Benevolence (IMIB),
 Integrity ITI)
- *Organizational Commitment* (IMO): Affective (IMOA), Continuance (IMOC), Normative (IMON)

Self-Efficacy (IMS)

3.2.3 Organizational Motivation (OM): Dependent Variable

The sub-variables of Organizational Motivation (OM) were adequately supported in chapter 2, figure 4.

- V V DE
 - Knowledge Sharing Tools (OMT)
 - Management Commitment (OMM)
 - Rewards and Incentives (OMR)
 - Organizational Culture (OMC)

3.2.4 Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS): Dependent Variable

There are three sub-scales of attitude which add influence on actual

knowledge sharing behavior being achieved; Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn (2000)

- Affective; Individual feeling about the object (ASA)

- *Cognitive;* Individual's belief of the object (ASC)
- *Behavioral;* Individual's desire to follow through act (ASB)

3.2.5 Model Expansion



Figure 7: Methodology Research Relationships Model

3.2.6 Components of Emotional Intelligence (EI)

When the Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test (TEIST) was prepared for field practice its Thai government creators established measurement guidelines as base line thresholds (Department of Mental Health, Ministry of Public Health DMH, 2000) Average scores of all categories of the TEIST range from 139-173, and the maximum is 208. They are classified into three equal levels, namely low EI (<139), normal EI (139-173), and high EI (>173). Finally, the ranges of normal scores were constructed and the norms of the Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test were also established from the research findings (DMH, 2000).

These overall baseline criteria were further decomposed for each of the three major categories (Virtue – Competence – Happiness) and the subscales per category are as follows:

The first category, Virtue (V) contains three subscales with 18 items (item number 1 to 18). Each subscale contains 6 items. Score of all subscales ranged from 49-59. The possible score ranged from 6-24 (DMH, 2000). The descriptions of three subscales are:

- *Emotional self-control*; the ability to understand and manage one's own feelings, needs, and behaviors especially in unpleasant situations. It refers to items numbered 1-6. This subscale has a normal score with a range of 14-18 (Mean =15.5, SD =2.1).
- *Empathy*; the ability to empathize with other feelings and behaviors. It refers to the items numbered 7-12. This subscale has a normal score with a range of 15-21 (Mean =18.5, SD=2.5).
- *Responsibility*; the ability to make decisions and act independently based on the Buddha's teachings and social acceptability. It refers to the item number 13-18. This subscale has a normal score with a range of 17-23 (Mean =19.9, SD=2.9).

The second category is Competence (C), which contains three subscales with 18 items (item number 19 to 36) (DMH, 2000). Each subscale contains 6 items. The possible scores ranged from 6-24. The descriptions of three subscales are:

- Self-motivation; the ability to know oneself and make an effort to do something successfully. It refers to the item number 19-24. This subscale has a normal score ranged from 15-20 (Mean =18.2, SD = 2.8).
- *Problem solving*; the ability to think carefully with mindfulness and clear comprehension to live and work with others. It refers to the item number 25-30. This subscale has a normal score ranged from 14-20 (Mean =17.2, SD = 2.9).
- Interpersonal relationship; the ability to assert oneself and use social skills when dealing with others. It refers to the item number 31-36.
 This subscale has a normal score ranged from 15-21 (Mean =17.6, SD = 2.8).

The third category is Happiness (H), which contains three subscales with 16 items (item number 37 to 52) (DMH, 2000). Each subscale contains 6 items except the first subscale contains only 4 test items. The descriptions of three subscales are:

- Self-esteem; respect for and self-confidence in oneself. It refers to the item number 37-40. This subscale has a normal score ranged from 10-14 (Mean =11.7, SD = 2.1).
- *Life satisfaction;* the ability to handle and regulate oneself in a creative way when meets unexpected situations. This subscale has a normal score ranged from 16-22 (Mean =19.2, SD = 3.1).

- *Peace*; the ability to relax oneself, and reduce tensions. This subscale has a normal score ranged from 16-22 (Mean =18.5, SD = 3.3).

In total, the EI screening test consists of 52 response items in the form of short sentences using a Likert scale for the scaling technique. The possible score ranged from 1-208. This test takes approximately 15-20 minutes to administer. It employs a four-point response scale with a textual response format ranging from 1= Never or Not true of me, 2= Sometimes is true of me, 3=Almost true of me, and 4= Very true of me.

The form of sentences contains both negative and positive connotations so that the researchers established the reverse scoring criteria of each item (DMH, 2000). There are twenty-eight positive connotation items, number: 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, and 50. These are the scoring criteria of each response scale 1 = 1 point, response scale 2 = 2 points, response scale 3 = 3 points, and response scale 4 = 4 points.

On the other hand, there are twenty-four negative connotation items, number: 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, 40, 45, 47, 51, and 52. Then, the scoring criteria of each response scales are: response scale 1 = 4 points, response scale 2 = 3 points, response scale 3 = 2 points, and response scale 4 = 1 point (DMH, 2000). This concludes the TEIST measurement guidelines.

3.2.7 Individual Motivation (IM) – Dependent Variable

As stated at the outset of Chapter 3, Figure 7, "Methodology Research Relationships Model" has added a second level of sub-variables to the Dependent Variable IM. This will extend and strengthen the Survey instrument and the resulting responses will improve the data available for statistical analyses in determining confirmation of the Hypotheses or their Nulls for a given antecedent. The Individual Motivation (IM) additions to its sub-variables are presented below.

Interpersonal Trust (IMI) based on the Integrative Model of Organizational Trust by Mayer et al (1995) adds:

- Ability (IMIA): reflects confidence that teammates and supervisors can help solve important problems
- Benevolence (IMIB) reflects an individual's confidence that teammates and supervisors will listen to and assist in solving work place difficulties impacting the individual
- Integrity (IMII) reflects openness and confidence that teammates and supervisors will keep promises made to the individual

Organizational Commitment (OC) based on Allen and Meyer's (1990) Organizational Commitment Scales, which adds:

- *Affective (IMOA)* reflects a strong desire and intention to remain with the organization provided the sense "of family" remains positive
- *Continuance (IMOC)* reflects the level(s) of need to remain affiliated with the organization primarily because no acceptable alternatives seem apparent.
- *Normative (OMON)* reflects a range of primarily positive reasons,
 i.e. loyalty, obligation, indebtedness, etc. for why an individual world remain with an organization.

The measurement details for the TEIST sub-variable scales and these added sub-sub variables on Individual Motivation (IM) and Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS) were added to further strengthen the Methodology research design. The Antecedents supporting aspects for each of the stated Hypotheses follows.

3.3 Phase 2 – Affirm that the eventual Survey Instrument would encompass all Data required to test the Hypotheses.

(H1) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Individual Motivation (IM)

EI as an antecedent to Interpersonal trust: Literature suggests that trust and safety within groups correlate to interpersonal affective behavior. The strength of social ties and relationships within groups is directly related to emotional competency and it enhances knowledge sharing and learning opportunities (McAllister, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998).

EI as an antecedent to Organizational Commitment: A positive relationship between EI and organizational commitment is established in many studies. For example, a study on direct health care workers by Humphreys, Brunsen, and Davis (2005) and a research conducted on public sector employees by Adeyemo (2007) both found EI significantly relates to organizational commitment. Also another study found that employees with high levels of EI have more capability to maintain their organizational commitment (Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Hartel, 2002).

EI as an antecedent to Self-efficacy: Various studies focused on the interrelation between EI and self-efficacy suggested that EI is important to develop

and can be a predictor of employees' self-efficacy (Chan, 2004; Moafian & Ghanizadeh, 2009; Schutte et al., 1998; Schwarzer, 1993).

(H2) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Organizational Motivation (OM)

Brackett & Mayer (2003) stated that the ability to perceive and deal with one's own emotions could influence attitudes. Emotional Intelligence (Adeyemo & Adeleye, 2008; Salami, 2004; Salami & Ogundokun, 2009; Tagliavia, Tipton, Giannetti & Mattei, 2006; Wong, Wong & Chau, 2001) have been shown to predict individual's attitudes. Hales and Gough (2003), stated that employees are motivated by organizational motivation factors differently because they perceive value in different ways according to their attitude towards the factors. For example, an attractive reward for one employee might not be attractive to others. Therefore, the researcher is convinced that emotional intelligence is also an antecedent to other components of organizational motivation, namely, Knowledge Sharing Tools, Management support and commitment, and Organizational Culture.

(H3 and H4) Antecedents of Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS)

Supporting attitude is formed from individuals' behavior, feelings and beliefs that are then manifest into the resulting behavior (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborne, 2000: Affective, Cognitive and Behavioral). In the context of knowledge sharing, that behavioral belief of attitude can either lead to a favorable or unfavorable result in the act of actually engaging in Knowledge sharing. If employees perceive knowledge sharing is favorable, they will have a higher intention and stronger positive attitude to actually share their knowledge (So and Bolloju, 2005).

(H3) Knowledge sharing motivation in an Individual (IM) as an antecedent to Attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)

A broad range of literature supports a positive influence on Knowledge Sharing Motivation of the Individual (IM) of interpersonal trust (IT), organizational commitment (OC), and self-efficacy (SE) (Chowdhury, 2005; McAllister, 1995; Meyer, et al., 2002; Lin, 2007; So and Bolloju, 2005).

(H4) Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) as an antecedent to attitude towards knowledge sharing (AS)

Knowledge sharing motivation has been discussed in numerous literature sources: The knowledge sharing motivation factors in organization are considered to be knowledge sharing tools, management support and commitment, reward and incentive for sharing knowledge and organizational culture related to knowledge sharing (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; Doan, Rosenthal-Sabroux & Grundstein, 2011; Gold et al., 2001).

(H5) Emotional Intelligence (EI) as an Antecedent to Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing

The Research Model further postulates that Employees' emotional intelligence can also be revealed to have a direct influence on the Attitude Toward Knowledge Sharing (AS) in addition to the knowledge sharing motivation dependent variables, Individual Motivation (IM) and Organizational Motivation (OM). 3.4 Phase 3 – Thai Financial Sector Profiles and Research Subject Bank

According to the Thai Financial Institution Business Act B.E. 2551 (P.4), financial institutions are classified into three types of organizations and each is defined as listed below:

1) "<u>Commercial Bank</u> means a public limited company licensed to undertake commercial banking business and shall include a retail bank, a foreign commercial bank's subsidiary and a foreign commercial bank's branch that is licensed to undertake commercial banking business."

1.1) "A retail bank means a public limited company, licensed to undertake commercial banking business with the main objective of providing services to retail customers as well as small and medium-sized enterprises. In this case it is restricted to undertake business related to foreign currencies, derivatives and other high risk transactions as prescribed in the notification of the Bank of Thailand."

1.2) "A foreign commercial bank subsidiary means a public limited company licensed to undertake commercial banking business whose shares are, directly or indirectly, held by a foreign commercial bank in the amount not less than ninety-five percent of its total number of shares sold."

1.3) "A foreign commercial bank branch means a branch of a foreign commercial bank licensed to undertake commercial banking business in Thailand."

2) "<u>Finance Company</u> means a public limited company, licensed to undertake finance business."

3) "<u>Credit Foncier Company</u> is defined as a company licensed to undertake "credit foncier business" by carrying out improvements, by means of loans and advances on real estate securities."

Among different types of financial institutions, commercial banks are the most competitive. Commercial banks need to pay particular attention to knowledge practices in order to initiate innovation and enhance productivity of financial products and services to acquire new customers and retain existing customers. The 14 Thai commercial banks are listed in Table 12:

In addition to these 14 Commercial Banks there are 8 state specialized financial institutions established under specific laws. Specialized financial institutions can be divided into two types. The first type operates as commercial banks providing financial services including both deposits and loans. There are 4 Thai specialized commercial banks in this first category. The second type is 4 financial institutions that do business under certain limits. Both types are also listed and described in Table 12.

Thai Commercial Banks									
4 Largest Commercial Banks	BanksNet Profits (Million Baht)No. of Branches		of ches	No. of Employees					
Bangkok Bank Plc.	34,181		1,140		27,142				
Kasikornbank Plc.	39,474		1,121		21,484				
Krung Thai Bank Plc.	28,494		1,213		23,898				
Siam Commercial Bank Plc.	47,182		1,210		26,159				
Subtotal	149,330	62%	4,684	48%	98,683	47%			
						1)			

Table 12: Thai Financial Sector Attribute Profiles

10 Additional Commercial Banks								
Bank of Ayudhya Plc.	18,634		636		23,070			
CIMB Thai Bank Plc.	1,052		123		3,963			
Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (Thai) Plc.	1,335		20		560			
Kiatnakin Bank Plc.	3,317		65		4,127			
Land and Houses Bank Plc.	1,661		126		1,653			
Standard Chartered (Thailand) Bank Plc.	(47) *		20		2,200			
10 Addition	al Comme	ercial B	Banks					
Thanachart Bank Plc.	10,743	1	616		14,652			
Tisco Bank Plc.	2,914		57		2,588			
TMB Bank Plc.	9,333		455		9,270			
United Overseas Bank (Thai) Co., Ltd.	3,121		155		4,275			
Subtotal	52,064	22%	2,273	23%	66,358	32%		
Subtotal of 14 Commercial Banks	201,394	84%	6,957	71%	165,041	79%		
Specialized Commercial Banks								
Government Savings Bank	22,699	2	1,043		15,653			
Bank for Agriculture and Agricultural Co-operatives	8,905		1,275		20,036			
Islamic Bank of Thailand	(4,595)	*	108		1,998			
Government Housing Bank	8,700		206		1,998			
Subtotal	35,709	15%	2,632	27%	39,685	19%		
					(Continue	d)		

Table 12 (Continued): Thai Financial Sector Attribute Profiles

104

Limited Financial Institutions								
Export-Import Bank of Thailand	1,520		10		617			
Small and Medium Enterprise Development Bank of Thailand	1,235		97		1,555			
Thai Credit Guarantee Corporation	111		74		1,174			
Secondary Mortgage Corporation	28		1		87			
Subtotal	2,894	1%	182	2%	3,433	2%		
Totals	239,997	100%	9,771	100%	208,159	100%		

Table 12 (Continued): Thai Financial Sector Attribute Profiles

*an accumulated net loss (Bangkok Bank, Kasikornbank et al. – Annual Report,

2015)

3.4.1 Profile Aspects Thai 14 Commercial Banks

The 14 Thai commercial banks are the most innovative and competitive banks compared to other types of banks in Thailand. They are private banks that offer hundreds of products and services. They need both hard and soft business strategies to retain their competitive status in the market. The application of Knowledge Sharing techniques and practices is one strategy that they all use to improve their employees' skills and efficiency/productivity rates. It also assists employees to understand and better adapt themselves into the organization. Effective knowledge sharing implementation saves the organization money in the training courses, helping to both lower the organizational budget and shorten the training time.

The 14 Thai commercial banks can be divided into two sub groups. The first is represented by the four largest, which are comparable in net profit, number of branches and number of employees. These four banks contribute approximately 72 percent of the total net profit, 66 percent of number of branches and 60 percent of employees of the 14 banks although only 28 percent numerically as 4 of the 14 \therefore Overall this portion of the "Thai Financial Sector" seems to reasonably reflect the classic "80 – 20" division applicable to many statistical findings in multiple aspects of the "real world".



Figure 8: Thai Commercial Bank Attribute Profiles

The top four banks are comparable in term of products and service. The brand images are respectively equivalent. The customers' preference for a given bank mostly depends on their products and services innovation. The banks continuously implement and update their knowledge management plans in order to capture knowledge and facilitate the processes of knowledge sharing/transfer among employees.

3.4.2 Research Selected Bank – Profile

The Demographic Response portion of the full respondent Data Base for this research represents the critical Human Capital component. Structural and Governing Capital (i.e. Facilities, Regulations, Policies, Currency, etc.) and Relationship Capital of the Bank's customer population and appropriate collaboration with stakeholders and other entities of the Thai Financial Sector and Government are necessary for "the Bank" to effectively conduct its business goals.

But the coincidence that each of the top four (4) Banks need to employ an average Human Capital Base of ~20,000 plus employees to deliver reasonably similar Net Profits with roughly equivalent numbers of Branches makes them individually large and collectively extremely large enterprises (approximately 72 percent of the assets while in number only 28% as 4 of 14 Banks). It takes a lot of employees to conduct, represent and interface with customers and stakeholders of such large financial institutions servicing businesses and individual customers. The "Characteristics profile" of the object Bank's 20,000 employees yields key insights into the probable profile of the 208,000 total Employees for the full 22 Banks of this Sector, who also account for net profits of ~ 240,000 million baht in 2015 (Annual Report 2015).

One of the top four banks was selected as the object for this research. The selected bank aims to be a strong Thai financial institution that provides a variety of financial services of world-class quality responsiveness to serve customers' needs by harmoniously combining technology and human resources so as to achieve optimal benefits to customers, shareholders, employees and the country. In order to achieve the bank's vision, employee selection is a key factor. The bank recruits employees through varieties of channels, diverse activities and effective communication channels are provided for job seekers' convenience. Employee Recruitment staff recruit applicants through an e-Recruitment System. Bank policy puts emphasis on competencies and qualifications suited to vacant positions, without discrimination

based on race, nationality, ethnicity, color, origin, religion, social status, gender, age, disability, political stance and marital status.

The recruitment criteria are a combination of education, basic skills, IQ and EQ. They prefer master's degrees in many positions because the applicants are already finished with the education and are ready to grow into maturity. Applicants can choose their confident basic skills to be tested, TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication), Thai language, mathematics, decision making and computers. The applicants need to take IQ and EQ tests, which help the bank to identify their personality. In some positions, applicants need to be tested for their technical knowledge, such as a relationship manager needs to know about credit analysis and risk management. The successful applicants are allocated in accordance with their qualifications appropriate for their respective positions.

The human resource development has been undertaken to ensure efficiency and consistency. There is a policy of communicating with the employees to ensure their understanding and knowledge about products, and benefits offered by the bank. New employees are required to attend an orientation to familiarize themselves with topics like financial knowledge, work principles, values and actions in compliance with the Anti-Money Laundering/Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) law, as well as the organization's provisions for their well-being. As a result, they will understand the overall business profile, directions and strategies, so that they can adjust well to the bank's operations.

The bank not only pays attention to the recruitment process but also to the equal treatment of employees and employees enhancement for sustainable success and

business growth. The bank, therefore, systematically implements an employee development plan on a continual basis. Post-employment, employees' competencies are enhanced with knowledge and skills training relevant to their current positions and in preparation for further business expansion. The Bank's human resources management and development policy focuses on value creation of the human resources. Through seminars and workshops, such as Enneagram, Performance Management, Leadership Excellence, Products and Services Innovation workshops and seminars, the potential of employees is identifying and utilizing to create the most value. Employees are encouraged to pursue additional knowledge and challenges in work so that they can move ahead with new experiences to advance their professional or personal skills. Career opportunities are widely open for capable employees to make sure that potential employees can grow in the bank. Rotations offer them opportunities for further career learning, enhancement, new experiences and challenges. Attractive and competitive rewards and incentives are offered to recognize employees' value.

With the belief that personnel are the bank's most valuable assets, the bank reviews and proposes directions and strategies in relation to human resources, regarding occupational health, employee participation, remuneration, diversity and cultures in accordance with the bank's business directions, regulatory requirements, and regulations on employment, labor relations, principle of humanity and human rights. Employee compensation management is carried out with a focus on fairness and competitiveness in the job market. The bank encourages employees' behaviors that match bank expectations and create employee engagement, thereby attracting and retaining talented employees for the bank's achievement and excellent customer service. The bank annually conducts an employee opinion survey to ensure thorough information access and sharing among employees. Related activities, such as cross departments product and service innovation program, have been developed to promote employee involvement, and to create a pleasant work atmosphere and building of experience.

The organizational culture has been developed based on the bank's Core Values: Customer Centricity, Organization-Wide Teamwork, Professionalism, and Innovation.

For the customer centricity perspective, the bank aims to have its employees be friendly and approachable and able to deliver products and services beyond customer expectation in striving for customer success and satisfaction.

The organization-wide teamwork is developed by creating trust and respect among employees with 360 degree relations, within and across teams: superiorsubordinate-peer. The constructive communication is initiated to ease the collaboration within and between various teams.

To create professionalism, a variety of employee learning channels are available, including in-house and outside learning, self-study and e-Learning. Employees are expected to be competent and have ownership spirit, plus, working based on integrity and ethics with an awareness of social responsibility.

The last core value is innovation. The bank encourages employees to initiate and implement without fear of embracing change and continuously developing their own skills and job in their areas of responsibility.

Knowledge Sharing in the selected Bank

The bank invests in a variety of knowledge management tools and technologies, which are representative of the four largest commercial banks. For example, in the selected bank, Lotus Note, an integrated messaging, business application, and social collaboration software is available to every employee. It can be used as a two-way communication tool and also for knowledge storage. Employees use Lotus Note to send and receive email or instant messages between colleagues or also to search for useful data. Historically this tool captured and conveyed the selected bank users' "Lessons Learned" as an early means of projecting practice improvements.

A Product Information Management (PIM) server is a powerful repository that allows employees in the organization to access and to understand hundreds of products, services, and processes. Back office staffs are required to input all the product details, promotion, processes and any important information related to their responsible products or services into the PIM server. Front office staff or other relevant employees access the server to acquire the information they need to serve customers.

In addition to the noted sample tools and technology available in the bank, which well described how knowledge sharing has been widely implemented in this bank from top management to junior staff, there are also, internal broadcast TV programs, monthly e-magazine, bi-monthly magazine and many other communication tools. All listed tools are used to communicate strategic movement as well as updates on new products, services, rules and regulations. Furthermore, they are also channels used by employees to share and to acquire knowledge. Knowledge sharing not limited to the internal but also to the external stakeholders, such as business partners and customers. The bank creates regular knowledge sharing sessions for business partners, and customers, by offering business management seminar, business wisdom exchange workshops, businesses/financial/ investment consultation services, and company visits. Moreover, the bank has also created a social network club among same-sized businesses, and organizes both courses and recreational activities for conveying knowledge and sharing experience among partners and customers. A knowledge sharing event about the AEC targeted to get its employees, partners, and customers ready for AEC integration. Major issues included mechanisms prerequisite to the AEC launch, roles of ASEAN and member nations, opportunities for Thai businesses and business conduct within ASEAN. These practices are also expanded to the countries where the bank has its branch (es) located. The bank business partners, especially, in AEC countries welcome to visit the bank and its partner companies to gain know how and exchange their experience.

The bottom line is that management regularly communicates the importance of knowledge collaboration, sharing, innovation and results measurements. They also offer flexible work schedules, rewards, and recognition in order to encourage employees to practice multiple aspects of knowledge management practices in addition to sharing. Further, as noted several times, the competitive market conditions faced by all commercial banks in the Thai financial sector drive comparable values and cultural activities throughout the majority of the banks listed in the Sector. In that regard, some of the most relevant and additional comparability features of the four (4) most significant banks have been incorporated below to extend the representative similarities of this subset portion of the Thai financial sector.

3.4.3 Respondent Pool – Demographic Attributes

Based on personal/professional networks and the researcher's 10 years of experience in this market with the selected bank, both the knowledge management and organizational culture environment and respondent base are representative of the largest 4 Banks in the Thai Commercial Banking sector representing approximately 62% of the 14 total Banks' financial asset base. The research findings for the one selected bank described by the preceding materials on culture, processes, collaboration, sharing and factual data on net profits, number of branches and number of employees further reinforces the relevance of all research attributes described to reflect how this research and the selected bank are representative of at least the most significant four (4) commercial banks in the total sector.

The research respondents were to be drawn from approximately 20,000 fulltime employees in the selected Thai commercial bank. The accessible population comprised all full-time employees in the selected Thai commercial bank Table 13 below presents a record of the number of the full-time employees in each division in May 2015. Further, it also reflects the comparable representative distribution of the full 421 respondents by division.

Table	13: The	number	of the	full-time	employe	es in	each division

Distribution of sample	Actual # of Employees	Actual Percentage	Response # of Sample	Response Percentage
Capital Markets Business Division	90	0.42%	2	0.48%
Compliance and Audit Division	279	1.30%	5	1.19%

113

Distribution of sample	Actual # of Employees	Actual Percentage	Response # of Sample	Response Percentage
Corporate and SME Products Division	815	3.79%	3	0.71%
Corporate Business Division	534	2.49%	2	0.48%
Corporate Secretariat Division	51	0.24%	2	0.48%
Corporate Strategy Management Division	202	0.94%	1	0.24%
Customer Service Fulfillment Division	952	4.43%	23	5.46%
Enterprise Risk Management Division	1,401	6.52%	15	3.56%
Finance and Control Division	210	0.98%	5	1.19%
Human Resource Division	146	0.68%	2	0.48%
Investment Banking Business Division	22	0.10%	2	0.48%
Retail Business Division	13,447	62.59%	314	74.58%
SME Business Division	1,947	9.06%	21	4.99%
Systems Division	1,217	5.66%	23	5.46%
World Business Division	172	0.80%	1	0.24%
Total	21,484	100.00%	421	100.00%

Table 13 (Continued): The number of the full-time employees in each division

To ensure that respondents represent all the population, the researcher used Stratified Random Sampling for the present study. Stratification is the dividing up of the population into sub populations called "strata", and from each stratum, a random sampling is drawn. There are two types of stratified sampling, proportionate and disproportionate. Proportionate stratified sampling, the number of samples drawn from each stratum is proportional to the size of the strata. Disproportionate sampling, equal number of samples are drawn from each stratum regardless of how the stratum is represented in the population. In this study, the Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling method was used to give proportional to the size of the strata. The sample size for this study was 820 employees. The sample size is 4% of the total population. This number of sample size constructed at least 99% Confidence interval with a Margin of Error of 5%.

The self-reporting instrument was used for this research. An advantage of using a self-reporting instrument is that it was an entirely standardized measuring instrument because the questions were always phrased exactly in the same way for all respondents (Sapsford, 2007). In addition, the self- reporting instrument was inexpensive and most efficient use of the researcher's time. Questionnaires were often used in sociological, opinion, psychological and in marketing research (Richardson, 2005).

A total of 820 electronic questionnaires were distributed via email. The sending of the questionnaires began in late May 2015 with a one month responding period. By the end of June 2015, a total of 421 (51%) of the questionnaires were returned and validated. Data input and processing took another week in July 2015.

3.5 Phase 4 – Survey Instrument, Pre-Test, Data Collection and Demographics Structure and Summary

3.5.1 Research Instrument

The questionnaire is divided into four sections. It begins with respondents' demographic data namely: Gender, Age, Educational Level, Years with the organization, Position within the organization, and Office Location. The second

section is the independent variable emotional intelligence screening test (TEIST). The third section collects respondent data on the dependent variables of individual and organization motivation environments, and the last section examines respondents' attitude towards knowledge sharing.

The Thai emotional intelligence screening test (TEIST) (Independent Variable)

The measures generated are based on the Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test of the Department of Mental Health, Ministry of Public Health (DMH 2000). The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

	Emotional Intelligence: virtue (EIV)					
Symbol	Item					
EIV 1	When I am angry or unhappy, I can recognize these feelings.					
EIV 2-R	I cannot tell what makes me feel angry.					
EIV 3-R	When I am displeased, I easily lose my temper.					
EIV 4	I am patient to achieve goals.					
EIV 5-R	I overreact to small problems.					
EIV 6	When I am forced to do something I don't like, I will argue my point until others accept it.					
EIV 7	I notice when people's emotions change.					
EIV 8-R	I am not sensitive to strangers' problems.					
EIV9-R	I cannot accept ideas, which are different from mine.					
EIV10	I can accept that other people might have their own reasons to disapprove of my behavior.					

Table 14: The Thai Emotional Intelligence Scale Items

	Emotional Intelligence: virtue (EIV)
Symbol	Item
EIV11-R	I feel that other people try too much to get attention.
EIV12	Even when I am busy, I will listen to other people who need help.
EIV13-R	I will take advantage of others when I have the chance.
EIV14	I appreciate what others do for me.
EIV15	When I do something wrong, I can say "sorry".
EIV16-R	I have a hard time accepting others' faults.
EIV17	I am pleased to do things for other people even when it means sacrifices on my part.
EIV18-R	I feel inconvenienced when asked to do something for others.
EIC1-R	I do not know what I am good at.
EIC2	Even when work is difficult, I am confident I can do it.
EIC3-R	When I do not succeed in doing something, I lose my motivation.
EIC4	I feel good when I do my best.
EIC5	When I face difficulties and disappointment, I do not give up.
EIC6-R	When I start doing something, I do not always finish it.
EIC7	I try to find out the real causes of problems without relying on my own opinions.
EIC8-R	Most of the time, I do not know what makes me unhappy.
EIC9-R	Making decisions is very difficult for me.
EIC10	When I have to do many things at the same time, I can prioritize.
EIC11-R	I feel uncomfortable when I am with strangers.
EIC12-R	I cannot stand it when I have to do things that are not familiar to me.
EIC13	I can easily get along with others.
EIC14	I have many close friends.
EIC15-R	I am not confident telling others what I want.
EIC16	I do what I want without causing trouble to others.

Table 14 (Continued): The Thai Emotional Intelligence Scale Items

	Emotional Intelligence: virtue (EIV)
Symbol	Item
EIC17-R	Arguing my point with other people is difficult although I have good
	reasons.
EIC18	When I disagree with others, I can explain my reasons and persuade
	people to accept them.
EIH1-R	I feel inferior to others.
EIH2	I perform my duties in all roles very well.
EIH3	I do my best when set a task.
EIH4-R	I am not confident doing difficult jobs.
EIH5	Although the situation is bad, I hope things will get better.
EIH6	I believe that every problem has a solution.
EIH7	When I feel stressed, I try to relax.
EIH8	I always enjoy weekend and holiday activities.
EIH9-R	I am not happy when others have something that I don't have.
EIH10	I am happy with my own situation.
EIH11-R	I do not know what to do when I get bored.
EIH12	When I have free time, I enjoy myself.
EIH13	When I am feeling down, I know how to lighten up.
EIH14	I can relax myself when I feel tired from work.
EIH15-R	I cannot be happy until I have everything I want.
EIH16-R	I always worry about little problems.

Table 14 (Continued): The Thai Emotional Intelligence Scale Items

Knowledge sharing motivation dependent variables

Individual motivation measurement: Interpersonal trust, Organizational Commitment, and Self-efficacy are measured. The aspects of each subscale are described as follows. Interpersonal trust: The measures generated based on the Integrative Model of Organizational Trust by Mayer et al. (1995). The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7 point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

	Interpersonal Trust: ability (IMIA)				
Symbol	Item				
IMIA1	I feel very confident about my teammates' skills.				
IMIA2	My teammates can help solve important problems in our organization.				
IMIA3	I feel very confident about my supervisor's skills				
IMIA4	My supervisor can help solve important problems in our organization.				
Interpersonal Trust: benevolence (IMIB)					
IMIB1	My teammates look out for what is important to me.				
IMIB2	I can talk freely to my teammates about difficulties I am having at work				
	and know that they will want to listen.				
IMIB3	My supervisor looks out for what is important to me.				
IMIB4	I can talk freely to my supervisor about difficulties I am having at work				
	and know that he/she will want to listen.				
	Interpersonal Trust: integrity (IMII)				
IMII1	My teammates will keep the promises that they make.				
IMII2	My teammates express their true feelings about important issues.				
IMII3	My supervisor will keep the promises that he/she makes.				
IMII4	My supervisor expresses his/her true feelings about important issues.				

Table 15: The Interpersonal Trust Scale Items

Organizational commitment: The measures generated based on Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Scale. The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7 point Likert scale (ranging from 1 =strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

	Organizational commitment: affective (IMOA)				
Symbol	Item				
IMOA1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.				
IMOA2	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.				
IMOA3-R	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this organization.				
IMOA4-R	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.				
IMOA5-R	I do not feel like 'part of my family' at this organization.				
IMOA6	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.				
IMOC1	Right now, staying with my job at this organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.				
IMOC2	It would be very hard for me to leave my job at this organization right now even if I wanted to.				
IMOC3	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I leave my organization now.				
IMOC4	I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.				
IMOC5	One of the few negative consequences of leaving my job at this organization would be the scarcity of available alternative elsewhere.				
IMOC6	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice.				
IMON1-R	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my organization.				

Table 16: The	Organizational	Commitment	Scale	Items
---------------	----------------	------------	-------	-------

Table 16 (Continued): The Organizational Commitment Scale Items

Organizational commitment: affective (IMOA)		
Symbol	Item	
IMON2	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	
IMON3	I would feel guilty if I left this organization now.	
IMON4	This organization deserves my loyalty.	
IMON5	I would not leave my organization right now because of my sense of obligation to the people in it.	
IMON6	I owe a great deal to this organization.	

Self-efficacy: The measures generated based on Schwarzer & Jerusalem's General Self-Efficacy Scale. The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7 point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) 1962

Table 17: The self-efficacy (se) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
IMS1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.
IMS2	If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.
IMS3	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.
IMS4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.
IMS5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.

Table 17 (Continued): The self-efficacy (se) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
IMS6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
IMS7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.
IMS8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.
IMS9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.
IMS10	I can usually handle whatever comes my way.
Organization motivation measurement	
Organization motivation measurement	

Organization motivation measurement

The Knowledge sharing motivation in organization dependent variable questionnaire section is developed from previous literature. It uses the subscales of: knowledge sharing tools, management support and commitment, rewards, recognition and incentives, and organizational culture.

Knowledge sharing tools: The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7 point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Table 18: The Knowledge Sharing Tools (OMT) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
OMT1	Knowledge sharing tools (i.e. Lotus notes, PIM) in my organization are accessible.
OMT2	There are varieties of knowledge sharing tools in my organization.

Table 18 (Continued): The Knowledge Sharing Tools (OMT) Scale Items

OMT3	I am satisfied with the overall quality of tools for sharing knowledge in our organization.
OMT4-R	Knowledge sharing tools in my organization are rarely used because it takes so much effort to understand how they work.

Management support and commitment: The level of management support and commitment will measure respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the support and commitment. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Symbol	Item
OMM1	Knowledge sharing is one of the company agenda that management focuses on.
OMM2	Management invests in knowledge sharing tools.
OMM3	Management encourages employees to share their knowledge.
OMM4-R	Management doesn't care if employees share their knowledge.

Table 19: The Management Support and Commitment (OMM) Scale Items

Rewards and incentives: The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)
Table 20: The Rewards and Incentives	(OMR) Scale Items
--------------------------------------	-------------------

Symbol	Item
OMR1	Sharing knowledge with employees improves tendency to get a better work assignment for me.
OMR2-R	There is no tangible reward for sharing knowledge with employees.
OMR3	Sharing knowledge elevate my reputation.
OMR4	Sharing knowledge improves tendency to get more respect for me.

Organizational culture: Questions were developed to measure employees'

perception on both organization and individual levels. The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the situations. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 =strongly disagree to 7 =strongly agree)

Table 21: The Organizational Culture (OMC) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
OMC1	My organization's environment stimulates employees to share their knowledge.
OMC2-R	Sharing knowledge rarely occurs in my organization.
OMC3	Employees in my organization often share their ideas to their colleagues.
OMC4	Employees in my organization utilize the best out of existing knowledge.

Attitude towards knowledge sharing dependent variable

There are three subscales of attitudes for this variable (Schermerhorn, Hunt, &

Osborn 2000), affective, cognitive, and behavioral.

These three subscales relate to the intention to perform specific behavior. The positive attitude results in employees willing to share their knowledge while the negative results to reluctance for sharing knowledge of employees in organizations.

The measures generated are based on Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn's literature (2000). The items measured respondents' perceptions of the degree to which they had positive or negative feelings towards the knowledge sharing.

The affective component is related to individual feelings. It encompasses the positive and negative feelings about knowledge sharing. Responses were documented on a 7 point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Table 22: The Organizational Culture (OMC) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
ASA1	Knowledge sharing benefits my organization and me.
ASA2-R	Knowledge sharing prolongs my working time.

The cognitive component is about belief of an individual. It forms a positive or negative opinion or perception based on information a person knows about knowledge sharing. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Table 23: The Cognitive Component (ASC) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
ASC1	I believe knowledge sharing makes improvement to my organization and me.
ASC2-R	I believe sharing knowledge makes me lose my knowledge that makes me stand out from others.

The behavioral component is about an attitude. When an individual has a desire to act in a certain way based on the feelings and opinions he/she has about knowledge sharing. Responses were documented on a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Table 24: The Behavioral Component (ASB) Scale Items

Symbol	Item
ASB1	I share knowledge because it benefits both the organization and me.
ASB2	I share knowledge because I believe knowledge sharing makes improvement to my organization and me.

In order to make the respondents more comfortable in answering the questionnaire, it is translated into Thai by a language specialist. For the content validity, the questionnaire has been reviewed by four specialists in the field, two in Thailand and two in the United States of America.

3.5.2 Instrument Pretest

To develop the reliable questionnaires, a pilot study was conducted to examine questionnaires to ensure that it is easily to understand, cover the various issues, unambiguously, and can be answered within a reasonable of time. The questionnaires were pretested two times. First, a participating pretest was conducted by sending the questionnaires to twelve selected Thai commercial bank employees in April 2015 for their advice on how to reduce ambiguity, the number of questions, and any identified misunderstandings. The comments from the respondents were used to review the questionnaire and to incorporate clarifications.

Second an "undeclared" pretest conducted by sending the questionnaires to sixty (60) employees of the selected Thai commercial bank in April 2015. Forty-three (43) completed questionnaires were returned. This pretest was conducted using the same protocol and setting subsequently used for the final distribution.

According to Brooks (2009), samples for pretesting need to be representative of the population and sufficiently large. The minimum of representative participants for a preliminary survey or scale development is recommended to be 30. The 43 responses from employees in different divisions in the bank were reviewed and found to be a representative population targeted for the overall distribution.

For reliability analysis, a preliminary exploratory factor analyses on the 43 respondents was conducted to test the validity of the constructs in the theoretical model. The component of item analysis examined in this research was the corrected items total correlations. A threshold of ≤ 0.3 has been used to eliminate items from further analyses (Du Plessis, 2004). Another criterion for eliminating items is to use Cronbach's Alpha, a threshold of ≤ 0.7 (Nunnaly ,1978)

Table 25 presents the corrected item-total correlation in each factor to present the internal consistency of the scale. Corrected Item-Total Correlation of all models is more than 0.53. Cronbach's Alpha of all models is more than 0.83. Thus, we can say that the Corrected Item-Total Correlation and Cronbach's Alpha values lie within the threshold 0.3 and 0.7, respectively.

Factors	No. Of Items	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha							
EIV	18	0.88 - 0.95	.99							
EIC	18	0.69 - 0.86	.97							
EIH	16	0.79 - 0.87	.98							
IMI	12	0.75 - 0.89	.96							
IMO	18	0.74 - 0.86	.97							
IMS	10	0.77 - 0.89	.96							
OMT	4	0.85 - 0.92	.95							
OMM	4	0.63 - 0.75	.86							
OMR	4	0.58 - 0.63	.78							
OMC	4	0.84 - 0.93	.95							
ASA	2	0.53 - 0.83	.91							
ASC	2	0.77 - 0.80	.83							
ASB	2	0.69 - 0.73	.85							
Overall $n = 43$										

Table 25: Pilot Testing Corrected Item-total Correlation and Cronbach's Alpha

3.5.3 Data Collection Procedure

In June 2015, eight hundred and twenty electronic surveys were sent to the employees. Four hundred twenty-one questionnaires were returned and considered to be legitimate for this research, resulting in a 51% response rate with the frequency distribution by Division presented in Table 26.

Distribution of sample	Number of Sample	Valid percentage
Capital Markets Business Division	2	0.48%
Compliance and Audit Division	5	1.19%
Corporate and SME Products Division	3	0.71%
Corporate Business Division	2	0.48%
Corporate Secretariat Division	2	0.48%
Corporate Strategy Management Division	1	0.24%
Customer Service Fulfillment Division	23	5.46%
Enterprise Risk Management Division	15	3.56%
Finance and Control Division	5	1.19%
Human Resource Division	2	0.48%
Investment Banking Business Division	2	0.48%
Retail Business Division	314	74.58%
SME Business Division	21	4.99%
Systems Division	23	5.46%
World Business Division	1	0.24%
Total	421	100.00%

Table 26: Frequency Distribution of Sample in Relation to Division

3.5.4 Respondents' Demographics Structure

Most of the items in these sections are based on a 10-year study on emotional intelligence of individuals' around the world conducted by JCA (Maddock, 2011).

The study revealed that emotional intelligence varies among individuals with differences in gender, age, and present position. The study also provides cogent insights into relevant findings on gender similarities and differences, age related evolutions that can impact changes in EI, position influences and focus between same and or the M/F genders and comparisons between employee workers and managerial personnel in general. Those study findings will aid in comparisons of statistical results and findings to this study and will be incorporated in Chapters 4 and 5 as appropriate.





Figure 9: Respondent Population Characteristics

3.5.5 Summary of Demographic Data

Sample characteristics were analysed using frequency distributions (Figure 9 and Table 26) .Analysis shows gender groups are fairly evenly represented comprised of 212 Males (50.4%) and 209 Females (49.6%). Considering the respondent's age, 16.2% are 18-30 years of age, the largest age group is 31-50 years at 61.52%, followed by 51 years and up at 22.3%. With respect to level of education, 4.51% list other, the majority of respondents (49.9%) had bachelor degrees, and 44.9% had master's degrees and close to 1% achieved doctoral degrees. The respondents were divided into three categories on the basis of their years with the organization; those with under 2 years (11.9%), 2 - 10 Years (31.8%), and the majority of the employees were with the organization 11 years or more (56.3%).

The respondents were also divided into three categories on the basis of their position within the organization, executive level, middle management level and staff level. The majority of the respondents are in the staff level (80.3%), followed by the

middle management level (18.1%) and the executive level (1.7%) consecutively; the last two categories are subsequently treated as a combined "Leadership Team." The leadership to staff ratios seemed reasonable as percentages but with 20,000 employee workforce a numerical representation might change that observation. Since, one division owns all branch location a numerical versus percentages analysis might prove more meaningful for deriving findings and solution implications. The respondents work in 15 different divisions. The majority are in the Retail Business Division (15,000). It is the only division with employees who work at the bank's branches.



CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Overview

This chapter sets forth the statistical strengths, consistencies and "measures of fit" between the proposed relationships among the research variables. Structural equation modeling (SEM) is then employed for hypothesis testing, followed by an evaluation of the associated paths inherent in the hypotheses generated from the literature review in Chapter 2. The statistical checks and balance testing and the hypotheses determinations frame a strong conceptual research and literacy historical basis that led to the survey instrument to which 421 of the research population responded. That respondent data set is analyzed for potential practical, social and/or commercial etc. research findings/applications in this chapter which might be taken by the research Bank in the near term.

Other findings, which may be plausibly derived as near term, but require collaboration with the Thai Financial Sector or other entities, will be identified. Future Applications or Research suggestions will be surfaced in Chapter 5.

4.2 Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a multivariate analysis technique which has been widely used in empirical studies especially in testing hypotheses of causal influences in social sciences (Snoj et al., 2004). It has been discussed extensively in the literature as it is more powerful than multivariate procedures because it takes the correlated independents, measurement error and multiple latent independents into account (Byne, 2000). SEM describes linear combinations of normally distributed variables between latent and observed using factor analysis and regression or path analysis.

Nachtigall, et al. (2003) stated that SEM consists of a structural model and measurement models. The structural model represents the relationship between the latent variables of interest, while the measurement model represents the relationship between the latent variable and their observed indicators, such as Knowledge Sharing Tools, Management Commitment, Rewards and Incentives and Organizational Culture. Under the assumption of multivariate normality of the model variables, SEM models are constructed by specifying relations between observed (emotional intelligence) and latent variables (individual motivation and perceived organizational motivation). Latent variables allow the formulation of hypothetical constructs that cannot be measured directly, which enable the testing of hypothesis. Therefore, the power of SEM comes from latent variable modeling.

SEM development begins with model specification followed by model identification, model estimation, model testing, and model modification respectively (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010).

Model specification is a state of describing relationships among variables in the study. Three types of relationships among variables are specified in SEM: (1) association (non-directional relationship), (2) direct effect and (3) indirect effect (Hoyle, 1995). The hypothesized relationships are depicted in a path diagram by arrows which connect the latent variables in ways that represent the hypothesized directions and magnitudes of the causal relations. Model identification refers to the correspondence between the free parameters (the regression coefficients in structural equations and the variances and covariance of independent variables) and the observed variances. (Bentler & Wu, 1995). The model can also become just-identified or over-identified. If the numbers of parameters estimated are greater than the number of variances and covariances, then the model is over-identified. Model estimation is an important component of the model specification. The analysis software creates a covariance matrix based on the specified model during the parameter estimation. If there is no relation between two variables specified during the model specification, the covariance is set to zero. The covariance matrix that is proposed by the model is then compared to the matrix produced by the data.

Model testing is an answer to what extent the empirical data fit the proposed model. Assessment of model fit is one of the complex tasks in SEM analysis. Absolute fit compares the predicted and observed covariance matrices indicated by the chi-square, goodness of fit index (GFI), and standardized root mean square residual (Standardized RMR). Parsimonious fit penalizes model complexity. The more paths specified, the lower the models' parsimony which indicated by the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). The RMSEA fit index is reported by LISREL and values approaching zero are desired. Relative fit compares the evaluated model to the fit of another model. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is a fit statistic of choice and commonly used fit index (Byrne, 1998). After the model has been estimated and is fit tested, the model modification may be required to make it a better acceptable fit to the empirical data. The modifications are entirely data driven and theoretical support must substantiate any changes to the model based of the modification indices.

4.3 Goodness of Fit Conceptual Model

Several model fit indices were inspected to examine the measures of overall model fit (MacCallum et al., 1996). In addition to model chi square, normed chi square (χ^2 /df), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) fit indexes were inspected in this study. The chi square value was significant χ^2 =152.88, p=.00. The normed chi square (χ^2 /df) was used to correct for the sample size sensitivity of the model chi square. The normed chi square value, which was 1.54, indicated a reasonable fit as values close to 2 have been recommended as demonstrating reasonable fit (Kline, 2005). Consistently, Comparative Fit Index (CFI)= .98, indicated reasonably good fit of the model to the data as suggested by Marsh, Hau, and Wen (2004). Standardized RMR (SRMR)=0.02 and RMSEA=.04 also indicated close approximate fit of the model (Kline,2005; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). In sum, values of the selected fit indices consistently indicated that the hypothesized measurement model fits the data well.



V

Figure 10: The Relationship between each Variable in the Statistical Model



Figure 11: Coefficient Values between Variables

4.4 Results of the Hypothesis Testing

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was conducted using the Lisrel 9.2 program to test the proposed relationships among the study variables. The SEM analysis followed a two-stage process as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). First, assess construct validity by running a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Second, evaluate the model in terms of measures of fit, statistical significance of coefficients and interpretation. Results of the hypotheses tests follow.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The analyses are evaluated in terms of the NFI (Normed Fit Index) and the CFI measures of fit; the statistical significance of the estimated coefficients, squared multiple correlation coefficient, composite reliability and average variance extracted are significantly associated with their observed variables. The measures of fit for the NFI and the CFI are evaluated in the context of suggested minimum threshold values of .9 (Arbuckle, 2010).

1) Emotional Intelligence

The measures of fit for Emotional intelligence (EI) are summarized by the NFI (.90) and the CFI (.91). Thus we can say that the NFI and the CFI values lie within the threshold .9 and hence the model is judged to have an acceptable fit.

2) Individual Motivation

The measures of fit for Attitudes towards knowledge sharing (AS) are summarized by the NFI (.89) and the CFI (.89). Thus, we can say that the NFI and the CFI values lie within the threshold .9 and hence the model is judged to have an acceptable fit.

3) Organizational Motivation

The measures of fit for Organizational commitment (OC) are summarized by the NFI (.92) and the CFI (.92). Thus we can say that the NFI and the CFI values lie within the threshold .9 and hence the model is judged to have an acceptable fit.

4) Attitudes towards knowledge sharing (AS)

The measures of fit for Attitudes towards knowledge sharing (AS) are summarized by the NFI (.90) and the CFI (.90). Thus, we can say that the NFI and the CFI values lie within the threshold .9 and hence the model is judged to have an acceptable fit.

4.5 Hypotheses Proof

The hypotheses generated from the literature review in Chapter 2 are evaluated in the context of the Theoretical Model. A summary of the hypotheses, associated paths and results is presented in Table 27.

Independent	Dependent	Coefficient (standard)	z	p>z
EI	IM	0.60	21.43	**
	ОМ	1.48	32.99	**
IM	AS	0.27	2.86	**
ОМ	AS	0.87	13.47	**
EI	AS	0.16	2.55	*

 Table 27: Direct Effect Result of Structural Equation Model

* Significant at p<0.05, ** Significant at p<0.01

Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Individual Motivation (IM)

- H1₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the individual motivation (IM)
- H1₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the individual motivation (IM)

Hypothesis 1 is represented by the coefficients of the path $EI \rightarrow IM$.

Hypothesis 1 is statistically significant at the 1% significance level (p<0.01) and has the expected positive sign (0.60). Therefore, reject H1₀ and accept H1₁.

Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Organizational Motivation (OM)

- H2₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)
- H2₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)

Hypothesis 2 is represented by the path $EI \rightarrow OM$. Hypothesis 2 is statistically significant at the 1% significance level (p<0.01) and has the expected positive sign (1.48). Therefore, reject H2₀ and accept H2₁.

Individual Motivation (IM) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

- H3₁: Individual Motivation (IM) has a positive relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)
- H3₀: Individual Motivation (IM) has no relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)

Hypothesis 3 is represented by the path IM \rightarrow AS. Hypothesis 3 is statistically significant at the 1% significance level (p<0.01) and has the expected positive sign (0.27). Therefore, reject H3₀ and accept H3₁.

Organizational Motivation (OM) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

- H4₁: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has a positive relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H4₀: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has no relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)

Hypothesis 4 is represented by the path OM \rightarrow AS. Hypothesis 4 is statistically significant at the 1% significance level (p<0.01) and has the expected positive sign (0.87). Therefore, reject H4₀ and accept H4₁.

Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

- H5₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H5₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)

Hypothesis 5 is represented by the path EI \rightarrow AS. Hypothesis 2 is statistically significant at the 5% significance level (p<0.05) and has the expected positive sign (0.16). Therefore, reject H5₀ and accept H5₁.

For the structural model, all five estimated path coefficients are strongly statistically significant. For each coefficient, the null hypothesis that the true value of the coefficient is zero is rejected. All coefficients have the expected positive signs. The tests of standard scores (z value) and probability values (p value) were computed from the interactive website of Social Science Statistics (2016). 4.6 Statistical and Analytical Summaries

4.6.1 Statistical Summaries

The results from the questionnaire of 421 employees provide empirical support for the overall structure theorized in the research model. All of the five hypotheses were supported. According to the total effect of all constructs (Table 27), the results indicate that emotional intelligence is a predictor of individual, organizational motivation, and attitude towards knowledge sharing



Figure 12: Distributions of Respondent Characteristics

4.6.2 Human Capital Demographic Categories

This Chapter displays basic groupings of findings for the 421 respondents' data set, and a comparison with the Retail Business Division since its' 314 respondent data set is approximately 75% of the total 421 respondents. Not surprisingly the two analyses are very similar.





Figure 13: Distributions of Respondent Characteristics

The researcher chose to also create a profile set based on a distribution by the physical number of employees in Retail (~15,000) and all others (5,000) in the selected Bank, using the percentage allocations from Figure 12. Projecting near term and/or future applications/research by viewing such a physically large number of employees assists in scoping more realistic findings and recommendations.







JE

Some overall observations can be implied from the six (6) Demographic Categories contributed by the 421 respondents' data set. Such as Gender equal, well educated, mature, stable, 20-80 Leadership to Staff Ratio, organizationally dispersed foot print through extended Branch Network, dominated by the "Retail Business Division," and competitively profitable large Thai Commercial Bank among the 4 largest such Banks.

4.6.3 Workforce Analytical Templates

The overall observations drawn from the preceding Demographic Category data are not adequate for deriving details from the respondent data set to create a "Findings Template" for the scope of the one subject Bank workforce of 20,000 employees, let alone the Financial Sector's estimated 205,000 employee base.

The researcher chose to exercise the functionalities of the Excel software suite for more detailed Workforce analytical templates. Figures 14 and 15 demonstrate overall Excel worksheets from which segments of data of responses (from the Survey Questionnaire are drawn into the six (6) Demographic Categories for detailed analyses.

The Excel spreadsheet in Figure 14 shows an example from the Gender category for Female Respondents' Educational levels and years with the Bank either in Leadership or staff positions; these data elements are compared to a person's age and the collective EI scores in Low, Normal or High columns. One block of data elements is used as an example of using the Template to derive a narrative understanding from which multiple findings can be determined. Table 27 demonstrates the corresponding block of data elements for the comparable Male respondents.

					Α	В	С						
FEMALE	1	8 - 30 Yea	irs	19 20 Voors	31 - 50 Years			31 - 50 Years	51 Years and Above			51 Vears and	Grand
Demographic	Low El Norm El H		High El	Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	Total	Low El Norm El		High El	Above Total	Total Female
1) Master Degree and above	11	4	2	17	50	12	33	95	3	1	2	6	118
1.1) 11 Years or Above					14	6	9	29	2	1	2	5	34
1.1.1) Leadership					2	3	2	7	1		1	2	9
1.1.2) Staff					12	3	7	22	1	1	1	3	25
1.2) 2 - 10 Years	7	2	1	10	35	6	22	63	1			1	74
1.2.1) Leadership	1			1	6	3	3	12					13
1.2.2) Staff	6	2	1	9	29	3	19	51	1			1	61
1.3) Under 2 years	4	2	1	7	1		2	3					10
1.3.1) Leadership							1	1					1
1.3.2) Staff	4	2	1	7	1		1	2					9
2) Bachelor Degree	18	4	10	32	14	7	14	35	10	2	7	19	86
2.1) 11 Years or Above				1/	10	3	11	24	10	2	7	19	43
2.1.1) Leadership							1	1	3		4	7	8
2.1.2) Staff		.1			10	3	10	23	7	2	3	12	35
2.2) 2 - 10 Years	5	3	4	12	1	4	2	7					19

Table 28: Data Elements for the Comparable Female Respondents

2.2.1) Leadership

2.3) Under 2 years

2.3.1) Leadership

3.1) 11 Years or Above

3.1.1) Leadership

2.2.2) Staff

2.3.2) Staff

3.1.2) Staff

3) Other

Total

The Excel functionality facilitates in extracting the narrative interpretation of the Excel data cells as provided in text below to provide readers insights into the "findings" analyses employed.

1) Column A: 50 Individuals – All are female in the numerically dominate 31-50-year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; all scored Low EI; 14 have been with the bank 11 years or more, 35 are at 2-10 years and 1 is under 2 years; 8 are in Leadership (2+6), while the other 42 are in Staff positions (12+29+1).

2) Column B: 12 Individuals – All are female in the 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; 6 have been at the bank 11 or more years,

6 with 2-10 years at the bank. Six (6) have Leadership positions and 6 have Staff positions. All 12 scored Normal EI.

3) Column C: 33 Individuals – All are female in the 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; 9 have been with the bank 11 or more years, 22 with the bank 2-10 years and 2 under 2 years. Six (6) have Leadership positions and 27 have Staff positions. All 33 scored High EI.

For the total of A, B, C, there are 95 Women, 31-50 years old with Masters Degrees or above. 75 are in Staff positions and 20 in Leadership. 50 of the 95 have Low EI, 12 have Normal EI and 33 have High EI.

In summary, Female EI tends to show slight improvement toward higher scores for the 31-50 (older) age group, versus 18-30 years for both Masters and Bachelors level respondent sub groups.

For all age groups (18-30) (31-50) (51 and above) Older and higher education tends to result in higher EI scores which is consistent with literature projections. (Goleman, 1998; Kafetsios, 2004; Kumar & Muniandy, 2006)

VDED 190

			1									
				Α	В	С						
8	8 - 30 Yea	rs	18 - 30 Years	3	1 - 50 Yea	irs	31 - 50 Years	51 Ye	ears and A	bove	51 Years and	Grand
	Norm El	High El	Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	Total Low El Nor		Norm El	High El	Above Total	Total Male
	2	2	8	29	7	19	55	6	3	2	11	74
				9	3	14	26	5	3	2	10	36
				5	1	8	14	2	1		3	17
				4	1	5	10	3	2	2	7	17
	1		2	19	4	5	28	1			1	31
				7	3	3	11					11
	1		2	12	2	3	17	1			1	20
	1	2	6	1			1					7
												0
	1	2	6	1			1					7
	2	2	11	31	13	23	67	21	9	16	46	124
				28	13	20	61	19	9	16	44	105

Table 29: Data Elements for the Comparable Male Respondents

Low El

MALE

Demographic
1) Master Degree and above

1.1) 11 Years or Above 1.1.1) Leadership 1.1.2) Staff 1.2) 2 - 10 Years

1.2.1) Leadership 1.2.2) Staff

1.3) Under 2 years

2) Bachelor Degree 2.1) 11 Years or Above

2.1.2) Staff

2.2.2) Staff

2.3.2) Staff

3.1.2) Staff

3) Other

Total

2.2) 2 - 10 Years

1.3.1) Leadership 1.3.2) Staff

2.1.1) Leadership

2.2.1) Leadership

2.3) Under 2 years

2.3.1) Leadership

3.1) 11 Years or Above

3.1.1) Leadership

1) Column A: 29 Individuals – All are male in the numerically dominate 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; all scored Low EI; 9 have been with the bank 11 years or more, 19 for 2-10 years and 1 under 2 years; 12 are in Leadership (5+7), while the other 17 are in Staff positions (12+29+1).

2) Column B: 7 Individuals – All are male in the 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; 3 have been at the bank 11 or more years and 4 with 2-10 years. 4 have Leadership positions and 3 have Staff positions. All 7 scored Normal EI.

3) Column C: 19 Individuals – All are male in the 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; 14 have been with the Bank 11 or more years and 5 with the bank 2-10 years. 11 have Leadership positions and 8 have Staff positions. All 19 scored High EI.

For the total of A, B, C, there are 55 Men, 31-50 years old with Masters Degrees or above. 28 are in Staff positions and 27 in Leadership. 29 of the 55 have Low EI, 7 have Normal EI and 19 have High EI.

In summary, Male EI improvement move higher in the older age groups at the Masters level, but level off and show a slight decline toward lower scores in the over 51 year age group for Bachelor's degree sub group.

For all age groups (18-30) (31-50) (51 and above) Low EI tends to be the greatest in the youngest (18-30) age group but about the same for Bachelors and Masters at the two older age groups.

4.6.4 Demographic Comparison Tables

Both Excel template examples demonstrate the initial level of analysis that was used to follow a structured process. This continued at a deeper level of detail to demonstrate how the researcher progressed to determine the distribution of applicable EI Low-Normal-High scores (Tables 30 to 35).

Age Group	Total N in the	lumber group	Lov	v EI	Norm	nal EI	High EI		
Female	209	100%	109	52%	31	15%	69	33%	
18 - 30 Years	49	59%	29	59%	8	16%	12	25%	
31 - 50 Years	131	49%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%	
51 Years and Above	29	55%	16	55%	3	10%	10	35%	
Male	212	100%	107	51%	37	17%	68	32%	
18 - 30 Years	19	58%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%	
31 - 50 Years	128	49%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%	
51 Years and Above	65	51%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%	
Grand Total	421	100%	216	51%	68	16%	137	33%	
18 - 30 Years	68	16%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%	
31 - 50 Years	259	62%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%	
51 Years and Above	94	22%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%	

Table 30: Demographic EI by Gender and by Age

Table 30 illustrates distribution of EI Score of respondents when combining both genders or separating them, are almost the same. Distributions of EI Score of Male and Female in different age group of respondents are ranging from Low, High and Normal. With the exception of males in the 18 - 30 year age respondents, the combined totals of people in Normal plus High EI are almost always close to or equal to the total low EI's. But in the comparison of Low versus High EIs, the Lows are always greater. Since High EI scores support a greater positive attitude towards knowledge sharing this research chooses to emphasize that work to improve all Low to High EI. Realistically, respondents with Normal EI scores would also be included in the coaching, workshop or discussion sessions to "improve EI scores". The largest age group is always the 31-50 year respondent group of the three segments (18-30, 31-50, and 51 and above). The remaining Table analysis accepts the 31-50 year segment as the most dominate and representative of all respondents. But for convenience to all readers the Appendix contains a full set of calculations for all age groups.

Age Group 31 - 50 Years	Total Number in the group		Low	v EI	Norm	al EI	High EI	
Female	131	51%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Male	128	49%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 31: Demographic EI by Gender within the 31-50 Years Age Group

The distribution of EI scores of female and male respondents in the age group 31 - 50 Years reflects the dominant trend of low EIs at the 50% plus to High EIs in the mid 30% range. (Table 31)

	Total Number in the group							
Education			Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Master Degree	95	73%	50	53%	12	13%	33	35%
and Above								
Bachelor Degree	35	27%	14	40%	7	20%	14	40%
Other	1	1%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Master Degree	55	13%	20	53%	7	13%	10	35%
and Above	55	т <u>э</u> 70	2)	5570		1370	17	5570
Bachelor Degree	67	52%	31	46%	13	19%	23	34%
Other	6	5%	3	50%	0	0%	3	50%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 32: Demographic EI by Education Levels

Table 32 reflects the statistics that were analyzed as examples in the Excel Templates of Figures 14 and 15. The distribution of EI scores of females and males with Bachelor/Master Degrees and above are similar between the genders. Further, the same pattern continues for both genders where by the Low EIs in the 50% plus segment outnumber the High EI scores in the ~ mid 30% ranges. Similarly, the combined Normal plus High EI total is close to the low EI total score, but the research will continue to emphasize Low EI verses High EI totals to focus on maximum improvement selection. One exception is in the Female, Bachelor's Degree category where the Low and High EIs are identical at 14 respondents and 40% each, but it is a rare exception.

Years with Organization	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
11 Years or Above	54	41%	24	44%	10	19%	20	37%
2 - 10 Years	70	53%	36	51%	10	14%	24	34%
Under 2 years	7	5%	4	57%	0	0%	3	43%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
11 Years or Above	93	73%	40	43%	16	17%	37	40%
2 - 10 Years	34	27%	22	65%	4	12%	8	24%
Under 2 years	1	1%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 33: Demographic EI by Years with the Organization

The male respondents at 11 years or above are the largest single unit for this demographic table and have an almost equal number of High (37) to Low (40) respondents, representing a second rare exception. However, the rest of the data follow the dominate trend. No matter, how long the respondents have been with the organization, the distribution of EI scores follow the now familiar pattern of dominance by Low EIs, although the "Under 2 years" segment, while fully included in the statistical analyses have little practical impact in determining scenario parameters for evolving corrective actions to move toward High EIs (Table 33).

Position	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Leadership	25	19%	9	36%	8	32%	8	32%
Staff	106	81%	55	52%	12	11%	39	37%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Leadership	37	29%	16	43%	7	19%	14	38%
Staff	91	71%	47	52%	13	14%	31	34%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 34: Demographic EI by Position within the Organization

As Table 34 shows EI scores of Female 31-50 Years who are in leadership positions reflect almost equal thirds results (Low 36%, Normal 32% and High 32%). This "equal" distribution has been rare for the respondent population and should allow additional discussion among the Bank's HR professionals and appropriate Leadership personnel on solution processes and/or expected corrective results. The actual number of people who might be in this segment of the total workforce, the position differences that might be involved, the functions which this segment represents across the 15 Divisions are only a few of the considerations. The final possible solution alternatives would be part of the practical near term and/or future application decisions. In this instance the "standard" of raising Low to High EIs underscores why to include Low and normal to High which allows one corrective approach. Another aspect is to set a higher expectation that such an "equal" distribution of responses should lead to a higher conversion success of this type segment to achieve greater than usual High EI results. The remaining results for the Female Staff and the Male Leadership and Staff responses follow the earlier pattern of Low EIs as a greater number than High EI response. However, another potentially encouraging "finding" is that 62 (25 female and 37 male) of the total 83 Leadership responders represent 74.7% in the 31-50 age group alone which is disproportionally higher than in the other age groups.

Office Location	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI				
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%			
Branch	59	45%	31	53%	7	12%	21	36%			
Head Quarter	72	55%	33	46%	13	18%	26	36%			
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%			
Branch	71	55%	31	44%	12	17%	28	39%			
Head Quarter	57	45%	32	56%	8	14%	17	30%			
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%			

 Table 35: Demographic EI by Location

No matter, where the respondents work, branch or head quarter, the distribution of EI Scores again follow the similar pattern of Low EI scores generally in the 50% plus versus High EIs in the mid 30% range. The fact that females split 45% Branch and 55% Headquarters, versus the males at 55% Branch and 45% Headquarters is worth noting. It becomes important to follow the analyses of the total workforce distribution to the Retail Business Division of approximately 15,000 and ownership of all the Branch locations versus approximately 5,000 at Headquarters.

The potential value of this level of analyses may well surface in various future actions of workforce distribution because of the sheer number of total employees to be impacted by any actions taken (Table35).



CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The combination of high emotional intelligence, strong individual motivation and supportive motivating organizational factors significantly enhances a positive attitude towards knowledge sharing, which increases the probability for achieving competitive advantage through the optimal use of 21st Century knowledge era assets and

practices.

This statement conveys that the Problem Focus, Objectives and Research Questions have been addressed in Chapters 1 through 4. The Hypotheses Summary (5.1) and Discussion (5.2 cap the results. Future applications and research project extension suggestions and the originality and value conclude the merits of this study.

5.1 Hypotheses Summary

The objective of this research study was to enhance the collective understanding of the factors affecting the attitude toward knowledge sharing of employees in a Commercial Bank in Thailand, with a key emphasis on determining the impact of Thai emotional intelligence (EI) on that attitude. The study drew upon theory and research from multiple streams of research such as social psychology, organizational learning, knowledge management, information systems, and the culturally oriented Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test (TEIST).

The Hypotheses Model map is replicated below and a set of summary results for each of the five (5) hypotheses follows.
The literature review identified four critical influences on employees' Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing: Emotional Intelligence (EI) - Independent Variable (Virtue, Competence, Happiness); Individual Motivation (IM) - Dependent Variable (interpersonal trust, organizational commitment, and self-efficacy) and Organizational Motivation (OM) - Dependent Variable (knowledge sharing tools, management support and commitment, rewards and incentive, and organization culture); and Motivational behavior, beliefs and feelings which could result in a Yes/No decision towards attitude for sharing (AS) versus the act or measurement of actual knowledge sharing (KS).



Figure 15: Hypotheses Relationships Linkages Model

The results from the questionnaire responses of 421 employees also provide empirical support for the overall structure theorized in the research model and all the five hypotheses were supported.

Individual Motivation (IM)

- H1₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the individual motivation (IM)
- H1₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the individual motivation (IM)

Organizational Motivation (OM)

- H2₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)
- H2₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with the knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM)

Attitude toward Knowledge Sharing (AS)

- H3₁: Individual Motivation (IM) has a positive relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)
- H3₀: Individual Motivation (IM) has no relationship with the Attitude for Knowledge Sharing (AS)
- H4₁: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has a positive relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H4₀: Knowledge sharing motivation in an organization (OM) has no relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing (AS)
- H5₁: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has a positive relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)

H5₀: The employees' emotional intelligence (EI) has no relationship with attitudes toward knowledge sharing (AS)

5.2 Research and Practical Findings

5.2.1 Literature Overview Findings Discussion

According to the finding, emotional intelligence is positively and significantly related to attitude towards knowledge sharing which coincides with the findings of prior researches on knowledge sharing (Tohidinia & Mosakhani, 2010; Cabrera, Collins & Salgado, 2006; Gallie et al., 2001). Emotional intelligence (EI) also demonstrated a strong positive relationship with individual motivation (IM) factors. The significance of the emotional intelligence effect supports the premise that employees who have higher emotional intelligence are more likely to have more positive individual motivation toward sharing knowledge.

The results also presented that emotional intelligence (EI) relates in a positive effect to organizational motivation (OM). Emotional intelligence demonstrated a strong positive relationship with knowledge sharing motivation factors in an organization, which is consistent with the study of Hales and Gough (2003). Once again, the significance of the EI effect on OM supports the premise that employees who have higher EI are more likely to have more positive motivation toward knowledge sharing.

Emotional intelligence related positively in direct effect to the attitude towards knowledge sharing. According to the total effect of all constructs the results indicated that EI is a significant predictor of Attitude towards Knowledge Sharing (AS). The relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and attitude towards knowledge sharing (AS) as shown in this study indicates that emotional intelligence (EI) will result in a higher positive attitude for employees to share their knowledge (AS).

Literatures (Bandura 1986; Kankanhalli et al. 2005; Wasko & Faraj 2005) presented that individual and organizational motivation can motivate employees to share knowledge with colleagues and that should have a positive relationship with attitude toward knowledge sharing. According to So and Bolloju (2005) attitude is formed from individuals' behavioral feelings and beliefs and can result in a specific behavior act, positive or negative. The results of this study found that the individual and organization motivation variables in the conceptual and modified conceptual model correlated positively to attitude toward knowledge sharing.

5.2.2 Research Findings and Practical Discussion

Findings are presented in two modes; Research Related Results and Practice(s) Related Results. The section begins with a full-page Figure DISPLAY of the Data Base Responses, followed by dual columns per page of "Tables" to organize and present "Research and Practical Findings". Before going to the section, there are other Salient Data Findings Areas emerged as responses to questions during the data analyses and are reflected below.

- All bank staff members are required to pass the IQ and EQ standard tests. Apart from that they must graduate from related fields of their applied positions. The qualifications of staff are mainly related to their job responsibilities. Not everyone in the same division or the same department needs to graduate from the same field. The number of departments varies up to 21 in one division, and there are several functions in a department. - The fundamental skills, such as, project management, negotiation, presentation, effective work; Communication Skills Training, Work Efficiency and Innovation workshop are applied to all staff in every division. The specialized training mostly focuses on the law and regulations, for example, Single License Course for Investment consultant.

- The major subject depends on the staff's job responsibility; i.e. Business Administration for Product manager, Computer Science/Engineering for IT related positions. A Bachelor's Degree is the minimum requirement for most candidates; however, the bank prefers candidates who are already hold a Master degree to reduce the risk of leaving the bank to pursue a graduate degree. Nevertheless, Bachelor degreed staff are normally offered financial support for half the cost towards a Master's degree.

- Of the 83 people with Leadership roles in the 421-respondent data base, 76 of them are from the 5 Divisions with double digit respondents. All but one of them has been with the bank for 2 years or longer. The percentage of Master and Bachelor degreed graduates is almost the same across the total workforce for both Leadership and Staff positions.

Division	# of Leadership
Customer Service Fulfillment Division	6
Enterprise Risk Management Division	5
Retail Business Division	56
SME Business Division	7
Systems Division	2

Table 36: Leadership by Division

				OW EI (Scores 5	32-241)		Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	(
		Total	No. of	Ы	IN	WO	AS	No. of	Ы	IM	WO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	WO	AS
From 4	121 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	A verage Score	Arerage Score	Arerage Score	Arerage Score	Respondents	Arerage Soure	Average Score	Arerage Score	Average R Score	tespon den ts	Arerage Score	Average Score	A verage Score	Are rage Score
Total		421	216	168.53	141.71	56.80	20.98	68	276.09	195.94	79.88	29.91	137	330.82	241.49	96.47	35.73
Cander	Fe male	2.09	109	169.65	140.24	56.11	21.19	31	275.35	195.29	80.65	29.55	69	328.81	240.38	96.64	35.61
Gender	Male	212	107	167.38	143.21	57.50	20.77	37	276.70	196.49	79.24	30.22	68	332.85	242.62	96.29	35.85
	18 - 30 Ye ars	89	40	179.75	147.15	55.60	21.93	12	283.17	214.00	85.00	31.42	16	331.38	241.13	96.25	35.75
Age	31 - 50 Ye ars	259	127	168.08	140.82	57.45	21.17	40	274.30	194.90	79.80	30.33	92	330.30	241.07	96.35	35.74
	51 Years and Above	94	49	160.53	139.59	56.08	19.73	16	275.25	185.00	76.25	27.75	29	332.14	243.03	96.97	35.69
1 0 11	Master de gree and above	192	103	178.62	146.80	58.29	21.68	29	280.69	200.48	83.59	31.66	09	329.50	241.27	96.27	35.90
EQUCATIONAL Taral	Bachelor Degree	210	101	159.68	135.96	55.13	20.45	37	272.38	190.05	76.00	28.14	и	332.19	241.86	96.78	35.61
TOVAL	Other	19	71	156.33	146.50	58.00	19.50	1	278.00	239.00	98.00	37.50	5	326.80	238.80	94.40	35.40
	11 Years or Above	237	109	163.63	140.26	56.81	20.45	42	276.38	192.00	78.57	29.57	86	331.23	241.33	96.70	35.66
Te ars with the	2 - 10 Years	134	9/	175.87	143.63	57.89	21.76	21	274.38	198.38	80.76	30.38	£	329.46	241.57	95.78	35.84
01gamzau011	Under 2 years	50	31	167.74	142.13	54.06	20.94	5	280.80	218.80	87.20	30.80	14	331.86	242.29	96.86	35.86
Position in the	Le aders hip	83	34	178.06	143.88	60.59	12.35	19	274.63	191.16	76.63	29.05	30	330.73	245.20	95.20	35.57
organization	Staff	338	182	166.75	141.31	56.09	20.73	49	276.65	197,80	81.14	30.24	107	330.84	240.45	96.82	35.78
Office Teerston	He ad Quarter	175	94	178.19	150.51	59.11	21.81	30	273.40	198.73	78.13	28.90	51	330.75	237.96	95.92	35.75
	Branch	246	122	161.08	134.93	55.02	20.34	38	278.21	193.74	81.26	30.71	86	330.86	243.58	96.79	35.72
	Capital Markets Business Divis	2	1	121.00	110.00	44.00	16.50										
	Compliance and Audit Division	5	4	217.50	169.50	73.00	22.00	4	276.00	188.00	60.00	23.00					
	Corporate and SMEP roducts Division	3	2	127.00	85.00	38.00	18.00	-	258.00	210.00	48.00	30.00					
	Corporate Business Division	2	2	105.00	132.00	44.00	20.50										
	Corporate Secretariat Division	2	2	122.00	97.00	44.00	14.50										
	Corpora te S trategy Manag ement Divisione	1	1	242.00	178.00	60.00	26.00										
	Customer Service Fulfillment	23	1					4	286.50	255.00	98.00	35.75	19	329.16	240.00	96.21	35.47
Division	Enterprise Risk Management	15	TI .	196.18	169.82	70.55	23.09	4	268.50	142.00	57.00	20.50					
	Finance and Control Division	5											5	332.00	245.20	95.20	37.00
	Human Re source Division	2						1	278.00	22.0.00	104.00	40.00	1	312.00	228.00	104.00	35.00
	Investment Banking Business Division	2	2	105.00	118.00	38.00	18.00										
	Retail Business Division	314	150	166.71	140.44	56.43	20.92	53	11.11	198.26	81.74	30.79	111	331.37	241.91	96.50	35.72
	SME Business Division	21	18	201.44	160.67	63.11	24.61	3	264.67	142.00	66.67	21.67					
	Systems Division	23	11	151.82	129.27	51.09	18.55	1	258.00	184.00	68.00	19.00					
	World Business Division	1											1	314.00	218.00	96.00	36.00

Figure 16: All Variables – Total Data Base for 421 Respondents.

				ow El (Scores !	52-241)		Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	_
1	101	Total	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	M	MO	AS
From	441 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Awrage Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		421	216	168.53	141.71	56.80	20.98	68	276.09	195.94	79.88	29.91	137	330.82	241.49	96.47	35.73
	18 - 30 Years	68	40	179.75	147.15	55.60	21.93	12	283.17	214.00	85.00	31.42	16	331.38	241.13	96.25	35.75
Age	31 - 50 Years	259	127	168.08	140.82	57.45	21.17	40	274.30	194,90	79.80	30.33	92	330.30	241.07	96.35	35.74
	51 Years and Above	94	49	160.53	139.59	56.08	19.73	16	275.25	185.00	76.25	27.75	29	332.14	243.03	96.97	35.69
	$\langle 0 \rangle$																
Female	U			ow El (Scores !	52-241)	2	Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	(
	V	No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	M	MO	AS
From	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average H Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	209	109	169.65	140.24	56.11	21.19	31	275.35	195.29	80.65	29.55	69	328.81	240.38	96.64	35.61
	18 - 30 Years	49	29	175.93	144.41	55.03	22.24	8	283.75	215.75	85.00	30.38	12	335.33	235.00	95.33	35.42
Age	31 - 50 Years	131	64	174.22	142.06	57.75	21.23	20	272.70	193.30	82.40	30.25	47	327.62	240.09	96.94	35.74
	51 Years and Above	29	16	140.00	125.38	51.50	19.13	3	270.67	154.00	57.33	22.67	10	326.60	248.20	96.80	35.20
								× /									
Male	5			ow El (Scores!	52-241)		Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	(
		No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	M	MO	AS
From	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average H Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
	Male	212	107	167.38	143.21	57.50	20.77	37	276.70	196.49	79.24	30.22	68	332.85	242.62	96.29	35.85
	18 - 30 Years	19	11	189.82	154.36	57.09	21.09	4	282.00	210.50	85.00	33.50	4	319.50	259.50	99,00	36.75
Age	31 - 50 Years	128	63	161.84	139.56	57.14	21.10	20	275.90	196.50	77.20	30.40	45	333.11	242.09	95.73	35.73
	51 Years and Above	65	33	170.48	146.48	58.30	20.03	13	276.31	192.15	80.62	28.92	19	335.05	240.32	97.05	35.95

Figure 17: Demographics of AGE Gender

166

Figure 16 shows the full results for the 421 responses reflecting all Females and Males. Figure 17 to Figure 20 simply extract the few lines of subsets from Figure 16 to allow an expansion for clearer reading of all age, education level, years with the organization, and position in the organization. The two subsequent portions in Figure 17 to Figure 20 allow a more convenient projection of data for Female and Male respondents separately, and are followed by the dual side-by-side columns of Research Findings and Practical Discussions.

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
The score of different Gender and Age	As both Genders reflect virtually a 50/50
are consistently similar and supportive of	percent distribution of Low EI scores
the theme: Higher EI Scores result in	versus the combined totals of Normal and
higher dependent variables scores for	High Scores. All ages clusters show the
Individual Motivation (IM) and	same results. It presents that gender and
Organizational Motivation (OM). Most	age are not the criteria to select to focus
significantly all result in higher scores for	on while improving the EI. The selected
Attitude for Knowledge sharing (AS).	research bank should consider to enhance
There are 3 groups of ages, which are	the low and normal score to the higher
dominant by the mid-range (31-50 years)	level of EI. Consideration should not only
for each gender. All cluster populations	include the EI in collaboration but also
in both Genders showed the consistency	expanding the training content to include
that increasingly higher EI Scores	the subject matter of the dependent
resulted in increasing scores for all	variables and sub-variables in IM, OM,
dependent variables and virtually	and AS.
identical results for all age clusters in	
both Genders for increasing the Attitude	
toward the Knowledge Sharing variable	
(AS).	
	(Continued)

Table 37: Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions

Table 37 (Continued): Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions

The distributions for Low to Normal to
High EI scores were essentially the same
for both Genders in supporting the
finding that the number of Low EI scores
consistently was close to or greater than
the combined Normal and High scoring
population.



				ow El (Scores	52-241)		Norr	nal El (Scores	242-3(3)	Hi	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
		Total	No. of	II	IM	NO	AS	No. of	II	IM	M	SK	No. of	II	IN	MO	SA
From	42] T otal Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Arenge Soure	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F	lesponden to	Average Score	Avenge Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		421	216	168.53	141.71	56.80	20.98	68	276.09	195.94	79.88	29.91	137	330.82	241.49	96.47	35.73
Pdurchand	Master degree and abov e	192	103	178.62	146.80	58.29	21.68	29	280.69	200.48	83.59	31.66	09	329.50	241.27	96.27	35.90
Laucauonal	Bachelor Degree	210	101	159.68	135.96	55.13	20.45	37	272.38	190.05	76.00	28.14	ц	332.19	241.86	96.78	35.61
TOUT	Other	19	12	15633	146.50	58.00	19.50	~	278.00	239.00	98.00	37.50	5	326.80	238.80	94.40	35.40
	2																
Female				ow El	Scores	52-241)	<i>.</i>	Norr	nal El (Scores	242-3(33)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
		No. of	No. of	II	M	ON	AS	No.of	EI	IN	M	AS	Ň. 0f	EI	IN	M	SA
From 4	421 T otal Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Avenge Score	Average Score	Avenage Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F Score	lespondents	Average Score	Average Score	Avenage Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	209	/109	169.65	140.24	56.11	21.19	31	275.35	195.29	80.65	29.55	69	328.81	240.38	96.64	35.61
1-1-1-T A	Master degree and above	118	64	180.81	148.69	59.44	21.78	η	279.76	199.06	83.76	31.12	37	32827	239.95	96.43	35.92
E OUCADODAL Lovel	Bachelor Degree	86	42	15557	128.62	51.81	20.36	13	269.38	185.69	74.77	27.00	31	329.42	240.71	96,90	35.29
TCACI	Other	5	3	128.67	122.67	45.33	20.33	I	278.00	256.00	104.00	36.00	1	330.00	246.00	96.00	34.00
	50																
Male			Y	ow El (Scores.	52-241)		Norr	nal El (Scores	242-3(33)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
		No. of	No. of	EI	IN	NO	SA	No.of	EI	M	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IN	W	SA
From 4	421 T otal Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Avenge Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F Score	lesponden to	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
	Male	212	107	167.38	143.21	57.50	20.77	37	276.70	196.49	79.24	30.22	68	332.85	242.62	96.29	35.85
Fducctional	Master degree and abov e	74	39	175.03	143.69	56.41	21.51	12	282.00	202.50	83.33	32.42	23	331.48	243.39	96.00	35.87
Luucauouau	Bachelor Degree	124	59	162.61	141.19	57.49	20.51	24	274.00	192.42	76.67	28.75	41	334.29	242.73	96.68	35.85
TALAT	Other	14	9	165.56	154.44	6222	19.22	1	278.00	222.00	92.00	39.00	4	326.00	237.00	94.00	35.75

Figure 18: Demographics of Educational Level

Table 38: Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
The overall theme remains consistent:	The EI and dependent variables scoring
Higher EI Scores equal higher scores for	performances and educational data
all dependent variables, IM, OM, & AS.	represents a tremendously skilled culture,
There is a similar distribution for Low	stability, and mentoring talent for the
through Normal and High EI Scores with	selected research Bank.
virtually a 50/50 percent distribution of	The result supports the merits in a
Low versus the combined total for	practical sense of using the EI score
Normal and High scores.	(which is administered to all entry level
Females have a significantly higher	applicants along with the IQ scores) to
number of Master's Degree and above,	retain the highest scoring "Other"
118 versus 74 for Males but a much lower	applicants as a high future developmental
number of Bachelor Degrees, 86 to the	potential. A well-crafted career
Male 124. Overall the combined total	enhancing program and carefully
degrees, 204 Female and 198 Male reflect	measured overall performance, combined
the Research Result of an overwhelming	with tuition benefits toward guided
highly educated work force, 402 degreed	degree status, can create an in house
versus 19 "Other"; Female 5, Male 14.	"InternTailored" augmentation /
This highly educated workforce also	replenishment team.
dominates all Age Groups from 18 to	
over 51 years. Although the cluster for	EU
Female Master's Degree tends to have the	
highest EI scores and most of the	
dependent variable scores. The surprise is	
in the "Other" category. Their scores are	
very competitive with the second highest	
scores in the EI independent and also the	
dependent variables for IM, OM, and AS.	

170

Degree	#/%	Low EI	Normal EI	High EI
Masters	192 = 45.60%	178.62	280.69	329.50
Bachelor	210 = 49.88%	159.68	272.38	332.19
Other	19 = 4.52%	156.33	278.00	326.00

Table 38 (Continued): Summaries of Research Findings and Practical Discussions



				ow El (Scores !	52-241)		Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
1	101	Total	No. of	EI	MI	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From	441 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Responde nts	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Ave rage Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		421	216	168.53	141.71	56.80	20.98	68	276.09	195.94	79.88	29.91	137	330.82	241.49	96.47	35.73
1 IV	11 Years or Above	237	109	163.63	140.26	56.81	20.45	42	276.38	192.00	78.57	29.57	86	331.23	241.33	96.70	35.66
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	134	76	175.87	143.63	57.89	21.76	21	274.38	198.38	80.76	30.38	37	329.46	241.57	95.78	35.84
UIgailizatiuli	Under 2 years	50	31	167.74	142.13	54.06	20.94	5	280.80	218.80	87.20	30.80	14	331.86	242.29	96.86	35.86
Female				ow El (Scores !	52-241)		Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	_
	/[No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	MI	MO	AS
From	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Responde nts	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Ave rage R Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	209	109	169.65	140.24	56.11	21.19	31	275.35	195.29	80.65	29.55	69	328.81	240.38	96.64	35.61
V. 14	11 Years or Above	82	39	156.05	133.44	53.03	20.31	13	276.15	195.69	79.69	30.08	30	325.60	244.07	98.00	35.57
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	93	49	183.39	144.41	60.24	21.98	15	274.40	191.73	81.07	29.73	50	329.38	238.28	95.45	35.69
01galilzati01	Under 2 years	34	21	162.86	143.14	52.19	21.00	3	276.67	211.33	82.67	26.33	10	336.80	235.40	96.00	35.50
	9																
Male	9		_	ow El (Scores ¹	52-241)	/	Norn	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	(
		No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	MI	MO	AS
From	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average R Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Male	212	107	167.38	143.21	57.50	20.77	37	276.70	196.49	79.24	30.22	68	332.85	242.62	96.29	35.85
Voom mith the	11 Years or Above	155	70	167.86	144.06	58.91	20.53	29	276.48	190.34	78.07	29.34	56	334.25	239.86	96.00	35.71
organization	2 - 10 Years	41	27	162.22	142.22	53.63	21.37	6	274.33	215.00	80.00	32.00	8	329.75	253.50	97.00	36.38
UISAIILAUUUI	Under 2 years	16	10	178.00	140.00	58.00	20.80	2	287.00	230.00	94.00	37.50	4	319.50	259.50	99.00	36.75
																	72

Figure 19: Demographic of Years with the Organization

Before delving into the specifics of Figure 19 it was interesting to extend the theme of identifying and "harvesting" the potential of 4.52% of the workforce without a Degree in the context of that portion of the workforce that might also have "Under 2 years" with the Organization (Figure 19). It seems logical that developmental activities for new applicants might show progress or failure in these early tenure periods.

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
The "under 2 years" group has the second	According to the score of employees
highest scores in the Low EI area and are	"under 2 years" group, tenure seems not
above the EI normal and high scores.	to be a barrier to share their knowledge.
Further it scores above the total average	The interesting information is the
on all dependent variables of IM, OM and	employees who got to be with company
AS except for OM and AS in the EI low	for a long time (11 years and above) has
totals. Logically there is a potential	the lower scores in knowledge sharing. It
practical result in leveraging the higher	could be interpreted that people with long
EI/IQ scorers as future valuable	tenure afraid to lose their status if they
employees. While the "11 years and	share knowledge. The bank should create
above" group got, the lowest dependent	program(s) to encourage them to share
variables scores	their knowledge and make it possible for
Female – The clusters for 11 years and	the new comer to learn from the long
above and 2-10 years are almost equal (82	tenure employees before they're gone.
and 93 respectively) The research theme	
remains strong and intact: Higher EI	
scores consistently result in higher	
dependent variables scores (IM, OM, and	
AS) consistently. The 109 Low EI scores	

Table 39: Summaries of Research and Practical Findings

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
are slightly higher than the 100 combined	
EI Normal and High Scores and the	
various IM, OM and AS scores trade back	
and forth between the two clusters	
Male – The largest single cluster between	
the Genders for years with the	
Organization is represented by the 155-	
person Male population of 11 years or	
above with the Organization. There is	UNIT
very little difference in scores or	
aggregations i.e. EI Low 107 scores	
versus EI Normal and High combined of	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
105 scores. Consequently, another strong	0
trend continues where there is an equal	
distribution of Low EI scores for the	\sim
combined Normal and High EI Scores.	
CUND.	ED 1962

Table 39 (Continued): Summaries of Research and Practical Findings

				ow El (Scores !	52-241)		Norr	nal El (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
	11	Total	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	MI	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From '	4 L T otal Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Awrage Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average I Score	kespon de nts	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		421	216	168.53	141.71	56.80	20.98	89	276.09	195.94	79.88	29.91	137	330.82	241.49	96.47	35.73
Position in the	Leadership	83	34	178.06	143.88	60.59	22.35	19	274.63	191.16	76.63	29.05	30	330.73	245.20	95.20	35.57
organization	Staff	338	182	166.75	141.31	56.09	20.73	49	276.65	197.80	81.14	30.24	107	330.84	240.45	96.82	35.78
Female				.ow El (Scores :	52-241)		Norr	nal EI (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	
		No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From 4	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average 1 Score	kespondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	209	109	169.65	140.24	56.11	21.19	31	275.35	195.29	80.65	29.55	69	328.81	240.38	96.64	35.61
Position in the	Leadership	35	14	175.29	149.71	61.71	21.21	8	269.25	183.25	81.50	28.50	13	330.31	245.38	95.69	35.69
organization	Staff	174	95	168.82	138.84	55.28	21.19	23	277.48	199.48	80.35	29.91	56	328.46	239.21	96.86	35.59
								-									
Male		0		.ow El (Scores!	52-241)		Nor	nal EI (Scores	242-30	3)	Hig	h El (s	cores 3	04-364	-
		No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SV	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From 4	421 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average 1 Score	kespondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Male	212	107	167.38	143.21	57.50	20.77	37	276.70	196.49	79.24	30.22	68	332.85	242.62	96.29	35.85
Position in the	Leadership	48	20	180.00	139.80	59.80	23.15	11	278.55	196.91	73.09	29.45	17	331.06	245.06	94.82	35.47
organization	Staff	164	87	164.48	144.00	56.97	20.22	26	275.92	196.31	81.85	30.54	51	333.45	241.80	96.78	35.98

Figure 20: Demographics Position in the Organization

Figure 20 seeks trends and insights on the potential similarities and/or differences represented by the roles of those in Leadership versus Staff positions in Thai commercial Banks relevant to the Variables analyzed from this Research's models. Continuing the pattern of "cluster profiles" the distribution of the two categories of Position roles and related response results begin these analyses.

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
The first consistent trend is the 50/50	Both leadership and staff are scored in the
percent distribution where 216 Low EI	same fashion may indicate that the
scores recorded are against the 205	knowledge sharing culture may not be
combined Normal and High EI scores.	embedded into the bank. Focusing on
Delving into the separate Gender data	leadership should be more effective in
results shows relatively few differences,	creating an environment which supports
either between the Genders or between	and encourages the overall employees to
the Leadership and Staff. For both the	share their knowledge.
Female and Male results, the Low EI	•
Leadership cluster initially contributed	
better EI, IM, OM, and AS scores than	
the staff respondents, but that change in	FD
the EI Normal and High score phases	
where much greater parity between the	
Leadership and Staff results seemed to	
alternate in contributing higher scores.	

Table 40: Summaries of Research and Practical Results

Practical Discussions
Further review of the 52 Question TEIST
Instrument raises the difficulty of
attempting to "train, orient, convey" ways
to suggest people naturally increase their
Virtue, Competence and Happiness
scores. Consequently, it warrants
discussion with the Thai Department of
Mental Health to see if there is reason to
possibly use a revised version of the
TEIST Instrument in any training
program. An added consideration that
seems more reasonable is to incorporate a
training emphasis on the Dependent sub-
variables for IM, OM, and AS.
Interpersonal Trust, Organizational
Commitment, Self Efficacy and
Knowledge Sharing Tools/methods,
Management Support to AS,
Rewards/Recognitions and emphasis on
"culture" i.e. "The way an organization
values Espirit d'Corps" and Team
Emphasis provides a much broader AS
awareness.

Table 40 (Continued): Summaries of Research and Practical Results

This Table will end the presentation of the separate Demographics Categories excluding the "Location-Headquarters Vs Branch" That data set is contained in FIGURE 1 and will also be reflected in many of the remaining DISPLAYS where it can be adequately analyzed for any additional insights on the demographic Location. Organization Divisions:

Of the Bank's 15 Divisions, 10 have single digit responses from the lowest (1) up to two with (5) for a total of 25 of the 421 overall responses.

- The Remaining 5 Division had a Total of 396 responses:
 - 314 from the Retail Business Division (Figure 21)
 - 82 from the remaining 4 Divisions which contributed totals of double digit responses.

The Divisions are analyzed and presented in two separate Tables: one for the dominant Retail Business Division (314) and one for the combined 5 Divisions numbering 396 total responses.

Of the five (5) Divisions with double digit response, this division with 314 respondents has contributed 74.58% of the 421 Total Respondent Data Base. Yet that is consistent with its' 75% presence in the workforce. Consequently, virtually all of the Research/Practical Findings summarized above for 5 of the 6 Demographic criteria (Gender, Age, Education, Years with the Organization, Leadership versus Staff, and we can add the last criteria – office location) would be redundantly reiterated. However, there are several comparative findings deserving special emphasis in addition to the dominance (74.58% of the respondent data base results) noted. In sheer workforce (Leadership and Staff) numbers this Division contributes 15,000 of the average 20,000 workforces. Furthermore, all Branch Locations are populated by this Division. Some of the most significant findings which emerge are as in Table 41 following.

				Low EI (Scores 5	2-241)		Non	nal El (Scores	242-303	(Ξ	gh El (s	cores 3(4-364)	
		No. of	No. of	EI	MO	IM	AS	No. of	EI	MO	IM	AS	No. of	EI	MO	IM	AS
From	314 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Awrage Score	Average Score	despondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F Score	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		314	150	166.71	140.44	56.43	20.92	53	277.17	198.26	81.74	30.79	111	331.37	241.91	96.50	35.72
Gender	Female	153	76	163.37	132.97	53.74	20.70	23	275.48	198.17	81.91	30.35	54	329.81	240.33	96.44	35.59
	Male 18 - 30 Vears	101	4/ 77	1/0.14	146.11	50.67	C1.12	ο γ	2/6.4/	218.44	88 89	33.00	14	332.84 337.86	245.00	05.06	35.03
Age	31 - 50 Years	188	2) 86	167.05	140.86	58.09	21.23	31	275.23	192.90	80.13	30.71	71	330.23	241.38	96.62	35.69
	51 Years and Above	76	37	167.08	141.51	56.76	20.38	13	276.31	197.08	80.62	29.46	26	333.69	241.69	96.62	35.69
Educational	Master degree and above	149	83	123.30	100.24	40.10	14.86	19	284.42	213.89	90.53	33.95	47	329.83	240.72	96.51	35.83
Level	Bachelor Degree	150	57	231.68	197.86	79.79	29.84	33	272.97	188.55	76.36	28.73	99 •	332.67	242.87	96.53	35.62
	Other 11 Years or Above	CI 189	10 86	156.60	146.80	56.74	20.40	34	276.24	222.00	92.00 78 35	39.00	4	330.00 331.88	241.50	96.00 96.99	36.00
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	84	39	177.69	138.56	58.26	21.79	t 1	278.00	207.07	86.67	32.73	90 G	329.93	241.87	95.33	36.10
organization	Under 2 years	41	25	159.76	139.12	52.48	20.52	4	282.00	224.00	92.00	32.75	12	332.00	241.17	96.67	35.75
Position in the	Leadership	56	20	168.80	135.70	57.60	21.30	14	276.29	191.71	76.86	28.93	22	331.73	245.45	96.00	35.27
organization	Staff Head Quarter	258	130	166.38	141.17	56.25 62 57	20.86	39	277.49 274.53	200.62	83.49	31.46	89	331.28	241.03 236.16	96.63 95 57	35.83
Office Location	Branch	246	122	161.08	134.93	55.02	20.34	38	278.21	193.74	81.26	30.71	86	330.86	243.58	96.79	35.72
							1										
Female				Low El (Scores 5	2-241)	-	Non	nal El (Scores 2	242-303	_	Ξ	gh El (s	cores 3(4-364)	
			97 - 10	EI	MO	IM	AS	, ,	EI	OM	IM	AS	۲ پ	EI	OM	IM	AS
From	314 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Awrage Score	Ave rage Score	kspondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	153	76	163.37	132.97	53.74	20.70	23	275.48	198.17	81.91	30.35	54	329.81	240.33	96.44	35.59
4 20	18 - 30 Years	8 D	19	157.47	132.53	49.68	20.47	15.	283.00	210.00	86.67	30.83	10 26	338.20	239.20	94.40	35.60
280	51 Years and Above	21	04 11	146.55	122.36	50.55	19.18	2	259.00	177.00	60.00	22.00	r ~	328.00	247.50	96.00	35.38
	Master degree and above	61	38	176.53	142.16	57.47	21.26	11	281.09	211.64	89.09	33.27	30	328.40	237.80	96.67	35.90
Level	Bachelor Degree	70	35	152.06	123.89	50.40	20.11	12	270.33	185.83	75.33	27.67	23	331.65	243.39	96.17	35.26
	Other At-	63	30	128.67	122.67	45.33 50.90	20.33	2	00 120	102.00	02 11	01.00	- 5	330.00	246.00	96.00	34.00
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	61	27	178.96	130.96	58.52	21.52	11	276.55	196.55	84.36	31.91	3 23	330.78	238.00	94.96	35.91
organization	Under 2 years	29	19	156.53	138.00	51.58	20.21	2	277.00	218.00	90.00	28.00	8	338.25	232.00	95.50	35.25
Position in the	Leadership	20	7	165.71	126.29	58.86	19.00	5	271.20	196.80	84.00	29.40	8	332.25	244.00	97.00	35.00
organization	Staff Head Quarter	133	69	163.13	133.65	53.22	20.87	8 8	276.67 260.50	198.56	81.33	30.61	46	329.39	239.70	96.35	35.70
Office Location	Branch	113	60	155.90	127.37	51.33	19.97	15	278.67	205.47	82.67	30.87	38	328.37	243.05	96.95	35.66
Male		0		Low El (Scores 5	2-241)		Non	nal El (Scores 2	242-303		Ξ	gh El (s	cores 3(4-364)	
		No. of	No. of	EI	MO	W	AS	No. of	EI	MO	IM	AS	No. of	EI	MO	IM	AS
From	314 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Awrage Score	Average	kespondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average F	espondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Male	161	74	170.14	148.11	59.19	21.15	30	278.47	198.33	81.60	31.13	57	332.84	243.40	96.56	35.84
	18 - 30 Years	15	∞ :	183.25	149.75	53.00	21.13	33	289.33	235.33	93.33	37.33	4	319.50	259.50	99.00	36.75
Age	31 - 50 Years 51 Varue and About	16	40 26	163.85	146.80	60.30 50.38	21.33	11	275.75	189.75 200.73	77.50 84.36	30.19	35	332.63	243.77	96.11	35.74
	Master degree and above	3 4	19	185.58	153.58	60.21	22.37	* *	289.00	217.00	92.50	34.88	17	332.35	245.88	96.24	35.71
Educational	Bachelor Degree	106	48	164.25	144.63	58.00	20.77	21	274.48	190.10	76.95	29.33	37	333.30	242.54	96.76	35.84
Tevel	Other	II	7	168.57	157.14	64.57	20.43	1	278.00	222.00	92.00	39.00	3	330.00	240.00	96.00	36.67
Years with the	11 Years or Above	126	56	169.14	147.07	59.93	20.84	24	277.17 282.00	736.00	93.00	35.00	46	334.87 327-14	240.30	96.35 96.57	35.63
organization	Under 2 years	12	9	170.00	142.67	55.33	21.50	10	287.00	230.00	94.00	37.50	4	319.50	259.50	00.66	36.75
Position in the	Leadership	36	13	170.46	140.77	56.92	22.54	6	279.11	188.89	72.89	28.67	14	331.43	246.29	95.43	35.43
organization	Staff	125	61	170.07	149.67	59.67	20.85	21	278.19	202.38	85.33	32.19	43	333.30	242.47	96.93	35.98
Office Location	Head Quarter Branch	133	12 62	191.00 166.10	178.33 142.26	62.33 58.58	23.42 20.71	23	280.29 277.91	238.57 186.09	85.71 80.35	32.86	9 48	332.89 332.83	240.22 244.00	96.00 96.67	36.22 35.77

Figure 21: Retail Business Division and Gender

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
Use of the TEIST instrument has	Applying the Lessons Learned from this
demonstrated high correlation with higher	Research and using the TEIST can be a
EI scores leading to higher IM, OM, and	positive tool in more efficiently staffing
AS scores.	and managing the AEC expansion as
	Commercial Banks expand their branches
	into the 10 Countries of the Asian
	Economic Community (AEC).
150 (70.78%) of the total 216 Low EI	This Division alone has 15,000 of the
scores are in this Division. But 111 of	total workforce. This better defines
137 also have High EI scores and 53 of	where to initially focus a major
68 delivered normal EI scores. So,	collaborative effort on better AS
combined Normal plus High scores at	sensitivities. But it needs to also
164 represent 80% of the combined	recognize that overall there are 7,835
Normal plus High Scores for the total	respondent equivalents that score at the
respondents.	combined Normal plus High EI levels.
OUND	ED 1962

Table 41: Summaries of Research and Practical Results - Retail Business Division

				Low El (9	Scores 5	241)		No	rmal El (Scores	242-303		E	gh El (s	cores 30	4-364)	
		No. of	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From	396 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		396	201	169.80	142.64	57.21	21.11	65	276.34	195.48	80.31	80.31	130	331.05	241.63	96.46	35.68
	Female	199	103	168.72	139.94	55.69	21.29	31	266.39	188.19	77.29	77.29	65	329.29	240.80	96.62	35.52
Gender	Male	198	98	170.94	145.47	58.82	20.92	35	277.26	196.34	80.69	80.69	65	332.80	242.46	96.31	35.85
	18 - 30 Years	L9	40	179.75	147.15	55.60	21.93	12	283.17	214.00	85.00	85.00	15	332.53	242.67	96.27	35.73
Age	31 - 50 Years	237	114	169.46	141.56	58.04	21.30	37	274.59	194.00	80.54	80.54	86	330.42	240.98	96.33	35.67
	51 Years and Above	92	47	162.17	141.40	56.60	19.96	16	275.25	185.00	76.25	76.25	29	332.14	243.03	96.97	35.69
1	Master degree and above	171	68	183.89	150.16	59.69	22.03	\mathcal{I}	281.63	199.41	84.15	84.15	55	329.56	241.31	96.29	35.85
E duca uonal I oriol	Bachelor Degree	206	100	158.88	135.48	54.92	20.48	36	272.28	190.11	76.44	76.44	70	332.51	242.09	96.74	35.57
TCAEL	Other	19	12	156.33	146.50	58.00	19.50	2	278.00	239.00	98.00	98.00	5	326.80	238.80	94.40	35.40
V	11 Years or Above	227	106	162.72	140.17	56.75	20.47	40	276.35	191.40	78.40	78.40	81	331.19	241.09	96.79	35.58
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	120	64	182.53	146.97	59.50	22.25	20	275.20	197.80	82.40	82.40	36	329.94	241.94	95.56	35.86
UIGAIIIZAUUII	Under 2 years	49	31	167.74	142.13	54.06	20.94	5	280.80	218.80	87.20	87.20	13	333.23	244.15	96.92	35.85
Position in the	Leadership	91	32	175.06	142.19	60.63	22.16	17	275.41	188.35	76.71	76.71	Ω	330.30	244.81	95.41	35.44
organization	Staff	320	169	168.80	142.72	56.57	20.91	48	276.67	198.00	81.58	81.58	103	331.24	240.80	96.74	35.75
Office I confiden	Head Quarter	150	79	183.27	154.53	60.61	22.29	\mathfrak{I}	273.70	197.93	78.96	78.96	44	331.41	237.82	95.82	35.61
ULICE LOCATION	Branch	246	122	161.08	134.93	55.02	20.34	38	278.21	193.74	81.26	81.26	86	330.86	243.58	96.79	35.72
	Customer Service Fulfillment Division	23	/					4	286.50	255.00	98.00	98.00	19	329.16	240.00	96.21	35.47
	Enterprise Risk Management Division	15	11	196.18	169.82	70.55	23.09	4	268.50	142.00	57.00	57.00					
Division	Retail Business Division	314	150	166.71	140.44	56.43	20.92	53	277.17	198.26	81.74	81.74	111	331.37	241.91	96.50	35.72
	SME Business Division	21	18	201.44	160.67	63.11	24.61	3	264.67	142.00	66.67	66.67					
	Systems Division	23	Ω	151.82	129.27	51.09	18.55	1	258.00	184.00	68.00	68.00					

Figure 22: 5 Divisions 396 Respondents

These analyses use the same basic data base specifics, but focus on the results of scores for the EI and dependent IM, OM, and AS variables on the total results by the Division responders. Thus, the Customer Service Fulfillment Division has zero responses in Low EI 4 in Normal EI and 19 in High EI for its 25 total responders. On the other hand, the Systems Division has 22 responders in Low EI, 1 in Normal EI and zero in High EI for its 23 total responders.

The SME Division with 21 total responders has 18 in Low EI scores, 3 in Normal EI and zero in High EI.

The Enterprise Risk Management Division with 15 total responders has 11 in Low EI, 4 in Normal EI and zero in High EI

The Retail Business Division which was previously analyzed has the much more representative distribution of its 314 responders where the 150 Low EI responders represent 47.77% and the combined total of 164 responders between Normal and High represent 52.23%. This reflects a slightly stronger EI response than the full 421 responders Group because the Low EI is slightly below the combined Normal and High EI scores.

Summary Analysis Format below will allow help to focus the Research and Practical Findings in Table 42.

Division	Low EI	Normal EI	High EI	Total
Customer Service Fulfillment	0	4	19	23
Systems	22	1	0	23
SME Business	18	3	0	21

Division	Low EI	Normal EI	High EI	Total
Enterprise Risk	11	4	0	15
Retail Business	150	53	111	314
5 Division Subtotals	201	65	130	396

Overall the 396 responses result in the same virtual 50/50 division between Low EI and the combined Normal and High EI scores at 201/195.

Table 42: Summaries of Research and Practical Results – 5 Divisions 396

Respondents

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
Overall of these 5 Divisions the Higher	The three Divisions with zero High EI
the EI total scores the same trend of	scores need to have higher numbers of
higher IM, OM and AS scores.	responders to be sure they are
	representative.
Excluding the 314 responders from the	Additional analyses need to be conducted
Retail Business Division isolates the	for Customer Service and the 3 Divisions
Customer Service Fulfillment Division as	with overwhelming Low EI results to be
seemingly unique with zero Low EI	sure there is an adequate number of
scores.	responders for each actually fully staffed
	Division.
The 4 Divisions outside of Retail	Roles, responsibilities, special
Business must receive comparable fully	requirements or profile attributes need to
representative analyses for Age,	also be considered for the 4 non-Retail
Educational Level(s) and Years with the	Business Division beyond the numerical
Organization to properly assess their	analyses indicated from the Research
statistical performance on EI, IM, OM &	Findings.
AS.	

Table 42 (Continued): Summaries of Research and Practical Results - 5 Divisions 396

Respondents

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
The Customer Service Fulfillment	Overall only the Retail Business Division
Division stands out with double digit	contains significant Respondent totals to
respondents dominated by High EI scores	be statistically satisfactory for this
(19), plus (4) in Normal and zero (0) in	comparison. All other Divisions must be
Low. Several other Divisions have zero	surveyed with much larger respondent
Low EI scores, but only very few total	numbers to judge their true performance
respondents, and others (like the Systems	profiles.
Division) have almost all Low scoring	
respondents and zero in High EI scores.	



Female				Low EI (9	cores 52	2-241)		No	rmal El	(Scores	242-303	_	Ξ	gh El (s	cores 30	4-364)	
		No. of	No. of	EI	IN	MO	SA	No. of	EI	MI	MO	SA	No. of	EI	MI	MO	AS
From	396 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	tespondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Female	198	103	168.72	139.94	55.69	21.29	30	275.27	194.47	79.87	79.87	65	329.29	240.80	96.62	35.52
	18 - 30 Years	48	29	175.93	144.41	55.03	22.24	8	283.75	215.75	85.00	85.00	11	337.27	236.55	95.27	35.36
Age	31 - 50 Years	123	60	171.33	140.23	56.73	21.18	19	272.42	191.89	81.26	81.26	44	327.91	240.18	96.91	35.64
	51 Years and Above	27	14	142.57	129.43	52.57	19.79	3	270.67	154.00	57.33	57.33	10	326.60	248.20	96.80	35.20
	Master degree and above	110	59	181.32	149.63	59.32	21.93	16	279.88	197.75	82.50	82.50	35	328.69	240.34	96.46	35.86
Educational	Bachelor Degree	83	41	153.51	127.27	51.22	20.44	13	269.38	185.69	74.77	74.77	29	330.00	241.17	96.83	35.17
Tevel	Other	5	3	128.67	122.67	45.33	20.33	1	278.00	256.00	104.00	104.00	1	330.00	246.00	96.00	34.00
	11 Years or Above	76	36	152.72	132.61	52.56	20.36	12	276.00	193.67	77.67	77.67	28	325.36	244.07	98.29	35.36
Years with the	2 - 10 Years	68	46	183.91	144.22	59.74	22.15	15	274.40	191.73	81.07	81.07	28	330.00	238.64	95.14	35.71
organization	Under 2 years	33	21	162.86	143.14	52.19	21.00	3	276.67	211.33	82.67	82.67	6	339.33	237.33	96.00	35.44
Position in the	Leadership	32	13	172.62	148.62	61.85	20.92	L	268.00	178.00	78.29	78.29	12	330.33	246.00	96.33	35.42
organization	Staff	166	96	168.16	138.69	54.80	21.34	23	277.48	199.48	80.35	80.35	53	329.06	239.62	96.68	35.55
	Head Quarter	85	43	186.60	157.49	61.77	23.14	15	271.87	183.47	77.07	77.07	27	330.59	237.63	96.15	35.33
Office Location	Branch	113	09	155.90	127.37	51.33	19.97	15	278.67	205.47	82.67	82.67	38	328.37	243.05	96.95	35.66
	Customer Service Fulfillment Division	13						2	287.00	262.00	98.00	98.00	11	326.73	243.09	97.45	35.18
	Enterprise Risk Management Division	2	3	201.33	186.00	76.00	26.00	2	278.00	139.00	54.00	54.00					
Division	Retail Business Division	153	76	163.37	132.97	53.74	20.70	23	275.48	198.17	81.91	81.91	54	329.81	240.33	96.44	35.59
	SME Business Division	14	12	191.50	167.00	61.33	24.83	2	267.00	145.00	70.00	70.00					
	Systems Division	13	12	171.67	145.50	57.33	20.33	1	258.00	184.00	68.00	68.00					
Male	E			Low EI (S	cores 52	2-241)		N	mal El	(Scores	242-303		Ξ	gh El (s	cores 30	4-364)	
		No. of	No. of	EI	M	MO	AS	No. of	EI	IM	MO	SA	No. of	EI	IM	MO	AS
From	396 Total Responses	Respondents	Respondents	Ave rage Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	tespondents	Ave rage Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Respondents	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Gender	Male	198	98	170.94	145.47	58.82	20.92	35	277.26	196.34	80.69	80.69	65	332.80	242.46	96.31	35.85
	18 - 30 Years	19	11	189.82	154.36	57.09	21.09	4	282.00	210.50	85.00	85.00	4	319.50	259.50	99.00	36.75
Age	31 - 50 Years	114	54	167.37	143.04	59.48	21.43	18	276.89	196.22	79.78	79.78	42	333.05	241.81	95.71	35.71
	51 Years and Above	65	33	170.48	146.48	58.30	20.03	13	276.31	192.15	80.62	80.62	19	335.05	240.32	97.05	35.95
Educational	Master degree and above	-61	30	188.93	151.20	60.40	22.23	п	284.18	201.82	86.55	86.55	20	331.10	243.00	96.00	35.85
Level	Bachelor Degree	123	59	162.61	141.19	57.49	20.51	23	273.91	192.61	77.39	77.39	41	334.29	242.73	96.68	35.85
	Other	14	6	165.56	154.44	62.22	19.22	- :	278.00	222.00	92.00	92.00	4	326.00	237.00	94.00	35.75
Years with the	11 Years or Above	161	9	10/.80	144.00	16.80	20.05	87	00.0/2	190.45	/8./1	18.11	یں م	554.20	10.622	90.00	35.70
organization	2 - 10 fears	1C 71	81 S	1/9.00	110.00	28.89	00.00	n (00.112	210.00	80.40	80.40	×	02 010	02.222	00.76	30.38
Decition in the	Under 2 years	44	01	176.74	137 70	00.00	20.00	7 [00.102	00.002	75.60	75.60	4 1	330.77	743 87	00.67	CI.0C
organization	Staff	154	02	16054	1/7 32	58.58	00.02	35	775 00	106.61	00.01	CL 08	50	333 56	10.012	06.80	35 06
D	Head Ouarter	65	36	179.28	151.00	59.22	21.28	12	276.00	216.00	81.33	81.33	17	332.71	238.12	95.29	36.06
Office Location	Branch	133	62	166.10	142.26	58.58	20.71	23	277.91	186.09	80.35	80.35	48	332.83	244.00	96.67	35.77
	Customer Service Fulfillment Division	10						2	286.00	248.00	98.00	98.00	8	332.50	235.75	94.50	35.88
	Enterprise Risk Management Division	10	8	194.25	163.75	68.50	22.00	2	259.00	145.00	60.00	60.00					
Division	Retail Business Division	161	74	170.14	148.11	59.19	21.15	30	278.47	198.33	81.60	81.60	57	332.84	243.40	96.56	35.84
	SME Business Division	7	9	221.33	148.00	66.67	24.17	-	260.00	136.00	60.00	60.00					
_	Systems Division	10	10	128.00	109.80	43.60	16.40										

Figure 23: 5 Divisions 396 Respondents by Gender

Figure 23 has been included to be sure the Gender attributes for the 396 total respondents in these 5 Divisions are included. At a minimum, this Figure continues to support the major trend that higher EI scores result in higher IM, OM, and AS scores - which they do.

Figure 1 at the very beginning of the Findings Analysis at 5.2.2 quickly demonstrated that scores trending from EI Low through Normal and to High EI led to higher scores for all dependent variables IM, OM and AS. That supported both the core premise of this research and all of the five (5) Hypotheses. Further it consistently showed similar support with escalating EI scores for all 15 of the Demographic Criteria, from Gender through Office Location, and for the 15 responding divisions of the Bank studied in this research. The Retail Business Division with 75% (314) of the 421 total responses understandably reflected virtually identical scores with all of the total results for the EI Independent and IM, OM, and AS Dependent Variables.

At this point in the Findings Analyses the Research sought to also explore the effect of the sub-variables for each of the four (4) key variables in the research model. Figure 24 shows the format created as the intended model for all variables (IM, OM, and AS) and their respective sub-variables. Subsequently, Table 43 undertook the summaries of Research and Practical Findings similar to earlier tables, but specifically searching for which of the sub-variables or combination scored the greatest impact on EI, the Independent Variable.

Emc	otional Intelligence		Low E	I (Scores :	(2-241)		Ň	ormal]	EI (Score	s 242-303)		H	High E	I (scores)	304-364)	
3	fith Sub-Variables	No. of	EI	EIV	EIC	EIH	No. of	EI				No. of	EI	EIV	EIC	EIH
From	421 Total Responses	Responses	Average Score	Ave rage Score	Ave rage Score	Ave rage Score	Res pons es	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score	Responses	Ave rage Score	Average Score	Average Score	Average Score
Total		216	168.53	56.67	58.75	53.11	68	276.09	96	97	83	137	330.82	118.38	113.52	98.92
Condon	Female	109	169.65	56.48	59.45	53.72	31	275.35	94	66	83	69	328.81	117.91	113.74	97.16
Gender	Male	107	167.38	56.86	58.04	52.49	37	276.70	98	96	83	68	332.85	118.85	113.29	100.71
	18 - 30 Years	40	179.75	63.45	56.70	59.60	12	283.17	98	66	87	16	331.38	117.00	111.38	103.00
Age	31 - 50 Years	127	168.08	55.56	59.10	53.42	40	274.30	98	96	81	92	330.30	118.57	113.48	98.26
	51 Years and Above	49	160.53	54.00	59.51	47.02	16	275.25	16	100	84	29	332.14	118.55	114.83	98.76
1000 Januar 11	Master degree and above	103	178.62	59.77	63.09	55.77	29	280.69	101	79	83	09	329.50	118.50	113.40	97.60
Educational Lovel	Bachelor Degree	101	159.68	54.00	54.36	51.33	37	272.38	92	98	82	72	332.19	118.25	113.50	100.44
TeAeT	Other	12	156.33	52.50	58.50	45.33	2	278.00	108	90	80	5	326.80	118.80	115.20	92.80
V	11 Years or Above	109	163.63	54.17	57.80	51.67	42	276.38	96	98	83	86	331.23	118.26	113.44	99.53
rears with the	2 - 10 Years	76	175.87	60.16	61.82	53.89	21	274.38	97	96	82	37	329.46	119.19	113.84	96.43
UIBallization	Under 2 years	31	167.74	56.90	54.58	56.26	5	280.80	94	101	86	14	331.86	117.00	113.14	101.71
Position in the	Leadership	34	178.06	61.94	62.47	53.65	19	274.63	95	96	84	30	330.73	116.40	114.60	99.73
organization	Staff	182	166.75	55.68	58.05	53.01	49	276.65	79	98	82	107	330.84	118.93	113.21	98.69
Office I confirm	Head Quarter	94	178.19	61.47	60.89	55.83	30	273.40	95	95	83	51	330.75	118.24	114.00	98.51
	Branch	122	161.08	52.97	57.10	51.02	38	278.21	97	99	82	86	330.86	118.47	113.23	99.16
	Capital Markets Business Division	2	121.00	36.00	45.00	40.00										
	Compliance and Audit Division	4	217.50	67.50	90.00	60.00	1	276.00	90	90	96					
	Corporate and SMEProducts Division	2	127.00	18.00	45.00	64.00	1	258.00	72	90	96					
	Corporate Business Division	2	105.00	27.00	54.00	24.00										
	Corporate Secretariat Division	2	122.00	27.00	63.00	32.00										
	Corporate Strategy Management Division	1	242.00	54.00	108.00	80.00										
	Customer Service Fulfillment Division					<u>th.</u>	4	286.50	113	90	84	19	329.16	119.37	114.63	95.16
Division	Enterprise Risk Management Division	11	196.18	76.91	52.36	66.91	4	268.50	<i>LL</i>	108	84					
	Finance and Control Division											5	332.00	115.20	108.00	108.80
	Human Resource Division						-	278.00	108	90	80	1	312.00	126.00	90.00	96.00
	Investment Banking Business Division	2	105.00	36.00	45.00	24.00										
	Retail Business Division	150	166.71	56.28	57.84	52.59	53	277.17	98	98	81	111	331.37	118.22	113.84	99.32
	SME Business Division	18	201.44	73.00	68.00	60.44	3	264.67	28	90	91					
	Systems Division	22	151.82	46.64	56.45	48.73		258.00	54	108	96					
	World Business Division											1	314.00	126.00	108.00	80.00

Figure 24: EI and its Sub-Variables EI-Virtue, EI-Competence, EI-Happiness

Table 43: Summaries of Research and Practical Findings - EI Sub Variables Total

Responses

Research Findings	Practical Discussions
Gender scores are essentially the "same"	The younger Age cluster; and the one
(Females at 109 Males at 107).	with fewer years with the Organization
Age is numerically dominated by the 31-	both deliver significantly higher average
50-year cluster of 127 responses, but the	scores than older and longer incumbent
highest average score is documented by	groups. That seems counter intuitive and
the 18-30 year younger cluster of only 40	deserves a Leadership research review.
respondents.	The 18-30 year youngest Age cluster;
Education presents effectively the same	Master's degree and above; 2-10 years
number of Masters and Bachelors but the	the younger cluster with time in the
Masters cluster delivers significantly	organization; the Leadership and
higher scores.	Headquarters clusters all deliver
Years with the organization 76	significantly higher and comparable
respondents of the 2-10 year reflects a	average scores. These representative
higher average score for cluster versus	respondent entities form multiple human
the 11 years or above incumbency of 109	resources as examples for use during up
respondents (Low); 42 respondents	grading workshops, seminars and
(Normal); and 86 respondents (High).	orientation training sessions.
The Leadership Position and	EU
Headquarters Location clusters each	
deliver significantly higher average	
scores.	

Attempts to analyze the demographic criteria responses as reflected above for Gender, Age, Education, etc added little in consistent and significant differences between Low-Normal-High EI scores. Consequently, these Displays were modified to highlight differences only based on the highest scores for given sub-variables of each of the EI Independent and the three (3) Dependent variables.

For example, the overall trend in the EI sub variables consistently shows EIV and EIC with very similar scores and both always higher than EIH. However, Table 43 notes the negative mathematical effect on EIH scores because of the 16 versus 18 question sets in EIV and EIC. Even increasing the EIH scores by 1.125x does not change the lower score trend for EIH. But, in the EI High Scores Category EIV and EIC scores for all 15 demographic criteria show a distinct change where EIV is now higher than EIC for the sub-variables impact. There is little value in speculating on the findings significance for each of these 15 criteria except to note that the 137 respondents in EI High Scores is double the 68 respondents in the EI Normal scores category. Hence, the larger respondent population may be a more representative scoring profile and best determined by comparing trends based on the combination of higher scores and higher respondent populations for every demographic criteria, cluster, or division.

In fact, analyzing the data on the 15 Divisions supports a similar conclusion since the Retail Business Division with 314 total respondents across EI Low-Normal-High understandably far outweighs any of the returns from the other 14 Divisions.

While numerical results can be viewed as quantitative or deterministic this research delivers a baseline model that builds from the human traits of Emotional Intelligence, and is therefore susceptible to qualitative interpretations. There is little to no great history of prior similar efforts for the Thai Financial Sector overall or the "70 percent leverage" of the four (4) largest commercial banks within the Sector. With average workforces in the 20,000 plus range for each Bank there are a variety of

recommendations for Future Applications and Future Research which follow these numerical data findings. The Recommendations stress expanding to expand into the human qualitative aspects for growth in the financial environments both nationally (Thailand) and regionally (Asian Economic Community - AEC).

5.3 Recommendation for Further Application

From a pragmatic perspective, there are many implications for organizations initiating or striving to stimulate a strong attitude toward knowledge sharing of their employees.

Based on the Findings data charts in Chapter 4 several near-term applications surfaced as suggested actions directly for the Leadership group of the subject Bank selected for this research. Much of those applications focus on use of this research as the knowledge source for obtaining support to establish internal collaboration sessions on the need and benefits to employees (and the Bank) for a strong, positive and active knowledge sharing environment. But that "near term" phase must focus on the logistics planning for rolling out such an effort to a 20,000-person work force that is; widely dispersed, doing so effectively without disrupting productivity, accomplishing it in timely increments integrated with other change/employee growth programs already in the pipeline(s), and creating content(s) compatible with existing programs. Examples of the preparatory activities extended from this research follow:

1.) The bank's Leadership Group should become engaged to advocate the importance of emotional intelligence for employees, both on behalf of the Banks objectives and for the well-being of the employee.

2.) Organizations should consider the importance of emotional intelligence for employees. Emotional intelligence can be developed over time through the use of tools such as coaching, discussion workshops on the broad meanings of the 52 queries in TEIST, and seminars by the architects and creators of TEIST.

3.) The results of the study indicate that emotional intelligence of employee positively influence organizational commitment, interpersonal trust, selfefficacy and knowledge sharing motivation factor in organization which seek to stimulate attitude toward knowledge sharing. It also directly affects the employees' attitude toward knowledge sharing and valuing intrinsic and extrinsic influences in life.

4.) The Divisions of the Bank should develop an environment to support the attitude toward knowledge sharing of employees, prior to launching knowledge sharing initiatives and during knowledge sharing implementation.

5.) Sub-variables for Individual and Organization Motivation (IM and OM) that were not analyzed in depth but should be undertaken as follows. Dependent Variable Individual Motivation (IM) – and its sub-variables (Interpersonal Trust (IT), Organizational Commitment (OC), and Self-Efficacy (SE)) as well as the sub-sub variables (for IT: ability, benevolence, and integrity) and (for OC: affective, continuance and normative need to be included in revalidation extension.

6.) The Dependent Variable Organizational Motivation (OM) and its sub variables (Knowledge Sharing Tools (KST), Management Support and Commitment (KSM), Rewards and Incentive (KSR), and Organization Culture (KSC)) need to be included in a revalidation. 7.) The results of the study support that emotional intelligence of employees can positively influence individual motivation factor, organizational motivation factor, and attitude toward knowledge sharing. But a much larger and broader sampling should be accomplished to validate all aspects that influence success. Through Blog and/or webinar workshop activities this Bank with BU/IKI-SEA involvement as an Academic/Financial resource for cultural/workforce change going forward might influence other entities of the Thai Financial Sector. That influence can be internal to Thailand and the announced ASEAN Economic Community of 10 countries, where the Thai commercial banks are mounting an expansion of their Branch networks in the AEC.

5.4 Recommendation for Further Research

Application of systematic research analyses which if strongly supported can encourage wider spread use, and highly impact a significant Thai and the National Financial Asset sector of each country in the newly formed 10 nation ASEAN Economic Community (AEC). Future studies might undertake some of the following efforts:

1) First, the industry perspective, to generalize the findings, the future study should expand the sample to other commercial banks in Thailand or to other type of Thai Financial Institutions. It would also benefit credibility for this research to add the results to the body of knowledge for adaptation of EI influences to different industry sectors.

2) Second, to determine the effect of respondents' demographics, the future study should expand the connection of characteristics and emotional

intelligence and attitude towards knowledge sharing from a national culture bias both for Thai people who work in other countries and foreigners who work in Thailand.

3) Third, from an organization perspective, determine the types of organization and the findings to be sought for setting the research in Thai organizations, Western organizations, and mixed organizations.

4) The Retail Business Division most senior Leaders need to be engaged and advocates for the foreseeable future and the Bank's expansion of its Branch networks into the AEC countries. The subject Bank's Human Resource Division will also have to be involved with a supportive attitude and an expertise locator capacity.

5) "Thai banks set to broaden overseas presence as AEC implemented action nears" Sucheera, Pinijapakarn, The Nation, (Thailand's Independent Newspaper Dec. 24, 2015). This reference seemed to convey the notion that the Bangkok Bank was the only one already extended into several of the AEC countries; that it had the only banking license in Myanmar; that it was prepared to add a second bank in Laos; and, in general, seemed to be presented in a manner that had them projected as "the Thai country" Bank for AEC." However, online investigation disclosed a rather different status presented in Table 33 and validated the initiative to include this as a Future Research opportunity. At present, all of the four largest banks have branches in other AEC countries as well as Bank of Ayudhya, one of the smaller 10 commercial banks.

Table 44: Foreign Bank Branches of Thai Banks

	Bangkok	Kasikornbank	Krung	Siam	Bank of	Total
	Bank	Public	Thai	Commercial	Ayudhya	
	Public	Company	Bank	Bank Public	Public	
	Company	Ltd.	Public	Company	Company	
	Ltd.		Company	Ltd.	Ltd.	
			Ltd.			
Indonesia	3	1				4
Laos	1	1	1	1	2	6
Malaysia	5					5
Myanmar	1			1		4
Philippines	1					1
Singapore	3		1	1		5
Vietnam	2	2		9		13
Cambodia	A A	1	2	4		8
China	07	6	1			14
Hong Kong	2	1		1	1	5
Taiwan	3					3
Japan	2	1		$\langle \cdot \rangle$		3
United Kingdom	1	(INI-		57		1
United States	1	VD				3
India			1			1
Cayman Islands		1	1			2
Total	33	16	9	17	3	78

*Branch, Sub-Branch, Representative Office, and Locally Incorporated Institution are

al included.

6) April 20, 2015 Andy Molinksy wrote in the Harvard Business Review an article: "Emotional Intelligence Doesn't Translate across Borders", but there is a broad inventory of literature which would differ with that notion in the globally interconnected world of April 2016.

7) The Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test (TEIST) – The researcher with positive acceptance and implementations of the research findings, in the subject bank, and with support through IKI-SEA in collaboration with Bangkok University (BU) and appropriate BU schools and/or Departments should approach the Thai Department of Mental Health to seek funding to affiliate on a "TEIST-AEC" multicultural version of the EI instrument. The literature review has already noted multiple integrations of concepts and principles that bridge the TEIST with Western and other Global regions. Of cogent interest this research came across the EI article by Andrea Ovans: "What the Dali Lama Taught Daniel Goleman about Emotional Intelligence," (Harvard Business Review, 2015). Reportedly dating the relationship between the two gentlemen "…two decades before Daniel Goleman first wrote about emotional intelligence in the pages of HBR…."

8) To return to the headline in statement 5 above, EI cross cultural initiatives around AEC and Thai Commercial Banks strategic expansion initiatives and this current research is another future opportunity. IKI-SEA/BU and the Thai Department of Mental Health would seem to have the ingredients for a successful and significant contribution to the bodies of knowledge represented in expanding TEIST to encompass the cross-cultural boarders of a 10 country AEC region.

9) After emotional intelligence was introduced to the public in 1995, it became the focus of thousands of research studies. The studies pointed to emotional
intelligence as a crucial factor separating high performance employees apart from the rest. Emotional intelligence affects how employees manage their behavior, navigate social complexities and make decisions. This research is further evidence reinforcing the findings of previous research on how emotional intelligence is critical to organizations. In order to add more validation of the importance of emotional intelligence to organizations, future studies should focus on how emotional intelligence influences other initiatives that promote organization performance and measurable successes.

10) As noted earlier this research has sought to relate EI, a distinctly human discipline, to a Thai Commercial Bank where arguably the key asset for the Bank is its 20,000-employee base. When the research for this Dissertation started in 2012-2013 it was about EQ replacing IQ as a means to better project a person's ability to work harmoniously with others in order to achieve competitive and superior results. EQ was viewed as a stronger influence of human emotions to compensate for the rush toward automating everything during the 20th century technology era. In 25 short years the pace of change, which fueled the "disruptive nature" of information and technology, has sped past the EQ movement onto the need for the yet ill-defined search to profile human personality and predictive behaviors in a world of "XQ". As expressed by extended coverage in Time Magazine's June 22, 2015 publication, quote:

"There's a new vital qualification for works all across the economy. It isn't an IQ rating or even EQ. There is no name yet, ["...but in fact it has the label: XQ..."] The qualities are so murky that often not even the employers chasing it are able to

define it; they simply know that an algorithm has discovered a correlation between a candidate's answers (such as an expressed preference for classical music or an answer to "why do stars twinkle.."?) and responses given by some of their most successful workers. So, let's call it the X quotient – and ... thriving in the new economy means acing your XQ test, an exam that no one has prepared you for."

The average workforce is around 20,000 for each of the four largest Thai Commercial Banks, and the total population for the 22 Banks in this Sector is around 208,000, so employee turnover and effective new hiring would be a major activity. Given the customer satisfaction/relationship management interactions with a demanding/competitive customer population it seems reasonable to identify the "XQ" developments as an important field for future research. Even if it doesn't replace EQ "for 5 years" the article reports that 457 of the Fortune 500 Companies are using one of the many tests, and "people analytics" as "XQ" is also known seems to be taking hold in the hiring process.

IQ	EQ	XQ
1912 German psychologist	1990 Psychologists John	2015 In the new wave of
William Stern invented the	Mayer and Peter Salovy	employer assessments, no
concept of the	defined "emotional	official name has emerged
"intelligence quotient,"	intelligence" as a "set of	for the qualities employers
defined as the ratio of a	skills" they believed	are testing for. In fact,
person's mental age to his	contributed to a person's	they can often seem
physical age, times 100.	ability to judge and	mysterious a kind of X
(A 10-year old with a	regulate emotion in oneself	quotient, or XQ.
mental age of 10 would	and others, and to use	Generally speaking, it is
have an IQ of 100.) That	feelings to achieve in life.	the practice of testing for
formula has fallen out of	The concept took off in the	personality traits that will
favor, but intelligence	business world, as leaders	lead to success in a
testing is still used in some	looked for those skills in	particular role.
workplaces	employees.	

Figure 25: The Age of Optimized Hiring

Source: Gray, E. (2015). Questions to Answer in the Age of Optimized Hiring. *Time*, *185*(23), 40.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

1) Research

- The first and most obvious limitation is that the measurements rely on self-reporting instruments. The validity of the results depends on the respondents' honesty and awareness of their feelings, and to provide responses that they believe the researcher desires. Matthews et al. (2002) caution researchers regarding the limited capacity to accurately identify low emotional intelligence using self-reporting measures. This criticism is based on the assertion that if emotional intelligence is

really intelligence, then it needs to be tested as other aspects of intelligence are tested, using ability testing and not self-reporting.

- Second, although the questionnaire was issued in the Thai language many sections of the questionnaire used assessment originally developed in western context. When using the assessment in Thailand, the respondent would respond to the questionnaire from a Thai perspective, which may lead to unintentionally skewed results.

- Third, the research setting for the study was a single commercial bank of the 22 in Thailand. Respondents were limited to full time working employees in the bank. As such, the study may limit the extent to which respondent behaviors can be generalized to all employees in that bank and throughout the financial sector. To further increase the general applicability of this study, future research should replicate the study's findings in different contexts, i.e. compare respondents among different banks and/or industries.

- Fourth, this research examined the attitude toward knowledge sharing of the employees, but not the actual knowledge-sharing results. Based upon the literature review, the assumption was made that the more positive the employees' attitude toward knowledge sharing, the more likely they are to actually share their knowledge. To achieve a clearer and more in-depth understanding of the findings in this study, future research should incorporate the actual measurement of knowledge-sharing behavior results into all future studies.

- Fifth, conclusions drawn in this study are based on a single method; questionnaires and a single set of respondents. It leaves the possibility for the common method bias. Future research should use a variety of measurements and multiple methodologies to triangulate the research findings.

2) Practical Implications

- Size of the respondent data set constrained to one (1) of the four (4) largest Commercial Banks in Thailand. Each bank has approximately 20,000 employees and a large physically dispersed network of branches.

- It is difficult to obtain approval to survey multiple Banks because of the competitive and secretive nature of each Bank's financial processes/activities.

- Constraints of time and resources (single researcher) for this study.

- The statistical analyses substantiating the merits of the construct foundational for this study needs to be translated into business and organizational terms readily applied to meet transformational and change aspects of both the competitive and technical organizational demands of this 21st Century.

3) Social Implications

In addition to emotional intelligence, social intelligence is another type of intelligence which has been the focus of recent research relating to organization performance. This type of intelligence is similar to emotional intelligence (EI) in the perspective that it can be developed through training, mentoring, coaching and experience. Therefore, researchers recommend studying the influence of social intelligence in conjunction with EI on employees' attitudes toward knowledge sharing.

5.6 Originality/Value of the Study

1) "IQ" (Intelligence Quotient) as a profiling/defining "tool" has had widespread use in organizational development, HR workforce "profiling," team

formation processes and specialty human asset segregation throughout the 20th Century Industrialization era.

2) Emotional intelligence directs individual behavior and performance. In this case, it can help to accelerate positive attitude of employees toward knowledge sharing. The contribution of this study has multiple facets. It involves a Nation's financial sector and can be applied for regional impact in the AEC. It offers quantitative support to the determinants of attitude toward knowledge sharing of employees in the Financial Services industry. The research model added collective understanding of the factors, which influence attitude toward knowledge sharing. That understanding could be used by organizations in developing realistic environments that are conducive to higher levels of knowledge sharing and its related benefits.

3) "EQ" (Emotional Quotient) (EQ/EI) is quoted as a 1990's concept and often identified with Daniel Goleman's 1995 Emotional and Social Competence Inventory (ESCI) (Western Version) and for this study reinforced by the Thai late 1990's/early 2000 TEIST profiling instrument. Furthermore, despite the robust application of KM (Knowledge Management) collaborative and Knowledge sharing advocacies concurrently introduced since the mid to late 90's there is little research/literature history of EI applied in the general, Global field of the financial sectors of the 10 AEC countries.

4) Even more germane is the speculative impact via the social media Global connectivity movement with the Twitter, Facebook, multiple digital text and imagery era sites now dominating the Global Communication networks in just this last decade. Among other developments is the progression of IQ, EQ (EI), now being joined by the concept of an "XQ" (i.e. "people analytics") personality profiling. 5) The foundational constructs used and validated by this original work can extend into supporting the expansion of both the Thailand National Financial Sector and its influence/ successes into ASEAN's strategic future.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adeyemo, D. A. (2007). Emotional intelligence and the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employee in public parastatals in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*, 324-330.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211.
- Akhavan, Rahimi, & Mehralian. (2013). Developing a model for knowledge sharing in research centers. *VINE: The journal of information and knowledge management systems*, *43*(3), 357-393.
- Alam, S., Abdullah, Z., Ishak, N., &Zain, Z. (2009). Assessing Knowledge Sharing Behavior among Employees in SMEs: An Empirical Study. *International Business Research*, 2(2).
- Al-Ammary, J.H., Fung, C.C., & Goulding, P. (2005). Alignment of knowledge and IS/IT strategies: A case for the banking sector in the Gulf Cooperation Countries (GCC). In: International Conference on Knowledge Management (ICKM 2005), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Knowledge Management Systems: Issues, Challenges and Benefits. *Communications of AIS*, 1(2), 1-37.
- Alavi, M., Kayworth, T. R., & Leidner, E. L. (2006). An empirical examination of the influence of organizational culture on knowledge management practices. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 22(3), 191-224.
- Alawi, A. I., Al-Marzooqi, N. Y., & Mohammad, Y. F. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: critical success factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(2), 22-42.

Alderfer, C. (1972). Existence, Relatedness and Growth. New York: Free.

- Ali, H. M., & Ahmad, N. H. (2006). Knowledge management in Malaysian banks: A new Paradigm. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 7(3), 1-13.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1997). Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modelling in practice:
 A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103* (3), 411-423.
- Andrea, O. (2015). What the Dalai Lama Taught Daniel Goleman About Emotional Intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 2015, Retrived from https://hbr.org/2015/05/what-the-dalai-lama-taught-daniel-goleman-aboutemotional-intelligence
- Arbuckle, J. S. (2010). *IBM SPSS*® *Amos*™ *19 User's Guide*. Retrived from www.amosdevelopment.com/download/amos.pdf
- Aurum, A. Daneshgar, F. Ward, J. (2007). Investigating knowledge management practices in software development organizations-An Australian experience. *Information and Software Technology*, 50(6), 511-533.
- Ba, S., Stallaert, J., & Whinston, A. B. (2001). Research Commentary: Introducing a Third Dimension in Information Systems Design--The Case for Incentive alignment, *Information Systems Research*, 12(3), 225-239.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American

Psychologist, 37(2), 122-147.

- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman and Company.
- Banville, D., Desrosiers, P., & Genet-Volet, Y. (2000). Translating questionnaires and inventories using a cross cultural translation technique. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 19(3), 374-387.
- Bar-On, R. (1988). *The development of a concept of psychological well-being*.Doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, South Africa.
- Bar-On, R. (1997a). The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (1997b). The Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2002). Bar-On emotional quotient inventory: Short technical manual. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*, *18*, 13-25.
- Bar-On, R. (2010). Emotional intelligence: an integral part of positive psychology. South African Journal of Psychology, 40(1), 54-62

Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging knowledge sharing: the role of organizational reward systems. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*, 9, 64-76.

Bates, D.G., & Plog, F. (1990). Cultural Anthropology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, 2000, 133-141.
- Belanger, F., Lewis, T., Kasper, G. M., Smith, W. J., & Harrington, K. V. (2007). Are Computing Students Different? An Analysis of Coping Strategies and Emotional Intelligence. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 50(3), 188-196.
- Benbya H., Belbaly N.A. (2005). Mechanisms for knowledge management systems effectiveness: An exploratory analysis. *Knowledge Process Management*, 12(3): 203-216.
- Bloodgood, J. M., & Salisbury, W. D. (2001). Understanding the influence of organizational change: Strategies on information technology and KM strategies. *Decision Support Systems*, 31, 55-70.
- Bock, G. W., & Kim, Y. (2002). Breaking the Myths of Rewards: An Exploratory Study of Attitudes about Knowledge Sharing. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 15(2), 14-21.
- Boisot, M. (1987). *Information and Organizations: The Manager as Anthropologist*, London: Fontana Collins.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R.
 Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (eds.), Handbook of emotional intelligence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 343-362.

- Brannick , M. T., Wahi, M. M., Arce , M., & Johnson, H. A. (2009). Comparison of trait and ability measures of emotional intelligence in medical students. *Medical Education*, 43, 1062-1068.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis. London: Heineman.
- Butler, T., Heavin C., O'Donovan, F. (2007). A theoretical model and framework for understanding knowledge management system implementation. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, 19(4): 1-21.
- Byrne, B. M. (2000). Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- Cabrera, A., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). Determinants of individual engagement in knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2), 245-264.
- Cabrera, E. F., & Cabrera, A. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *16*, 720-735.
- Cameron, K.S., & Ettington D.R. (1988). The conceptual foundations of organizational culture. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 4, 356-396.
- Chan, D. W. (2004). Perceived emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among
 Chinese secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8), 1781-1795.

- Chang H., & Chuang S. (2011). Social capital and individual motivations on knowledge sharing: Participant involvement as a moderator. *Information & Management*, 48, 9-1.
- Chatzoglou, P. D., & Vraimaki, E. (2009). Knowledge-Sharing Behavior of Bank Employees in Greece. *Business Process Management Journal*, *15*(2), 245-266.
- Chauvel, D. & Rolland, N. (2000). "Knowledge Horizons: The Present and the Promise of Knowledge Management", Knowledge Transfer in Strategic Alliances, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Chen, C., & Huang, J. (2007). How organizational climate and structure affect knowledge management-the social interaction perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 27(2), 104-118.
- Chen Tsung-Yi, Chen Yuh-Min, Lin Chia-Jou, & Chen Pin-Yuan (2010). A fuzzy trust evaluation method for knowledge sharing in virtual enterprises. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 59, 853-864.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-68.
- Chennamaneni, A. (2006). *Determinants of Knowledge Sharing Behaviors: Developing and Testing an Integrated Model*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas.
- Cherniss, C., Boyatzis, R. E., & Elias, M. (2000). *Developing emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chiu, C. M., Hsu, M. H., & Wang, E. T. G. (2006). Understanding knowledge sharing in virtual communities: an integration of social capital and social cognitive theories. *Decision Support Systems*, 42(3), 1872-1888.

- Chong, S.C. (2005). Implementation of Knowledge Management among Malaysian ICT Companies: An Empirical Study of Success Factors and Organizational Performance. Malaysia: Multimedia University.
- Chow, W. S., & Chan, L. S. (2008). Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information & Management*, 45(7), 458-465.
- Chowdhury, S. (2005). The role of affect-based trust and cognition-based trust in complex knowledge sharing. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 310-326.
- Christensen H. P. (2007). Knowledge Sharing: moving away from the obsession with best practices. *Journal of Management*, *11*(1), 36-47.
- Christian, H., Lindgren, R., Nulden, U., & Pessi, K, (2002). The evolution of knowledge management systems needs to be managed. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*.
- Civi, E. (2000). Knowledge Management as a Competitive Asset: A Review. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 8(4), 166-174.
- Connelly, C. & Kelloway, E., (2003). Predictors of employees' perceptions of knowledge sharing cultures. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(5), 294-301.
- Constant, D., Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1996). The kindness of strangers: The usefulness of electronic weak ties for technical advice. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 119-135.
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organisations*. New York: Grosset/Putnum.

- Cross, R., & Baird, L. (2000). Technology is not enough: Improving performance by building organizational memory. *Sloan Management Review*, *41*(3), 69-78.
- Crotty, M. (1998). The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process, London: Sage.
- Davenport, T. H. & Harris, J. G. (2007). Competing on analytics: The new science of winning. *Harvard Business School Review Press*, Boston, MA.
- Davenport, T. H. (1997). Ten Principles of Knowledge Management and Four Case Studies. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 4(3), 187-208.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know. *Harvard Business School Press*, Boston: MA.
- David G. Wastell. (2001). Barriers to effective knowledge management: action research meets grounded theory. *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, 6, 21-35.
- Davies, M., Stankov., L. & Roberts R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: in search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 989-1015.
- Davis, J., Schoorman, D., Mayer, R., & Tan, H. H. (2000). The trusted general manger and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(5), 563-576.
- Decker, B., Landaeta, R., & Kotnour, T. (2009). Exploring the relationships between emotional intelligence and the use of knowledge transfer methods in the project environment. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 7(1), 15-36.

- Delong, D. W., & Fahey, L. (2000). Diagnosing Cultural Barriers to Knowledge Management. Academy of Management Executive, 14(4), 113-127.
- Department of Mental Health. (2000). The Development of Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test for Ages 12-60. Thailand: Department of Mental Health.
- Desouza KC (2003). Barriers to effective use of knowledge management systems in software engineering. *Communications of the ACM*, 46(1), 99-101.
- Doan Q. M., Rosenthal-Sabroux C., & Grundstein M. (2011). A Reference Model for Knowledge Retention within Small and Medium-sized Enterprises. *Knowledge* management and information sharing, 306-311.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 81-90.
- Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M. & Slaski, M. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence:
 Content, construct and criterion-related validity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(5), 405-420.
- Edvinsson, L. (1996). Developing a model for managing intellectual capital. *European Management Journal*, *14*(4), 356-364.
- Felipe de Sequeira Rocha. (2008). The importance of Organizational Commitment to Knowledge Management. *Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão*, 14(2), 211-232.
- Fiedler, M., & Welpe, I. (2010). How do organizations remember? The influence of organizational structure on organizational memory. *Organization Studies*, 31(4), 381-407.

Financial Institution Business Act B.E. 2551. (2008). Government Gazette, 125(4).

Fincham, R, & Rhodes, P. (2005). Organizational Behavior (4ed). UK: Oxford Press.

- Fjermestad, J., & Hiltz, R. S. (2000). Group support systems: A descriptive evaluation of case and field studies, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 17(3), 115–159.
- Fliedner, G. (2003). CPFR: an emerging supply chain tool. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, *103*(1), 14-21.
- Ford, D. P. (2003). Trust and knowledge management: The seeds of success.
 Handbook on Knowledge Management Holsapple CW (Ed.), *Springer-Verlag*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 553-576.
- Freudenthaler, H. H., & Neubauer, A. C. (2005). Emotional Intelligence: The convergent and discriminant validities of intra- and interpersonal emotional abilities. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 569-579.
- Fukuyama, F. (1996). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York: The Free.
- Fuller, S. (1988). Social epistemology, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Gallie, D., Felstead, A., & Green, F. (2001). Employer Policies and Organizational Commitment in Britain, *Journal of Management Studies*, *38*(8), 1081-1101.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books.

- Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A. H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185-214.
- Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee. (2002). "Primal Leadership," Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence. Harvard Business School.

- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (2001). An EI-based Theory of Performance. In C. Cherniss and D.Goleman, The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 27-45.
- Gottschalk, P. (2006). Research propositions for knowledge management systems supporting IT outsourcing relationships. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, *46*(3), 110-116.
- Grabner, I., & Speckbacher, G. (2009). How to control creative work: the role of intrinsic motivation and task programmability for control system design. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 1-38.
- Gray, E. (2015). Questions to Answer in the Age of Optimized Hiring. *Time*, 185(23), 40.
- Gupta, A. K. & Govindarajan, V. (2000). Knowledge Management's Social
 Dimension: Lessons from Nucor Steel. *Sloan Management Review*, 42(1), 7180.
- Gupta, B. (2008). Role of personality in knowledge sharing and knowledge acquisition behavior. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 34(1), 143-149.
- Gürol, A., Özercan, M. G., Yalçın H. (2010). A comparative analysis of pre service teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 3246-3251.

- Haggie, K. & Kingston, J. (2003). Choosing Your Knowledge Management Strategy, Journal of Knowledge Management Practice, 4.
- Hair J. F., Black W. C., Babin B. J., Anderson R. E. and Tatham R. L. (2006).*Multivariate Data Analysis 6th edition*. Pearson Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Hales, C. & Gough, O. (2003). Employee evaluations of company occupational pensions: HR implications. *Personnel Review*, 32(3), 319-340.
- Harder, M. (2008). How do rewards and management styles influence the motivation to share knowledge?. *SMG Working Paper*, 6.
- Hargadon, A. B. (1998). Firms as Knowledge Brokers: Lessons in Pursuing Continuous Innovation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 209-227.
- Harrison, J. & Daly, M. (2009) Leveraging health information technology to improve patient safety. *Public Administration and Management*, *14*(1), 218-237.
- Haung, Q., Davision, R. M., & Gu, J. (2008). Impact of Personal and Cultural Factors on Knowledge Sharing in China. *Asia Pacific Journal Management*, 25, 451-471.
- He, W., Fang, Y. & Wei, K. (2009). The role of trust in promoting organizational knowledge seeking using knowledge management systems: an empirical investigation. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(3), 526-537.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York.
- Hislop, D. (2002). Managing knowledge and the problem of commitment. The Third European Conference on Organisational Knowledge, Learning, and Capabilities, Astir Palace, Athens, 5-6.

- Hislop, D. (2003). Linking human resource management and knowledge management via commitment: A review and research agenda. *Employee Relations*, 25(2), 182-202.
- Ho, L. A., Kuo, K. T., Lin, C., & Lin, B. (2010). The mediate effect of trust on organizational online knowledge sharing: an empirical study. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*, 9(4), 625-644.
- Hofstede G., & Hofstede G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences; Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Holsapple, C. W., & Joshi, K. D. (2002). Knowledge management: A three-fold framework. *The Information Society*, 18(1), 47-64.
- Hoof, B. V. D., & Huysman, M. (2009). Managing Knowledge Sharing: Emergent and Engineering Approaches. *Information & Management*, 46 (1), 1-8.
- Hsu, I. (2006). Enhancing employees' tendencies to share knowledge-Case studies of nine companies in Taiwan. *International Journal of Information Management*, 26(4), 326-338.

- Hsu, M., Ju, T., Yen, C., & Chang, C. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectation, *Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65(2), 153-169.
- Hsu-Hsin, C., Tzu-Shian, H., & Ju-Sung C. (2011). The relationship between high commitment HRM and knowledge-sharing behavior and its mediators. *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(5/6), 604-622.
- Huang, Q., Davison, R. & Gu, J. (2008). Impact of personal and cultural factors on knowledge sharing in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 451-471.
- Huber, G. P. (1991). Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 88-115.
- Humphreys, J., Brunsen, B., & Davis, D. (2005). Emotional structure and commitment: Implications for health care management. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 19, 120-129.
- Huysman, M., & Wulf, V. (2006). IT to support knowledge sharing in communities, towards a social capital analysis. *Journal of Information Technology*, 21(1), 40-51.
- Intasuwan, P., Chuawanlee, W., Sucaromana, A., & Choochom, O. (2003).Instrumentation of emotional intelligence based on Buddhist principles for Thai university students. *Journal of Evaluation in Education*, 24(72), 1-14.
- Ipe, M. (2003). Knowledge sharing in organizations: A conceptual framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), 337-359.

- Jackson, S. E., Hitt, M. A., & DeNisi, A, S. (2003). Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Jackson, T. (1995). Cross-cultural management. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Jager, W., Straub, R. (1999). Knowledge resources use-results of an inquiry. *Personal* wirtschaft, 26(7), 20-23.
- Janz, B. D., & Prasarnphanich, P. (2003). Understanding the Antecedents of Effective Knowledge Management: The Importance of a Knowledge-Centered Culture. *Decision Sciences*, 34(2), 351-384.
- Jarrar, Y. F. (2002). Knowledge management: learning for organisational experience. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 17(6), 322-328.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Staples, D. S. (2000). The Use of Collaborative Electronic Media for information Sharing: An Exploratory Study of Determinants. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 9(2/3), 129-154.
- Johanson, G. a., & Brooks, G. P. (2009). Initial Scale Development: Sample Size for Pilot Studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(3), 394–400.
- Jonathan R. Z., & Gerald L. C. (2011). Emotion and perception: the role of affective information. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews, Cognitive Science*, 2(6), 676-685.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Hartel, C. E. J. (2002). Emotional intelligence as a moderator of emotional and behavioral relations to job insecurity. Academy of Management Review, 27, 361-372.
- Jordan, P. J., Ashkanasy, N. M., Härtel, C. E. J. and Hooper, G. S. (2002). Workgroup emotional intelligence: Scale development and relationship to team process

effectiveness and goal focus. *Human resource management review*, *12*(2), 195-214.

- Jordan, P., & Lawrence, S. A. (2009). Emotional intelligence in teams: Development and initial validation of the short version of the Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile (WEIP-S). *Journal of Management & Organization*, 15(4), 452-469.
- Jőreskog Karl G., & Dag Sőrbom (1983). *LISREL V: Analysis of Linear Structural Relationships by the Method of Maximum Likelihood*, Chicago: National Educational Resources.
- Kafetsios, K. (2004). Attachment and emotional intelligence abilities across the life course. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *37*, 129-145.
- Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., & Wei, K. K. (2005). Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: An empirical investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 113-143.
- Kankanhalli A, Tan B.C.Y. (2004). A review of metrics for knowledge management systems and knowledge management initiatives. *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii.*

Kanoksilp, J. (2009), Hiring in a time of crisis, The Nation.

- Kaur, I., Nicolas, S., & Thorsteinsson, E. B. (2006). Gambling Control Self-Efficacy as a Mediator of the Effects of Low Emotional Intelligence on Problem
 Gambling. *Journal of Gaming Studies*, 22, 405-411.
- Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2000). Knowledge work as organizational behavior. International Journal of Management Reviews, 2, 287-304.

Kilmann, R. H. 1989. Beyond the quick fix. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

- Kim, S. & Ju, B. (2008). An analysis of faculty perceptions: Attitudes toward knowledge sharing and collaboration in an academic institution. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(4), 282-290.
- King, R., & Marks, P. (2008). Motivating Knowledge Sharing Through a Knowledge Management System. *The International Journal of Management Service*, 36, 131-146.
- Ko, D. G., Kirsch, L. J., & King, W. R. (2005). Antecedents of knowledge transfer from consultants to clients in enterprise system implementations. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 59-85.
- Kohn, A. (1993). Why Incentive Plans Cannot Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 54-63.
- Kowal, J. & Fortier, M.S. (1999). Motivational determinants of flow: contributions from self-determination theory, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139(3), 355-68.
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A. and Buelens M. (2001). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kugel. J, & Schostek. C. (2004). *Knowledge Sharing: Rewards for knowledge sharing*. Retrieved from

http://www.gurteen.com/gurteen/gurteen.nsf/id/rewards-k-sharing.

Kulkarni, U.R., Ravindran, S., & Freeze, R. (2007). A knowledge management success model: Theoretical development and empirical validation. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 23(3), 309-347.

- Kumar, J.A. and Muniandy, B. (2012), The influence of demographic profiles on emotional intelligence?: A study on polytechnic lecturers in Malaysia, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 62–70.
- Lai JY (2009). How reward, computer self-efficacy, and perceived power security affect knowledge management systems success: *an empirical investigation in high-tech companies*. J. Am. Soc. Inform. Sci. Technol., 60(2): 332-347.
- Lapre, M. A., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2001). Creating and transferring knowledge for productivity improvement in factories. *Management Science*, 47(10), 1311-1325.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C., & Song, L. J. (2004). The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. *Journal* of Applied Psychology, 89, 483-496.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C., Huang, G., & Li, X. (2008). The effects of emotional intelligence on job performance and life satisfaction for the research and development scientists in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25, 51-69.
- Lee, C.K., & Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2002). Factors impacting knowledge sharing. Journal of Information & Knowledge Management, 1(1), 49-56.
- Lee, H. & Choi, B. (2003). Knowledge enablers, processes and organizational performance: An integrated view and empirical examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(1), 179-228.
- Lee, Y., Lee, J., & Lee, Z. (2006). Social influence on technology acceptance behavior: self-identity theory perspective. *The DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems*, 37(2/3), 60-75.

- Lee, J. -H., Kim, Y. -G., & Kim, M. -Y. (2006). Effects of managerial drivers and climate maturity on knowledge-management performance: *Empirical validation. Information Resources Management Journal*, 19(3), 48-60.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1998). Wellsprings of Knowledge-Building and sustaining the sources of innovation. Harvard Business School.
- Levin, D.Z., Cross, R., Abrams, L.C., & Lesser, E.L. (2004). Trust and knowledge sharing: a critical combination. in Lesser, E. and Prusak, L. (Eds), Creating Value with Knowledge. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 36-41.
- Lin, C. -P. (2007a). To share or not to share: *Modeling knowledge sharing using* exchange ideology as a moderator. Personnel Review, 36(3), 457-475.
- Lin, H. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science*, *33*, 135-149.
- Lin, H. (2007a). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of Information Science*, *33*(2), 135-149.
- Lin, H. (2007b). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: An empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315-332.
- Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A., Nezlek, J. B., Schutz, A., Sellin, I., & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1018-1034.
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 641-658.
- MacKenzie, Scott B.; Podsakoff, Philip M.; and Podsakoff, Nathan P. (2011). Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral

Research: Integrating New and Existing Techniques. *MIS Quarterly*, (35:2), 293-334.

- Maddocks, J. (2011). *A Decade of Emotional Intelligence*. JCA (Occupational Psychologists) Ltd., Cheltenham, UK.
- Maltz, E., Kohli, A. K., 2000. Reducing marketing's conflict with other functions: The differential effects of integrating mechanisms. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(4), 479-492.
- Marakas, G., Yi, Mun Y., & Kats, E. C. (1998). The Multilevel and Multifaceted Character of Computer Self-Efficacy: Toward Clarification of the Construct and an Integrative Framework for Research. *Information System Research*, 9(2), 126-163.
- Markus, M. L. (2001). Towards a Theory of Knowledge Reuse: Types of Knowledge Reuse Situations and Factors in Reuse Success. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 57-94.
- Mármol, F. G. & Pérez G. M. (2011). Trust and Reputation Models Comparison. *Internet Research*, *21*(2), 138-153.
- Maslow, A. H. (1968). Towards a Psychology of Being. Van Nostrand, New York.
- Masrek, M. N., Karim, N. S. A., & Hussein, R. (2008). The effect of organizational and individual characteristics on corporate intranet utilizations. *Information Management & Computer Security*, 16(2), 89-112.
- Mayer, J. D. & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence?. In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds). Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators, New York: Basic Books, 3-31.

- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R. & Salovey P. (2000). Selecting a Measure of Emotional Intelligence: The Case for Ability Scales. In R. Bar-On, and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco. 15, 320-342.
- Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M. T., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 54, 772-781.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) user's manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197-215.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20, 709-734.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24-59.
- McClelland, D.C. (1987), Human Motivation, Cambridge University.
- McDermott, R. & O'Dell, C. (2001). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 76-85.
- McKenna, E. (2000). *Business psychology and organizational behavior*. Hove: Psychology.
- McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L. & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23. 473-490.

- Meng-Hsiang Hsu, Teresa L. Ju, Chia-Hui Yen, & Chun-Ming Chang. (2007).
 Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Virtual Communities: The Relationship between Trust, Self-efficacy, and Outcome Expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65, 153-169.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA .
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20-52.
- Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Gellalty, I. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of current and time lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710-720.
- Moffett, S., McAdam, R., & Parkinson, S. (2003). An Empirical Analysis of
 Knowledge Management Applications. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
 7(3), 6-26.
- Moffett S, McAdam R, Parkinson S (2004). Technological utilization for knowledge management. *Knowledge Process Management*, 11(3): 175-184.
- Moore, D. S., & McCabe, G. P. (2003). *Introduction to the practice of statistics* (4th ed.). New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors, and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, 231-248.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic.
- Nadler, D. & Tushman, M. (1998). Strategic organization design: Concepts, tools & Processes. Scott, Foresman, Glenview, IL.
- Nahavandi, A. (2000). *The Art and Science of Leadership* (2nd ed). New Jesley: Prentice Hall.
- Nelson, A., Sabatier, R., & Nelson, W. (2006). Toward an understanding of global entrepreneurial knowledge management (EKM) practices: A preliminary investigation of EKM in France and the U.S. *Journal of Applied Management* and Entrepreneurship, 11(2), 70-89.

Newell, S. et al. (2002). Managing Knowledge work. Palgrave, Great Britain.

Newman, B. D., & Conrad, K. W. (2000). A Framework for Characterizing Knowledge Management Methods, Practices, and Technologies. Third International Conference on Practical Aspects of Knowledge Management (PAKM2000). Basel, Switzerland.

Nishimoto, K. & Matsuda, K. (2007). Informal communication support media for encouraging knowledge-sharing and creation in a community. *International Journal of Information Technology & Decision Making*. 6(3), 411-426.

- Nonaka, I. & Takuechi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company: How* Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation New York: Oxford University.
- Nunnaly, J. C. (1978), Psychometric theory (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). 'A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors'. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673.
- O'Dell, C., & Grayson, C. J. (1998). If only we knew what we know: Identification and transfer of internal best practices. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 154-174.
- Osterloh, M. & Frey, B. S. (2000). Motivation, knowledge transfer, and organizational forms. *Management Review*, 42(5), 71-80.
- Osterloh, M., & Frey, B. S. (2000). Motivation, Knowledge Transfer, and Organizational Forms. *Organization Science*. *11*(5), 538-550.
- Othman , A. K., Abdullah , H. S., & Ahmad, J. (2011). Emotional intelligence and career role effectiveness in service organizations: the moderating effect of emotional labor. *Business Management Quarterly Review*, 2(3), 126-137.
- Othman, A. K. & Abdullah, H. S. (2011). The Influence of Emotional Intelligence on Tacit Knowledge Sharing in Service Organizations. M. Al-Shammari (Ed.), *Knowledge Management in Emerging Economies: Social, Organizational and Cultural Implementation*, 171-185.
- Palmer, B. R., Manocha, R., Gignac, G., & Stough, C. (2003). Examining the factor structure of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory with an Australian general population sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1191-1210.

- Palmer, B., & Stough, C. (2001). Workplace SUEIT: Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test-Technical Manual. Organisational Psychology Research Unit, Swinburne University, Hawthorn.
- Pan, S. L. & Scarbrough, H. (1998). A Socio-Technical View of Knowledge-Sharing at Buckman Laboratories. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(1), 55-66.
- Park, H., Ribiere, V., & Schulte, W. (2004). Critical attributes of organizational culture that promote knowledge management implementation success. *Journal* of Knowledge Management, 8(3), 106-117.
- Pavlou, Paul A., & Mendel F. (2006). Understanding and predicting electronic commerce adoption: An extension of the theory of planned behavior. *MIS Quarterly*, 30, 115-143.
- Pemberton, J. D., Stonehouse, G. H., & Francis, M. S. (2002). Black and Decker-Towards a Knowledge-Centric Organization. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 9(3), 178-189.
- Perez, J. C., Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2005). *Measuring Trait Emotional Intelligence*. In R. Schulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), International Handbook of Emotional Intelligence Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, 123-143.
- Petrides, K. V. (2009). Psychometric properties of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue). In C. Stough, D. H. Saklofske & J. D. Parker (Eds.), Assessing emotional intelligence, Theory, research, and applications. Dordrecht, New York: Springer, 85-102.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *29*, 313-320.

- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal* of Personality, 15, 425-448.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioral validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 39-57.
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 277-293.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality space. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98, 273-289.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.
- Politis, J. D. (2003). The connection between trust and knowledge management: What are its implications for team performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(5), 55-66.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 5, 603-609.
- Prodromos, D. C. & Vrimaki, E. (2009). Knowledge sharing behavior of bank employees in Greece. *Business Process Management Journal*, *15*(2), 245-266.
- Raghu, T. S. & Vinze, A. (2007). A business process context for knowledge management. *Decision Support Systems*, 43(3), 1062-1079.
- Rasli, A., Madjid, A., & Asmi, A. (2004). Factors that influence implementation of knowledge management and information technology infrastructure to support

project performance in the construction industry. Universiti Tenaga Nasional, International Business Management Conference.

- Rastegar, M. & Memarpour, S. (2009). The relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers. *System*, *37*, 700-707.
- Renzl, B. (2008). Trust in management and knowledge sharing: the mediating effects of fear and knowledge documentation. *International Journal of Management Science*, 36(2), 206-220.
- Rhee, S. Y. (2005). How should emotions among group members influence group effectiveness? The role of broadening and building interactions. PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan.
- Rosenbach, W. E. & Taylor R. L. (1993). Contemporary Issues in Leadership. Boulder, Colo: West View Press.
- Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404.
- Ruppel, C. P., & Harrington, S. J. (2001). Sharing knowledge through intranets: A study of organizational culture and intranet implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 44(1), 37-52.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.

- Ryan, S.D. & Prybutok, V. R. (2001). Factors Affecting Knowledge Management Technologies: A Discriminative Approach. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*. 41(3), 31-37.
- Sabherwal, R. & Becerra-Fernandez, I. (2003). An empirical study of the effect of knowledge management processes at individual, group, and organizational levels. *Decision Sciences*, 34(3), 225-260. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sackmann, S. A., & Friesl, M. (2007). Exploring cultural impacts on knowledge sharing behavior in project teams: results from a simulation study. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(6), 142.
- Salleh, Y. & Goh, W.K. (2002). Managing Human Resources Toward Achieving Knowledge Management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(5), 457-468.
- Salovey, P. & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition* and personality, 9(3), 185-21.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goleman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). *Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale*. In J.W. Pennebaker (Ed.), Emotion,
 Disclosure and Health. American Psychological Association, Washington,
 D.C.
- Sarker, S., & Sahay, S. (2004). Implications of space and time for distributed work: an interpretive study of US-Norwegian systems development teams. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 13(1), 3-20.
- Scarbrough, H., & Carter, C. (2000). *Investigating Knowledge Management*. London: CIPD.

- Schermerhorn, J. R., Osborn, R., & Hunt, J. G. (2000). *Organizational behavior*. New York: Wiley.
- Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review*, *6*, 589-599.
- Schumacher, R. E., &. Lomax, R. G. (1996). A beginner's guide to SEM. Manwah, New Jersey, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 167-177.
- Schwarzer, R. (1993). Measurement of perceived self-efficacy. Psychometric scales for cross-cultural research. Berlin, Germany: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Sharme, M., Arya, B., & Singh, S. (2012). Moderating Effect of Gender Role
 Orientation on the Relationship between Organizational Commitment and
 Self-Efficacy. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 2(12).
- Sharrat M. & Usoro A. (2003). Understanding Knowledge-Sharing in Online Communities of Practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1(2), 4-5.
- Shaw, R. B. (1997). Trust in the Balance: Building Successful Organizations on Results, Integrity, and Concern. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers,
 R.W. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, *51*, 663-671.
- Shi, J., & Wang, L. (2007). Validation of emotional intelligence scale in Chinese university students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(2), 377-387.
Shyh, R. F., Shin, C. F., & Ming, C. C. (2006). The impact of internal marketing mechanism on KS motivation and KS behavior. Department of Business Administration, National Chung Hsing University, Taiwan.

Singh, S. (2009). Emotional Intelligence at Workplace. Business Manager, 24-25.

- Śmieja, M., Orzechowski. J., Stolarski. M. S. (2014). TIE: An Ability Test of Emotional Intelligence. *PLoS ONE*, 9(7).
- Smith, H. & McKeen, J. (2003). Developing and Aligning a KM Strategy. Queen's Center for Knowledge-Based Enterprises. Canada: Ontario.
- Snoj, B., Korda, A. P. and Mumel, D. (2004). The relationships among perceived quality, perceived risk and perceived product value. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 13(3), 156-167.
- So, J. C. F., & Bolloju N. (2005). Explaining the Intentions to Share and Reuse Knowledge in the Context of IT Service Operations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(6), 30-41.
- Song, L. J., Huang, G. H., Peng, K. Z., Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Chen, Z. J. (2010). The differential effects of general mental ability and emotional intelligence on academic performance and social interactions. *Intelligence*, 38, 137-143.
- Soo C., Devinney T., Midgley D., & Deering A. (2002). Knowledge management: philosophy, processes, and pitfalls. *California Management Review*, 44(4), 129-150.
- Sridharan, B., & Kinshuk. (2002). Knowledge Management and Reusability in Internet Based Learning. In Kinshuk, R. Lewis, K. Akahori, R. Kemp, T. Okamoto, L. Henderson & C. H. Lee (Eds.), Proceedings of the International

Conference on Computers in Education, Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Computer Society, 1398-1399.

- Srivastava, A., Bartol, K.M., & Locke, E.D. (2006). Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects of knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), 1239-1251.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Stys, Y., & Brown, S. L. (2004). A review of the emotional intelligence literature and implications for corrections. Research Branch. Correctional Service of Canada.
- Subramaniam AM, Soh PH (2009). Contributing knowledge to knowledge repositories: dual role of inducement and opportunity factors. *Information Resource Management Journal*, 22(1): 45-62.
- Sucaromana U. (2010). The Thai Emotional Intelligence Screening Test: Measurement and Validation with Pre-Service Teachers. 8-16.
- Sveiby, K. E. (2001). A Knowledge Based Theory of the Firm to Guide Strategy Formulation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(4).
- Teece, D. J. (2000). Strategies for managing knowledge assets: the role of firm structure and industrial context. *Long Range Planning*, *33*, 35-54.

Thompson, L. F., Meriac, J. P., & Cope, J. G. (2002). Motivating Online Performance: the influences of goal setting and Internet self-efficacy. *Social Science Computer Review*, 20, 149-160.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. Harper's Magazine, 140, 227-235.

- Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *34*, 275-285.
- Timothy J. S., & Michelle T. P. (2006). The Role of Self-Efficacy Validation of the Happiness in Happiness: Self-Efficacy Scale, *Asia-Pacific Biotech News*, 10(02), 94-101.
- Tippins, M. J. & Sohi, R. S. (2003). IT Competency and Firm Performance: is Organisational Learning a Missing Link?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(8), 745-761.
- Tiwana, A. & Bush, A.A. (2005). Continuance in expertise-sharing networks: A social perspective. *Engineering Management, IEEE Transactions*, 52(1), 85-101.
- Tohidinia, Z. & Mosakhani, M. (2010). Knowledge Sharing Behavior and its predictors. *Industrial Management and Data system*, *110*(4), 611-631.
- UNESCO. (2001). UNESCO Universal Declaration on cultural diversity. Paris: UNESCO.
- Vallerand, R. J. & Rousseau, F. L. (2001). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in sportand exercise: a review using the Hierarchical Model of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. In Handbook of Sport Psychology (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley, 389-416.
- Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.). Advances in experimental social psychology, San Diego, CA: Academic, 271-360.

- Vitari C, Moro J, Ravarini A, Bourdon I (2007). Improving KMS acceptance: The role of organizational and individuals' influence. *International Journal Knowledge Management*, 3(2): 68-90.
- Walsh, J. P. & Ungson G. R. (1991). Organizational memory. Academy of Management Review, 16(1), 57-91.
- Wang, S. & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 115-131.
- Wasko, M. M. & Faraj, S. (2005). Why Should I Share? Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 35-57.
- Wastell, D. G. (2001). Barriers to effective knowledge management: action research meets grounded theory. *Journal of systems and Information Technology*, 5(2), 21-35.
- Watson, S., & Hewett, K. (2006). A Multi-Theoretical Model of Knowledge Transfer in Organizations: Determinants of Knowledge Contribution and Knowledge Reuse. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(2), 141-173.
- Wei, C., The, P., & Asmawi, A. (2012). Knowledge Sharing Practices In Malaysian MSC Status Companies. *Journal of Knowledge Management Practice*, 1(13).
- Weinberg R, & Gould, D. (2003). Foundations of Sport and Exercise Psychology.Human Kinetics.
- Weisinger, H. (1998). *Emotional intelligence at work: The untapped edge for success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolff, S. B. (2005). *Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI): Technical Manual*. Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research and Innovation.

- Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 243-274.
- Yang, C., & Chen, L. C. (2007). Can organizational knowledge capabilities affect knowledge sharing behavior? *Journal of Information Science*, 33(1), 95-109.
- Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W. & Peng, T. K. (2009). Supervisory procedural justice effects: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 143-154.
- Yao, L. J., Kam, T. H. Y., & Chan, S. H. (2007). Knowledge sharing in Asian public administration sector: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 20(1), 51-69.
- Zand, D. (1997). *The leadership Triad: Knowledge, Trust, and Power*. Oxford University.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2004). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: A critical review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53, 371-399.







Figure 26: All 421 respondents' data set



Figure 27: All 421 respondents' data set, and a comparison with the 314 respondent Retail Business Division data set



Figure 28: A distribution by the physical number of employees in Retail in comparison to all others

240

					Α	В	С						
FEMALE	1	.8 - 30 Yea	rs	40. 20 %	3	1 - 50 Yea	rs	24 50 Viewe	51 Ye	ears and A	bove	F4 Manual and	Grand
Demographic	Low El	Norm El	High El	Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	31 - 50 Years Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	Above Total	Total Female
1) Master Degree and above	11	4	2	17	50	12	33	95	3	1	2	6	118
1.1) 11 Years or Above					14	6	9	29	2	1	2	5	34
1.1.1) Leadership					2	3	2	7	1		1	2	9
1.1.2) Staff					12	3	7	22	1	1	1	3	25
1.2) 2 - 10 Years	7	2	1	10	35	6	22	63	1			1	74
1.2.1) Leadership	1			1	6	3	3	12					13
1.2.2) Staff	6	2	1	9	29	3	19	51	1			1	61
1.3) Under 2 years	4	2	1	7	1		2	3					10
1.3.1) Leadership							1	1					1
1.3.2) Staff	4	2	1	7	1		1	2					9
2) Bachelor Degree	18	4	10	32	14	7	14	35	10	2	7	19	86
2.1) 11 Years or Above					10	3	11	24	10	2	7	19	43
2.1.1) Leadership							1	1	3		4	7	8
2.1.2) Staff					10	3	10	23	7	2	3	12	35
2.2) 2 - 10 Years	5	3	4	12	1	4	2	7					19
2.2.1) Leadership				K	1	2	1	4					4
2.2.2) Staff	5	3	4	12		2	1	3					15
2.3) Under 2 years	13	1	6	20	3		1	4					24
2.3.1) Leadership													0
2.3.2) Staff	13	1	6	20	3		1	4					24
3) Other	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	4	5
3.1) 11 Years or Above	\wedge					1		1	3		1	4	5
3.1.1) Leadership									Ś				0
3.1.2) Staff						1		1	3		1	4	5
Total	29	8	12	49	64	20	47	131	16	3	10	29	209

Figure 29: Data elements for the comparable female respondents

The Excel functionality facilitates in extracting the narrative interpretation of the Excel data cells as provided in text below to provide readers insights into the "findings" analyses employed.

 Column A: 50 Individuals – All are female, in the numerically dominate 31-50-year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; all scored Low EI; 14 have been with the bank 11 years or more, 35 are at 2-10 years and 1 is under 2 years; 8 are in Leadership (2+6), while the other 42 are in Staff positions (12+29+1).

- Column B: 12 Individuals All are female in the 31-50 year age group, and have Masters Degrees or above; 6 have been at the bank 11 or more years, 6 with 2-10 years at the bank. Six (6) have Leadership positions and 6 have Staff positions. All 12 scored Normal EI.
- 3) Column C: 33 Individuals All are female in the 31-50 year age group, and have Masters Degrees or above; 9 have been with the bank 11 or more years, 22 with the bank 2-10 years and 2 under 2 years. Six (6) have Leadership positions and 27 have Staff positions. All 33 scored High EI.

For the total of A, B, C, there are 95 Women, 31-50 years old with Masters Degrees or above. 75 are in Staff positions and 20 in Leadership. 50 of the 95 have Low EI, 12 have Normal EI and 33 have High EI.

In summary, Female EI tends to show slight improvement toward higher scores for the 31-50 (older) age group, versus 18-30 years for both Masters and Bachelors level respondent sub groups.

For all age groups (18-30) (31-50) (51 and above) Older and higher education tends to result in higher EI scores which is consistent with literature projections. (Goleman, 1998; Kafetsios, 2004; Kumar & Muniandy, 2006)

					Α	В	С						
MALE	1	8 - 30 Yea	ars	18 - 30 Vears	3	1 - 50 Yea	ars	31 - 50 Vears	51 Y	ears and A	bove	51 Vears and	Grand
Demographic	Low El	Norm El	High El	Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	Total	Low El	Norm El	High El	Above Total	Total Male
1) Master Degree and above	4	2	2	8	29	7	19	55	6	3	2	11	74
1.1) 11 Years or Above					9	3	14	26	5	3	2	10	36
1.1.1) Leadership					5	1	8	14	2	1		3	17
1.1.2) Staff					4	1	5	10	3	2	2	7	17
1.2) 2 - 10 Years	1	1		2	19	4	5	28	1			1	31
1.2.1) Leadership					7	3	3	11					11
1.2.2) Staff	1	1		2	12	2	3	17	1			1	20
1.3) Under 2 years	3	1	2	6	1			1					7
1.3.1) Leadership													0
1.3.2) Staff	3	1	2	6	1			1					7
2) Bachelor Degree	7	2	2	11	31	13	23	67	21	9	16	46	124
2.1) 11 Years or Above					28	13	20	61	19	9	16	44	105
2.1.1) Leadership					3	3	2	8	2	3	3	8	16
2.1.2) Staff					25	10	18	53	17	6	13	36	89
2.2) 2 - 10 Years	3	1		4	3		3	6					10
2.2.1) Leadership				1	1		1	2					2
2.2.2) Staff	3	1		4	2		2	4					8
2.3) Under 2 years	4	1	2	7					2			2	9
2.3.1) Leadership													0
2.3.2) Staff	4	1	2	7					2			2	9
3) Other	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	6	6	1	1	8	14
3.1) 11 Years or Above					3		3	6	6	1	1	8	14
3.1.1) Leadership													0
3.1.2) Staff					3		3	6	6	1	1	8	14
Total	11	4	4	19	63	20	45	128	33	13	19	65	212

Figure 30: Data elements for the comparable male respondents

- Column A: 29 Individuals All are male, in the numerically dominate 31-50 year age group and have Masters Degrees or above; all scored Low EI; 9 have been with the bank 11 years or more, 19 for 2-10 years and 1 under 2 years; 12 are in Leadership (5+7), while the other 17 are in Staff positions (12+29+1).
- Column B: 7 Individuals All are male in the 31-50 year age group, and have Masters Degrees or above; 3 have been at the bank 11 or more years and 4 with 2-10 years. 4 have Leadership positions and 3 have Staff positions. All 7 scored Normal EI.

3) Column C: 19 Individuals – All are male in the 31-50 year age group, and have Masters Degrees or above; 14 have been with the Bank 11 or more years and 5 with the bank 2-10 years. 11 have Leadership positions and 8 have Staff positions. All 19 scored High EI.

For the total of A, B, C, there are 55 Men, 31-50 years old with Masters

Degrees or above. 28 are in Staff positions and 27 in Leadership. 29 of the 55 have Low EI, 7 have Normal EI and 19 have High EI.

In summary, Male EI improvement move higher in the older age groups at the Masters level, but level off and show a slight decline toward lower scores in the over 51 years age group for Bachelor's degree sub group.

For all age groups (18-30) (31-50) (51 and above) Low EI tends to be the greatest in the youngest (18-30) age group but about the same for Bachelors and Masters at the two older age groups.

Gender	Total N in the	lumber group	Lov	v EI	Norm	al EI	Hig	h EI
Female	209	50%	109	52%	31	15%	69	33%
Male	212	50%	107	50%	37	17%	68	33%
Grand Total	421	100%	216	51%	68	16%	137	33%

Table 45: Demographic EI by Gender

Distribution of EI Score of all respondents and separated between Male and Female respondents both of them ranging from Low, High and Normal.

Age Group	Total N	lumber	Lov	v EI	Norm	nal EI	High	EI
	in the	group						
Female	209	100%	109	52%	31	15%	69	33%
18 - 30 Years	49	59%	29	59%	8	16%	12	25%
31 - 50 Years	131	49%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
51 Years and Above	29	55%	16	55%	3	10%	10	35%
Male	212	100%	107	51%	37	17%	68	32%
18 - 30 Years	19	58%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%
31 - 50 Years	128	49%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
51 Years and Above	65	51%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%
Grand Total	421	100%	216	51%	68	16%	137	33%
18 - 30 Years	68	16%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%
31 - 50 Years	259	62%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%
51 Years and Above	94	22%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%

Table 46: Demographic EI by Age

Table 47: Demographic EI by Gender within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents

Age Group 18 - 30 Years	Total Number in the group		Lov	w EI	Norm	al EI	High EI		
Female	49	72%	29	59%	8	16%	12	24%	
Male	19	28%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%	
Grand Total	68	100%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%	

Education	Total N in the	Number group	Lo	w EI	Norm	al EI	High	n EI
Female 18 - 30 Years	49	100%	29	59%	8	16%	12	24%
Master Degree and Above	17	35%	11	65%	4	24%	2	12%
Bachelor Degree	32	65%	18	56%	4	13%	10	31%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Male 18 - 30 Years	19	100%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%
Master Degree and Above	8	42%	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%
Bachelor Degree	11	58%	7	64%	2	18%	2	18%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Grand Total	68	100%	40	49%	12	15%	16	36%

Table 48: Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents

Table 49: Demographic EI by Years with Organization within the 18-30 Years

Respondents

Years with Organization	Total N in the	Number group	Lo	w EI	Norm	al EI	High	n EI
Female 18 - 30 Years	49	100%	29	59%	8	16%	12	24%
11 Years or Above	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2 - 10 Years	22	45%	12	55%	5	23%	5	23%
Under 2 years	27	55%	17	63%	3	11%	7	26%
Male 18 - 30 Years	19	100%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%
11 Years or Above	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2 - 10 Years	6	32%	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%
Under 2 years	13	68%	7	54%	2	15%	4	31%
Grand Total	68	100%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%

Position	Total N in the	Number group	Lo	w EI	Norm	al EI	High EI		
Female 18 - 30 Years	49	100%	29	59%	8	16%	12	24%	
Leadership	1	2%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	
Staff	48	98%	28	58%	8	17%	12	25%	
Male 18 - 30 Years	19	100%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%	
Leadership	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Staff	19	100%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%	
Grand Total	68	100%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%	

Table 50: Demographic EI by Position within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents

Table 51: Demographic EI by Office Location within the 18 - 30 Years Respondents

					· · · · ·			
Office Location	Total N in the	Number group	Lo	w EI	Norm	al EI	High EI	
Female 18 - 30 Years	49	100%	29	59%	8	16%	12	24%
Head Quarter	16	33%	11	69%	2	13%	3	19%
Male 18 - 30 Years	19	100%	11	58%	4	21%	4	21%
Branch	13	68%	7	54%	3	23%	3	23%
Head Quarter	6	32%	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%
Grand Total	68	100%	40	59%	12	18%	16	24%

Age Group 31 - 50 Years	Total I in the	Number e group	Lo	w EI	Norm	al EI	High	n EI
Female	131	51%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Male	128	49%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 52: Demographic EI by Gender within the 31-50 Years Respondents

Table 53: Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 31-50 Years Respondents

Education	Total in the	Number e group	Lo	w EI	Norn	nal EI	Hig	h EI
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Master Degree and Above	95	73%	50	53%	12	13%	33	35%
Bachelor Degree	35	27%	14	40%	7	20%	14	40%
Other		1%	0	0%	ľ	100%	0	0%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Master Degree and Above	55	43%	29	53%	7	13%	19	35%
Bachelor Degree	67	52%	31	46%	13	19%	23	34%
Other	6	5%	3	50%	0	0%	3	50%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 54: Demographic EI by Years with the Organization within 31-50 Years

Years with Organization	Total N in the	Number group	Lov	w EI	Norm	al EI	Higł	n EI
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
11 Years or Above	54	41%	24	44%	10	19%	20	37%
2 - 10 Years	70	53%	36	51%	10	14%	24	34%
Under 2 years	7	5%	4	57%	0	0%	3	43%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
11 Years or Above	93	73%	40	43%	16	17%	37	40%
2 - 10 Years	34	27%	22	65%	4	12%	8	24%
Under 2 years	1	1%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Respondents

Table 55: Demographic EI by Position within the 31-50 Years Respondents

Position	Total N in the	Number group	Low EI		Norm	al EI	High EI	
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Leadership	25	19%	9	36%	8	32%	8	32%
Staff	106	81%	55	52%	12	11%	39	37%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Leadership	37	29%	16	43%	7	19%	14	38%
Staff	91	71%	47	52%	13	14%	31	34%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Office Location	Total N in the	Number group	Low	v EI	Norn	nal EI	Hig	h EI
Female 31-50 Years	131	100%	64	49%	20	15%	47	36%
Branch	59	45%	31	53%	7	12%	21	36%
Head Quarter	72	55%	33	46%	13	18%	26	36%
Male 31-50 Years	128	100%	63	49%	20	16%	45	35%
Branch	71	55%	31	44%	12	17%	28	39%
Head Quarter	57	45%	32	56%	8	14%	17	30%
Grand Total	259	100%	127	49%	40	15%	92	36%

Table 56: Demographic EI by Location within the 31-50 Years Respondents

Table 57: Demographic EI by Gender within the 51 Years and Above Respondents

Age Group 51 Years and Above	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female	29	31%	16	55%	3	10%	10	34%
Male	65	69%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%
Grand Total	94	100%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%

Table 58: Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 51 Years and Above

Respondents

Education	Total I in the	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female 51 Years and Above	29	100%	16	55%	3	10%	10	34%	
Master Degree and Above	6	21%	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	
Bachelor Degree	19	66%	10	53%	2	11%	7	37%	
Other	4	14%	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	

(Continued)

Table 58 (Continued): Demographic EI by Education Levels within the 51 Years and

Education	Total N in the	Number group	Lov	v EI	Norn	nal EI	Hig	h EI
Male 51 Years and Above	65	100%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%
Master Degree and Above	11	17%	6	55%	3	27%	2	18%
Bachelor Degree	46	71%	21	46%	9	20%	16	35%
Other	8	12%	6	75%	1	13%	1	2%
Grand Total	94	100%	49	49%	16	15%	29	36%

above Respondents

Table 59: Demographic EI by Years with the Organization within the 51 Years and

Above Respondents

Years with Organization	Total N in the	Total Number in the group		Low EI		Normal EI		High EI	
Female 51 Years and Above	29	100%	16	55%	3	10%	10	34%	
11 Years or Above	28	97%	15	54%	3	11%	10	36%	
2 - 10 Years	1	3%	L L	100%	0	0%	0	0%	
Under 2 years	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
Male 51 Years and Above	65	100%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%	
11 Years or Above	62	95%	30	48%	13	21%	19	31%	
2 - 10 Years	1	2%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	
Under 2 years	2	3%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	
Grand Total	94	100%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%	

Position	Total I in the	Number e group	Lov	v EI	Norn	nal EI	Hig	h EI
Female 51 Years and Above	29	100%	16	55%	3	10%	10	34%
Leadership	9	31%	4	44%	0	0%	5	56%
Staff	20	69%	12	60%	3	15%	5	25%
Male 51 Years and Above	65	100%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%
Leadership	11	17%	4	36%	4	36%	3	27%
Staff	54	83%	29	54%	9	17%	16	30%
Grand Total	94	100%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%

Table 60: Demographic EI by Position within the Organization within the 51 Years

and Above Respondents

Table 61: Demographic EI by Office Location within the 51 Years and Above

Office Location	Total I in the	Number e group	Lov	v EI	Norn	nal EI	Hig	h EI
Female 51 Years and Above	29	100%	16	55%	3	10%	10	34%
Branch	21	72%	11	52%	2	10%	8	38%
Head Quarter	8	28%	5	63%	1	13%	2	25%
Male 51 Years and Above	65	100%	33	51%	13	20%	19	29%
Branch	49	75%	24	49%	8	16%	17	35%
Head Quarter	16	25%	9	56%	5	31%	2	13%
Grand Total	94	100%	49	52%	16	17%	29	31%

Respondents

BIODATA

Name-Surname	:	Chanthawan Sathitsemakul

:

Address : Bangkok, Thailand

E-mail : chanthawans@yahoo.com

Educational Background

Ph.D. in Knowledge Management and Innovation

Management at Bangkok University, Bangkok,

Thailand

Master in Early Childhood Education at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

MBA in International Management at Thunderbird, the

American Graduate School of International

Management.), Arizona, USA

Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics at Thammasat

University, Bangkok, Thailand

Bangkok University

License Agreement of Dissertation/Report of Senior Project

Day 7 Month December Year 2017

Mr./Mrs./Ms.Chanthawan Sathitsemakul_now living at <u>1199/2-4</u> Soi Ladprao 29 Street Ladprao Sub-district Chantharakasem District Chatuchak Province Bangkok Postal Code <u>10900</u> being a Bangkok University student, student ID <u>9-54-02-0001-2</u> Degree level Bachelor Master Doctorate Program Ph.D. KIM Department The Institute for Knowledge and Innovation (IKI-SEA) School Business Administration hereafter referred to as "the licensor"

Bangkok University 119 Rama 4 Road, Klong-Toey, Bangkok 10110 hereafter referred to as "the licensee"

Both parties have agreed on the following terms and conditions:

1. The licensor certifies that he/she is the author and possesses the exclusive rights of dissertation/thesis/report of senior project entitled <u>The Influence of Thai Emotional</u> <u>Intelligence on Employees' Knowledge Sharing Attitude in a Commercial Bank in Thailand</u> submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for <u>Chanthawan Sathitsemakul</u> (hereafter referred to as "dissertation/thesis/report of senior project").

2. The licensor grants to the licensee an indefinite and royalty free license of his/her dissertation/thesis/report of senior project to reproduce, adapt, distribute, rent out the original or copy of the manuscript.

3. In case of any dispute in the copyright of the dissertation/thesis/report of senior project between the licensor and others, or between the licensee and others, or any other inconveniences in regard to the copyright that prevent the licensee from reproducing, adapting or distributing the manuscript, the licensor agrees to indemnify the licensee against any damage incurred.

This agreement is prepared in duplicate identical wording for two copies. Both parties have read and fully understand its contents and agree to comply with the above terms and conditions. Each party shall retain one signed copy of the agreement.

