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**ABSTRACT**

The diversity of generation in organizations is a challenge for HRM, especially generation Y, who are going to become the majority of employees. This research aimed to study the influence of knowledge sharing on competency development and Thai generation Y employee engagement with a sample of 400 generation y, aged 22-39 (Born1981-1998) who were working in Bangkok Thailand.

The results of this research showed that the structural models were consistent with the empirical data and all criterial passed (χ2= 308.192, χ2/df=1.045, p = 0.287, df = 295, CFI = 0.998, IFI = 0.998, TLI = 0.998, RMSEA = 0.011, SRMR = 0.018). The knowledge sharing has a positive direct effect on competency development (β=0.417), the knowledge sharing had a direct positive effect on employees’ engagement (β=0.764), while the knowledge sharing had a negative indirect effect on employees’ engagement with competency development mediator (β=-0.408). Competency development has a negative direct effect on employees’ engagement (β = -0.978). All effects have a significant level at 0.001.

**INTRODUCTION**

Developing people in the organization up to date with technology changes is a challenge for HR. Technology has been developed with great influence on the basic thinking of the new generation. Although the development of people in the new generation relies on old experiences. Both of the fundamental potential of humanity and social relationships. There was a challenge in managing a diverse generation. In a labor force covers three generations: Baby boomers (1946-1960), Gen X (1961-1980), and Gen Y (1981-2000) (Tymon et al., 2005). In 2030 was predicted that 75% of the labor force in the world comes from Gen Y. (Naim and Lenka, 2016)

To achieve efficiency for employment with opportunities for learning and career path is a challenge for HR. (D’Amato and Herzfeldt, 2008) The historical study that is among the factors that supervisor’s support, awareness, performance management, internal justice, learning, and development are the most effective strategies for achieving positive employee outcomes (Hutchinson et al., 2009) It can be confirmed that the organization must focus on employee learning and development. The ways to support their development needs is to develop capacity and share ideas and information within the organization and thereby seek organizations that promote knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing has supported individual learning outcomes.

Knowledge sharing is where employees are willing to share valuable knowledge and behaviors that facilitate the exchange of relevant information among members of the organization. Which despite receiving considerable interest in academic. But there is still a lack of empirical literature on the influence of knowledge sharing on employee attitudes. More importantly, the researcher noted that sharing knowledge didn’t directly benefit to the organization. Additionally, the link between competency development and employee engagement should be empirically validated the relationship between knowledge sharing, competency development, and employee’s engagement (Zamir, 2019).

However, there has been no serious study in Generation Y that will become a driving force in the future labor market about the relationship between knowledge sharing competency development and employee engagement in the organization.

People who have been developed to be outstanding until they are known as talented people. According to Michaels, Handfield-Jones, Axelrod (2001), the talent of the organization is the capacity of an organization that unites people in their talents, skills, knowledge, abilities, experience, intelligence, the ability to make decisions, attitudes, personality, and internal drives. They analyze the importance of talent to the organization, according to a study by Rueff and Stringer (2006), that the value of talent can increase the market value of the organization by up to 8 percent. Classify the level of proficiency to generate profit for the organization at 3 levels, namely 1) High-level people Generate profits for the organization increased by 37%. 2) People at a moderate level. Generating profits for the Org is increased by 4% and 3) people who are less skilled or not good This not only contributes to profitability but also makes a negative 7.6%, which is why smart people have no long-term commitment to the organization. Since it is a minority of the organization, only 3-10% of the existing workforce (kulpheng, 2009; Phuwittayaphan, 2007) and the organization faced a problem competing for the war for talent from competitor’s business. Especially in large cities where the employees are concentrated.

Bangkok is the capital and main economic city of Thailand with the largest population of the country 50% of GDP comes from Bangkok, both public and private companies. (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board, 2019) It is therefore very appropriate for researchers to use as a source of information to study the influence of knowledge sharing on competency development and employee engagement in this study.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

To study the influence of knowledge sharing on the competency development and generation Y employee engagement in Bangkok Thailand.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The researcher has presented the current knowledge related to knowledge sharing competency development and employee engagement. The study of relevant research results as follows.

***The Basic Concepts of Knowledge sharing***

Organizations and businesses today need to be sharpened by differentiating and combining external and internal factors to find ways to manage and improve efficiency (Lerro et al., 2012). Knowledge sharing is one of the key tools. Because it helps spread knowledge, the transfer of knowledge in the organization allows the efficient and effective use of resources (Grant, 1996; Argote, McEvily, and Reagans, 2003; Henttonen et al., 2016) and contributes to the intellectual property. The organization transmitted from generation to generation Creating through interpersonal activities helps to achieve cooperation in problem-solving. Develop new ideas and put them into action (Wang and Noe, 2010). Knowledge sharing means that people share relevant information. Provide feedback and expertise to others and can make their knowledge clear It is a deeply ingrained knowledge of a person (Ho, Li-An and Tsung-Hsien Kuo, 2013), same as Davenport and Prusak (1998) and O’Dell and Grayson (1998). Knowledge sharing is a process of sharing knowledge. How to work excellence in transforming performance across departments or departments The goal of knowledge sharing is to create new, different, or better knowledge than existing knowledge. (Christensen, 2007). Knowledge consists of information resulting from an individual's interpretation, experience, and expertise. Where new knowledge arising from one person's knowledge is combined with the knowledge of another, therefore, effective knowledge sharing increases the learning curve for each person.

Knowledge sharing is an important organizational tool because it helps spread knowledge, transfer knowledge, increase performance from best practice methods, and learn from past experiences. Create and develop into new knowledge through interpersonal interaction the knowledge or intellectual property of the organization is passed on from generation to generation, resulting in the organization's sustainable development. In this regard, in implementing a knowledge sharing strategy must be culturally appropriate availability of technology that promotes trust and interpersonal interaction including incentives to achieve the goal of implementing knowledge-sharing strategies.

**KNOWLEDGE SHARING**

Hooff and Ridder (2004) discuss elements of the knowledge sharing process is a process by which each person shares his or her knowledge. Together to create new knowledge by converting personal knowledge into organizational knowledge, the knowledge sharing process consists of 2 main components:

1. Knowledge donation is the communication of knowledge of individuals to other people, including colleagues from within and different organizations.

2. Knowledge collecting is communication to acquire knowledge from other individuals, including colleagues, both inside and outside the organization. Consult together to share knowledge and create new knowledge together.

Tabrizi and Morgan (2014) discuss elements of the knowledge sharing process, including:

Step 1 Initiation. It is the starting point for knowledge sharing. At this stage, demand analysis is surveyed by the recipient or by source. Then matching the right partner, that is who knows that knowledge. The alliance then decides whether to participate in the feasibility analysis.

Step 2 requirements. Select the appropriate knowledge sharing method and mechanism. Consistent knowledge management

Step 3 Implementation. The first of Knowledge Source Operation Procedure, it is necessary to establish the necessary knowledge and belief that knowledge, then the hirer to absorb that knowledge and apply it depending on his needs and combines the useful part of knowledge with his knowledge.

Step 4 follow up. To assess the relevant issues during the knowledge sharing process both knowledge sources and knowledge recipients.

Much of the research that has been studied on knowledge sharing has been focused on the possibilities of knowledge sharing such as corporate culture technological capabilities and the direct impact on economic indicators such as Individual performance enterprise efficiency, productivity, product improvement, innovation competitive advantage, and organizational effectiveness (Gupta et al., 2000; Levine and Prietula, 2012; Lin, 2007; Yang, 2007). It was also found that empirical literature is limited. And most of the studies are "explorations" Normal case which demonstrates a lack of depth in the contemporary understanding of knowledge sharing. There is also a lack of research to examine the influence of knowledge sharing on individual effectiveness (Trivellas et al., 2015), so this research will examine the influence of knowledge sharing on employee engagement through the mediator variable is the competency development.

**COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT**

Competence or Competency refers to the ability to do something very well, Competent refers to having the knowledge and expertise to do something according to the standard (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2003). The translation found to be used Often in Thai Competency, which this study uses the term competency means is the knowledge, skills, behavior, and characteristics of a person necessary to perform work in a certain position efficiently (Akharaborn, 2010)

There are many scholars abroad who have studied about competencies, for example, Boyatzis (1982), which implies that competence is an intrinsic attribute of a person, including motivation, trait, skill, self-image, Social Role, and knowledge that people use for causing efficiency in work to be successful.

Spencer and Spencer (1993) refer to competence as a deep attribute. It is the internal presence of a person who is reasonably related to a higher benchmark and or performance in the work or in a particular situation. The meaning of both Boyatzis (1982) Spencer and Spencer (1993) has a similar meaning because it is based on a widely accepted pioneering study by McClelland (1973) (Camuffo Gerli and Gubitta, 2012). Besides, Boyatzis (1982) states that in performing the highest performing tasks, believed to be caused by talent as a basis consistent with job requirements and the organizational environment (Boyatzis, 2008) means that employees have the necessary knowledge and abilities. In doing that task to be successful with attitudes and values Personal philosophy, interests, lifestyle consistent with corporate culture. Contributes to high performance.

In addition, Spencer and Spencer (1993) argue that competencies can be divided into 2 groups: 1) Threshold Abilities Competencies, which refers to the basic knowledge or skills a person needs to do their job. These fundamental abilities do not distinguish individuals from others. 2) Differentiating Outstanding Competencies, refer to factors that affect a person's performance. Work above or better than the general public Competencies in this group emphasizes the use of knowledge, skills, and other attributes (including values, motives, and attitudes) that will help achieve goals. The best success in this work (Spencer and Spencer, 1993: 15).

From the research results more than 30 years found that leaders, managers, operators who perform outstandingly different from others need to have both competencies there are; (Boyatzis, 2008) 1) Threshold Abilities Competencies consist of Expertise and Experience), Knowledge, and Basic Cognitive, Memory and Deductive Reasoning. 2) Differentiating Outstanding Competencies consist of Cognitive Competencies, Emotional Intelligence, and Social Intelligence.

Competency development refers to positive characterization or expansion at the level of personal competency (De Vos et.at., 2005). In this view, it’s the level of knowledge of the individual through acquired competence (Eilström and Kock, 2008). For organizations that focus on continuous employee development in order to gain a competitive advantage, personal competencies need to be developed. Professionalism and Social Responsibility The following three types of assessment of the ability to do work.

1. Personal competency, which includes the ability to learn, adapt to change, creative readiness, self-development readiness, readiness to deal with stress, and the ability to take initiative. And shows self-confidence these capabilities can be implemented in a variety of contexts and settings. It is suggested that professional skills are important for all employees, regardless of role or position. So, professional competence is critical to effective operations in the knowledge economy, which exposes employees to the challenges that arise.
2. Professional competency refers to the knowledge and skills necessary for employees to successfully perform their tasks. These are based on the mission and role of the employee and vary with the organization's objectives and functional roles (Kuijpers and Scheerens, 2006).
3. Social competency refers to the intellectual function or the overt behavior in which the individual engages while interacting with the other person (Schumaker and Hazel, 1984).

***Organization Commitment***

The organization committed to the members of the organization will not change for reasons of the absence of changing the workplace, dedication, and encouragement in the work for the success of the organization’s goal (Buchanan II. 1974). Include of Identifications, Involvement, and loyalty.

Steers (1977) believes that organizational commitment is a tough relationship. The tightness of the members of the organization and is a behavior in which members of the organization have values that are in harmony with other members, and encouragement to participate in organization activities.

Mowday et al. (1982) refer to the organization’s commitment as an expression of more than the usual loyalty because of the strong driven relationship to be willing to devote themselves to creating a better status of the organization.

Dunham et al. (1994) summarized in Meyer’s view that organizational commitment refers to a member’s relationship with the organization. It consists of 3 structures which are; 1) Affective Commitment, 2) Continuance Commitment, and 3) Normative Commitment.

From the above definition, in conclusion, the organization commitment refers to the attitudes or feelings of employees that are loyal to the organization, which loyalty to the organization. Accepting the organization’s goals, values, culture, they are happy to use the knowledge and abilities that they have fully and dedicated and willing to become on with the organization. Aside from attitude and feelings, it includes the behavioral expression of the employees, such as working regularly, dedication, determination and determination to work, protect and preserve the organization’s assets as if they were their own. Including participation in all organization activities and ready to persuade others to join the organization.

From the literature review, it was found that knowledge sharing in particular, specialized knowledge these doesn’t come from a single textbook can encourage employees to be able to perform more tasks. In line with Phang & Foong (2010); Pillay & Barnard (2019), knowledge sharing will create a strong relation with organizational commitment. But it contradicts Aggari, Diño & Orte (2020) they found that professional skill development had no direct influence on professional advancement among nurses. A study by Ilyasa, Madhakomala, & Ramly(2018) found that knowledge sharing has a positive direct influence on employee engagement within the organization. There are in line with Al-Jabri (2020) that found the influence of knowledge sharing on employee engagement. Therefore, leading to the determination of the research hypothesis and the conceptual framework as follow;

H1: Knowledge sharing has a positive direct effect on competency development.

H2: Competency development had a positive direct effect on the generation Y employee engagement.

H3: Knowledge sharing has a positive direct effect on the generation Y employee engagement.

Knowledge Sharing

Competency Development

Employee Engagement

H1

H2

H3

**Figure 1**: The Conceptual Framework of this study.

However, many organizations in Thailand still face a shortage of talent. Talent hijacking shows that the organization has problems managing talent. That’s no plan for talent management. And human resource management adheres to redundancy and the foster care system. proposes an approach to talent management in issues 1) support and develop talent 2) design activities suitable for talented people 3) organizations must have a good image 4) organizations must adjust human resource management policies to have flexibility 5) HR must have a system for recruiting and developing talent and 6) Organization must focus on factors affecting the retention of talent. Based on the understanding that different people have different motives, it should be focused and understood individually to respond accurately. The same with the Department of Industrial Promotion (2020) when the organization has outstanding talent. It has excellent performance. Then there must be a talent management that is the most effective. If the organization able to draw talented people to work with the organization and create value for the organization in the long run by the organization must have 1) good image 2) good job characteristics 3) appropriate compensation and lifestyle by controlling the direction of talent management with high flexibility. 4) To allow using his potential.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The population of this survey research was 5,270,376 of the generation Y employees who had worked in Bangkok Thailand. Data were collected using survey questionnaires. The sample comprises born between 1981 and 2000 total of 400 samples were received by using convenience sampling.

The data were analyzed with a structural equation modeling method. Both the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) models and the structural model were elaborated. The model was then estimated and assessed. Estimation was done according to the maximum likelihood method (ML). The evaluation of the data and model quality were conducted based on the following tests: normality assessment, average variance extracted (AVE), composite reliability (CR), root mean square error of approximation (RSMEA), minimum discrepancy [divided by its degrees of freedom (χ2/df)], the p-value of χ2. Comparative fit index (CFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Lewis Index (TLI), and Standard Root Mean Square Residual: SRMR). Before the empirical model was measured the quality of the sample and construct measurements were assessed. With the following criteria; χ2/df < 3, CFI IFI , TLI > 0.9, ค่า RMSEA , SRMR < 0.08 (Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2011). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy index was 0.937 on the p-value < 0.001 level and the total variance explained level was 90 percent, which is significant (Bartlett, 1950).

***The Validity of defined constructs***

The first validation of the terms of using SEM is to examine the distribution of an observable variable, which determines whether the variable has a normal distribution or not, is determined by skewness in +2 and kurtosis in +7 (Curran West and Finch, 1996). This study found that every question is in rage -0.855 - 0.369 of skewness and range -0.882-1.428 of kurtosis. So this data has a normal distribution.

Validation of the Common-Method Variance (CMV) which is the variance generated by the measurement method, CMV is the result of the observed score variance and the result of the measurement method (Suwatthipong and Lawthong, 2015). Then, Podsakoff MacKenzie Lee and Podsakoff (2003) proposed a statistical validated method called Harman Single Factor Technique. With % of variance not more than 50% of the result, % of variance = 37.659%, as in this research, there is not cause problems of Common-Method Variance (Eichhorn, 2014).

**RESEARCH RESULT**

First, the construct validity and reliability of the scale and overall fit of the hypothesized model are examined with the maximum likelihood method. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed for all contracts (knowledge sharing, competency development, employee engagement). The results of CFA indicate that model has acceptable fit indices (χ2= 332.519, χ2/df=1.108, p = 0.095 df = 300, CFI = 0.996 IFI = 0.996 TLI = 0.994 RMSEA = 0.016, and SRMR = 0.019. Therefore, the model indices indicate that the model possesses a good overall fit. (Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2011). And the standard of loading factor of the CFA was between 0.654-0.858 which p-value <0.001.

The authors examined the test of the Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The CR should be greater than 0.6 and AVE should be greater than 0.5 (Huang, Lu & Chen, 2019) as shown in the table;

**Table 1**: Pairwise Correlation, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pairwise Correlation of factors | Knowledge sharing | Competency development | Employee engagement |
| Knowledge sharing  Competency development  Employee engagement | 1.000  0.406\*\*  0.319\*\* | 1.000  0.441\*\* | 1.000 |
| CR  AVE | 0.922  0.598  0.773 | 0.944  0.532  0.729 | 0.891  0.621  0.788 |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01

From the table1, all of the pairwise correlations between constructs are less than the square root of the AVE (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). AVE of all latent variables are greater than 0.5 and CR of all latent variables are greater than 0.60.

The structural model indices indicate that overall fit (χ2= 308.192, χ2/df=1.045, p = 0.287 df = 295, CFI = 0.998, IFI = 0.998, TLI = 0.998 RMSEA = 0.011, and SRMR = 0.018). There are satisfies all criteria. Whether the data support the hypothesized relationships in the conceptualization model. All the relationships are found to agree with the proposed hypotheses. Next, we examined the significance of each hypothesized path in the research model. The results of the analysis were depicted in Figure 2.
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**Figure 2**: The structural equation model.

The hypothesis testing found knowledge sharing had a direct positive influence on competency development (β=0.417, p-value <0.001), accept H1. Knowledge sharing had a direct positive influence on the generation Y employee engagement (β=0.764, p-value <0.001), accept H3. On the other hand, competency development had a negative direct influence on the generation Y employee engagement (β=-0.978, p-value <0.001), Reject H2. The results of hypothesis testing were summarized in Table2.

**Table2**: The Hypothesis Testing

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hypothesis | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Total Effect | Accept Hypothesis |
| H1:KN-->CD | 0.417\*\*\* | 0.000 | 0.417\*\*\* | Support H1 |
| H2:CD-->EN | -0.978\*\*\* | 0.000 | -0.978\*\*\* | Reject H2 |
| H3:KN-->EN | 0.764\*\*\* | -0.408\*\*\* | 0.356\*\*\* | Support H3 |

Note: KN is Knowledge sharing, CD is competency development, EN is employee engagement

\*\*\*p-value < 0.001

**CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION**

The most surprising result, worth to discuss is the significant negative direct influence of competency development on the generation Y employee engagement. This result contradicts most of the literature. When generation Y employees had more knowledge and more competency, they were not loyal in the organization same as the result of Aggari, Diño & Orte (2020) found that competency development (professional skill) had no direct influence on professional advancement among nurses. So, if most of generation Y employees increase their knowledge and competency development, they will not have organization loyalty. Because generation Y employees may not receive appropriate support from the organization with their increased knowledge and competency development. This makes them strive to explore new organizations that can meet their job needs and capabilities. This is very disappointing for many organizations in Thailand. If these organizations do not have ways to manage the talent especially generation Y employees, they will loss valuable human resources that have directly affected to organization’s performance.

However, the result show point to knowledge sharing is related knowledge management. With the knowledge sharing environment, knowledge educating, and knowledge retention. So, knowledge sharing had a positive direct effect to competency development; If generation Y employees work in an organization that full of a good environment to support knowledge and skills from employee to employee, supervisor to subordinates, talent to colleagues with a systematic record of a new methods or new knowledge, it will be able to create talent or better employee performance. Same as the study of Pillay & Barnard (2019) studied knowledge sharing was transferred to employees by employers. Until employees can be used to create and develop their competencies. This result from we studied, found a positive direct influence of knowledge sharing on generation Y employee engagement with good environment in knowledge sharing among everyone in the organization. In addition, the result created a better solution to solve some problems under organization’s goal. The study result is the same of Ilyasa, Madhakomala, & Ramly (2018) found that knowledge sharing had a positive direct influence on employee engagement, the study was conducted 230 sample size who were employees in the health organization found that knowledge sharing has a positive direct influence on employee engagement and was created new ideas or innovations to increase value for the organization. Same as Al-Jabri (2020) found that employee engagement was received the effect of knowledge sharing when he studied the relationship between social factors, knowledge sharing and employee engagement in holding company 191 employees and he found that the knowledge sharing had an indirect effect to employee engagement.

From the research findings; the organizations should adopt talent management model in generation Y employee, with a focus on their performance (a result of work) in a tangible value with the following methods;

1) Leaders should support and develop talent in Generation Y.

2) The organization should analyze themselves to design their activities and environment suitable for talent in Generation Y.

3) The organization should create a good image like a dream organization to make employees feel proud when referring to their organization.

4) The organization should adjust the human resource management policy to be a flexible organization in all change based on resource competency and political neutrality.

5) HR should have a good system for recruiting and developing talent to increase the number of talent in the organization and rewarding talented people.

6) The organization should focus on the factors affecting the retention of talent based on the understanding that different people who have different motives. Therefore, it should be given importance and understood individually to respond appropriately.

7) Providing opportunities for generation Y employees to use their potential for organizational as possible.

**REFERENCE**

Aggari, M. I., Diño, M. J. S., & Orte, C. J. S. (2020). “Leaders shaping leadership: Knowledge, professional values and competency as prognosticators of career growth and development among nurses”. Enfermería Clínica, 30, 9–14. doi:10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.09.020

Akharaborn, J. (2007). Create Person to Create Performance. Bangkok: K. Pol-Pim.

Al-Jabri, I. M. (2020). “Investigating the Mediating Role of Knowledge Sharing on Employee Engagement”. International Journal of Human Capital and Information Technology Professionals, 11(1), 47–63. doi:10.4018/ijhcitp.2020010104

Argote, L., McEvily, B. and Reagans, R. (2003). “Managing knowledge in organizations: an integrative framework and review of emerging themes”. Management Science, Vol. 49, pp. 571- 82.

Bartlett, M.S. (1950), “Tests of significance in factor analysis”, British Journal of Statistical Psychology, Vol. 3, (Part II), pp. 77-85.

Boyatzis, R. E. (2008). “Competencies in the 21st Century”. The Journal of Management Development, 27, 5-12.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). “The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance”. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Buchanan, Bruce. (1974). “Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations”. Administrative Science Quarterly. 19. 10.2307/2391809.

Camuffo, Arnaldo & Gerli, Fabrizio & Gubitta, Paolo. (2012). “Competencies matter: Modeling effective entrepreneurship in northeast of Italy small firms”. Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal. 19. 48-66. 10.1108/13527601211195628.

Christensen, P. (2007). “Knowledge sharing: moving away from the obsession with best practices: Journal of Knowledge Management”., Vol. 11 No. 1 2007, pp. 36-47.

Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). “The robustness of test statistics to nonmorality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis”. Psychological Methods, 1(1), 16–29. doi:10.1037/1082-989x.1.1.16

Davenport, T.H. and Prusak, L. (1998). “Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know”. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

De Vos, A.S. (2005). “Scientific theory and professional research”. In De Vos A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché C.B. & Delport C.S.L. Research at the grass roots for the social sciences and human service professions. 3rd ed. Pretoria: JL Van Schaik Publishers.

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castañeda, M. B. (1994). “Organizational commitment”: The utility of an integrative definition. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79(3), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.3.370>

D'Amato, A. and Herzfeldt, R. (2008), "Learning orientation, organizational commitment and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 929-953. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904402>

Eichhorn, S. (2014). Journal of Medical and Biological Engineering, 34(1), 76. doi:10.5405/jmbe.1170

Eilström, Per-Erik & Kock, Henrik. (2008). “Competence development in the workplace”: Concepts, strategies and effects. Asia Pacific Education Review. 9. 5-20. 10.1007/BF03025821.

Fornell, C.G. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), “Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error”, Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.

Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981). “Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error”: Algebra and Statistics: Journal of Marketing Research.,18(3), p. 382.

Grant M.(1996). “Toward A Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm”. Strategic Management Journal, Vol.17(Winter Special Issue), pp109-122.

Gupta, B., Iyer, L.S. and Aronson, J.E. (2000), “Knowledge management: practices and challenges”, Industrial Management and Data Systems, Vol. 100 No. 1, pp. 17-21.

Henttonen, Kaisa & Kianto, Aino & Ritala, Paavo. (2016). “Knowledge sharing and individual work performance: an empirical study of a public sector organization”. Journal of Knowledge Management. 20. 749-768. 10.1108/JKM-10-2015-0414.

Ho, Li-An & Kuo, Tsung-Hsien. (2013). “How system quality and incentive affect knowledge sharing”. Industrial Management & Data Systems. 113. 10.1108/IMDS-01-2013-0015.

Hooff, B.V., and Ridder, J.A. (2004). “Knowledge sharing in context: the influence of organizational commitment, communication climate and CMC use of knowledge sharing”: Journal of Knowledge Management. Vol8, No.6, pp. 117-130.

Huang, C., Lu, S., & Chen, J. (2019). “Enhanced generally weighted moving average variance charts for monitoring process variance with individual observations”. Quality and Reliability Engineering International, 36(1), 285–302. doi:10.1002/qre.2571

Hutchinson, Joe & Lai, Fujun & Wang, Youcheng. (2009). “Understanding the relationships of quality, value, equity, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions among golf travelers”. Tourism Management. 30. 298-308. 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.07.010.

Ilyasa, Madhakomala, & Ramly, M. (2018). “The Effect of Organization Culture, Knowledge Sharing and Employee Engagement on Employee Work Innovation”. International Journal of scientific research and management, 6. doi:10.18535/ijsrm/v6i1.em09

Kuijpers, M. A. C. T., & Scheerens, J. (2006). “Career Competencies for the Modern Career”. Journal of Career Development, 32(4), 303–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845305283006

Kulpheng, K. (2009). “Don’t want to lose talent in the organization, what to do?”. Bangkok: H R Center.

Lerro, Antonio & Iacobone, Francesca & Schiuma, Giovanni. (2012). “Knowledge assets assessment strategies: Organizational value, processes, approaches and evaluation architectures”. Journal of Knowledge Management. 16. 563-575. 10.1108/13673271211246149.

Levine, S.S. and Prietula, M.J. (2012), “How knowledge transfer impacts performance: a multilevel model of benefits and liabilities”, organization Science, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 1748-1766.

Lin, H.F. (2007), “Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study”, international Journal of Manpower, Vol. 28 Nos 3/4, pp. 315-332.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2003). “Longman dictionary of contemporary English”. Harlow: Longman, 2003. Print book: English: New [i.e. 4th] ed.

McClelland, D. C. (1973). “Testing for competence rather than intelligence”. American Psychologist, 28(1), 1-14.

Michaels, E., Handfield-Jones, H., & Axelrod, B. (2001). “The War for Talent”. Brighton, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Michaels, Ed, Helen Handfield-Jones, and Beth Axelrod. (2001). “The War for Talent”. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). “Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover”. New York: Academic Press.

Naim, M.F. and Lenka, U. (2016), “Knowledge sharing as an intervention for Gen Y employees’intention to stay”, Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 142-148

Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board. (2019). “Thailand’s Social Situation and Outlook in Q1/2019”. [retrieved Nov17,2019 [www.nesdc.go.th](http://www.nesdc.go.th)].

Phang, M. M. S., & Foong, S. Y. (2010). “The Effects of Interactive Management Control Systems on Knowledge Sharing and Professional Competency”. SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1658267

Phuwittayaphan, A. (2007). “Talent Management Strategy”. Bangkok: H R Center.

Pillay, D., & Barnard, B. (2019). Entrepreneurship and Knowledge Management: Knowledge Requirements, Utility, Creation, and Competency. SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3308884

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lee, J. Y. (2003). “The mist measure of man(agreement) and its implications for leadership research”. The Leadership Quarterly, 14(6), 615–656. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.08.002

Rueff, Rusty and Stringer, Hank. (2006). “Talent Force: a New Manifesto for Human Side of Business”. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Schumaker, J. B., & Hazel, J. S. (1984). “Social Skills Assessment and Training for the Learning Disabled: Who’s on First and What’s on Second? Part I”. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17(7), 422–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/002221948401700708.

Spencer, L.M. and Spencer, S.M. (1993). “Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance”. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Steers, R.M. (1977). “Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment”. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.

Suwatthipong, C. and Lawthong, N. (2015). “A Proposed Model of Knowledge Sharing to Develop Educational Computer Standardized Test in Higher Education”. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Volume 191, 2 June 2015, Pages 93-97.

Tabrizi, N.M. and Morgan, S. (2014). “Models for Describing Knowledge Sharing Practices in the Healthcare Industry: Example of Experience Knowledge Sharing”: International Journal of Management and Applied Research., Vol.14 No.2. pp.48-67.

The Department of Industrial Promotion. (2020). Bangkok, Thailand.

Trivellas, Panagiotis & Kakkos, Nikolaos & Blanas, Nikos & Santouridis, Ilias. (2015). “The Impact of Career Satisfaction on Job Performance in Accounting Firms”. The Mediating Effect of General Competencies. Procedia Economics and Finance. 33. 468-476. 10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01730-X.

Tymon, W.G., Stumpf, S.A. and Doh, J.P. (2010), “Exploring talent management in India: the neglected role of intrinsic rewards”, Journal of World Business, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 109-121.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). “Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research”. Human Resource Management Review, 20(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.10.001>

Yang, J.T. (2007), “The impact of knowledge sharing on organizational learning and effectiveness”, Journal of Knowledge Management, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 83-90.

Zamir, Z. (2019). The Impact of Knowledge Capture and Knowledge Sharing on Learning, Adaptability, Job Satisfaction and Staying Intention: A Study of the Banking Industry in Bangladesh. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge. 7. 46-64. 10.2478/ijek-2019-0004.