

High Performing Organization Model in the Office of National Broadcasting and Telecommunication Commission (NBTC) of Thailand

Atiporn Gerdruang¹,

Chanchai Banchaphattanasakda²

School of Management, Shinnawatra University

E-mail: atiporn.g@siu.ac.th¹

E-mail: chanchai@siu.ac.th²

Received: June 16, 2019; Revised: October 30, 2019; Accepted: November 7, 2019

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to study the factors of high performance organization of National Broadcasting and Television Communication (NBTC). Questionnaires were employed to collect data from 240 employees who were working at the NBTC. The obtained data was analyzed using the method of exploratory factor analysis. The research also used Varimax Method to rotate the element core perpendicularly.

The results showed that there were 5 factors which Eigen values between 2.662 to 24.940. Therefore, it could be described that the NBTC represented the high-performance organization. Factors that drove the organization to the status of high-performance came from the adaptation of innovative organization, management and personnel development, risk management, organizational culture and collaboration. Each factor had an Eigen value of more than 1.00 which could explain the cumulative variance equal to 50.68 percent. The factor described variance of 24.940, 19.946, 4.564, 3.138 and 2.662 respectively. The findings also revealed that element number 1 (innovation organization) had the highest variation value, meant that it was the most influence element of the high-performance of NBTC. Next is element number 2 (Management and Personnel Development) influenced of element high-performance organization of NBTC respectively.

KEYWORDS: Exploratory Factor Analysis, High-Performance, Organization

Introduction

The study of organization management currently becomes a strategy in managing both operations and missions due to the fact that all organizations depends on human being to plan and work through. Participation in organizational management are different from one place to the others according to the various types of organizations with the organizations' objectives as leading principles. Generally speaking, organization management is the comprehensive panorama of the connecting micro perspective of internal units and their operations, which drive forward the whole organization. The study of organizational management is therefore not only for understanding in interrelations but also to create the ability to initiate integration of various differences within organizations and from people in organizations, leading to efficiently managing resources in the organizations in the appropriate approach in line with the adjusting surrounding under the fast changing conditions for both profit and non-profit organizations. Some organizations failed and was unable to survive eventually, whereas new organizations have just born and launched. Some have continued and been succeeded in their operation. As a result, people are nowadays very alert about how to successfully manage organizations

and how to continue maintaining successfully and sufficiently. (Maharatskul, 2011)

Referring to the past NBTC's operations, consistent evaluations have been regularly conducted. The results deflexed the efficiency and effectiveness of the NBTC. In term of operations obstacles, the research by NBTC cooperating with Girdwichai, Gerdrueang, and Sophonthada (2015) found out that there are problems observed from the operations as follows: 1) Organizational structure: The chain of command is vertically levels, complicated and duplicated causing slow functions. Consequently, some parts of working process could not effectively operate. 2) Human resources development should help boost the personnel's higher ability. The employees' attitudes should also be developed for work determination and devotion including willingness with professionalism. 3) Though being an independent regulator, the organizational management reflexes' the government working style, lacking of agility, still depending on government and political connection and patronage system. 4) Organizational culture: Opportunities are still not open for participation and expression of opinions. Thoughtful comments from operations officers are also still hindered. 5) Lack of networking and participations both from the public and the government sectors.

Having the status of a high-performance organization is currently prioritized by many agencies, both within the private and government sectors of Thailand, by applying different management to develop the organization. Administrators of organizations highly prioritize this because it demonstrates that the organization is powerful, has plans for different situations clearly, and has analyzed overall situations which can affect its work. Therefore, the organization can successfully achieve its objectives efficiently and timely. The NBTC is also observed by all sectors and expected by society to be a high-performance organization. However, although the overall management achieves a certain level of success, there are still some problems which need to be solved. Therefore, the study of the factors associated with high-performance organizations is necessary for its further development. In this study, the author aims to study the factors associated with high-performance organizations and utilizing the results can lead to the NBTC's further development of such factors associated with being a high-performance organization.

Moreover, the research will find out the existing operation problems in each NBTC's units. Such the findings can be also used as importance information, from which the management and concerned parties at

NBTC can use to increase NBTC's efficiency. The aim of this study was to study the factors of high performance organization of NBTC.

Literature Review

For this study, the researcher has studied Organizational Theory and Behavior. It can be said that these theories are fundamental to understand and analyze an organization in more detail in different aspects. Moreover, it is a systematic study of human behavior in an organization in terms of personal, group and organizational behaviors. The knowledge can be used to increase the productivity and satisfaction of personnel by achieving targets. This will lead to overall organization optimization including other related studies as follows:

1. Classical Organization Theory

The early part of the twentieth century saw the beginning of classical organization theory, which brought together the strands of administrative and bureaucratic theory along with scientific management.

Scientific management theory, developed at the same time, is sometimes known as Taylorism after its creator, Taylor (1917). The theory had four key components. First was finding the best means of completing a task. Second was to allocate the right worker to each task. Third involved close supervision along with punishments and

rewards to guide behavior. Fourth involved a management system of control and planning.

Production was quickly improved using Taylor's ideas, since his approach used the best materials, staff, and equipment, and then analyzed every aspect of the working process by breaking the task down to individual steps. This allowed analysis which subsequently resulted in identifying the successful combinations of factors which would enhance productivity.

Although this approach worked effectively in basic industrial processes in the early part of the last century, modern companies have not found it to be so successful. The central concept of "production first, people second" has resulted in falling productivity levels, poor quality work, unhappy staff with a lack of pride in their work, and employees who feel no desire to support their own companies.

Taylor's ideas were extended by Weber, Henderson, and Parsons (1947), who believed it necessary to cut down on diversity and ambiguity in the workplace. Authority and control were prioritized, and a power hierarchy had to be established. The bureaucratic theory recognized that specialization and the division of labor are important, and therefore set out rules which would ensure stability as well as uniformity. Weber added that the behavior of an organization stems

from the network of underlying human interactions, and therefore it can be understood through the examination of cause and effect.

Meanwhile, administrative theory was the creation of Mooney (1931) in the 1930s, and its focus was the need to set out principles of management which would be applicable across all organizational types.

Classical management theory was found to be mechanical and rather rigid, and these weaknesses were quickly noticed. The biggest shortcoming of all was that it sought to explain motivation only in terms of its links to economic rewards.

2. Neoclassical Organization Theory

Classical theory was rather authoritarian and harsh in its structure, and this brought about the development of the human relations movement as a response, thereby addressing a number of the key concerns which arose due to classical theory. One particular problem with classical theory is that it fosters a lack of creativity because of the rigid control, and thus motivation fails and individual growth is blocked. In contrast, neoclassical theory showed greater interest in the needs of humans as people.

One early experiment which showed the weaknesses in the classical position was carried out by Mayo during the late 1920's at the Western Electric plant in Hawthorne, Illinois (Mayo, 1933). The

experiments involved making small changes to the working conditions and monitoring the effect upon productivity. However, ultimately it was discovered that any change at all would have a positive outcome, including the act of being pleasant to employees. This has been described at the “wart” theory (Uris, 1986) since any treatment at all can effectively remove a wart, while any action on the part of management can improve productivity over the short term.

The Hawthorne experiment can be viewed with alarm since it suggests that new management approaches cannot be accurately evaluated. Therefore, organizations might repeatedly implement the latest management trends, and only create an ongoing series of Hawthorne effects. Pascale (1990) commented on these Hawthorne results, noting that the experiment was simply a story about managers or researchers playing tricks on employees. The results are flawed simply because the whole experiment took a manipulative approach to the working staff.

In 1939, Barnard (1968) began to develop the first truly modern organizational theory through his definition of an organization which described a system of activities which were consciously coordinated. He explained that executives had the primary duty of ensuring that the values and purpose

of the organization were clearly conveyed through the working atmosphere, adding that success would depend on whether or not the leadership could develop a productive and functional working environment. Barnard also claimed that authority could only result when subordinates accepted the situation, rather than being imposed hierarchically. The theory therefore incorporated elements of both classical and neoclassical theories, but while academics often take differing views on Barnard, he can be considered as a transition theorist. Another valuable theorist was Simon (1997), who suggested the “limited rationality” model as a means to explain the results obtained in the Hawthorne experiments. It was proposed that when managers observe staff, staff can react in unpredictable ways. The theory was supported by a highly rigorous scientific approach, involving deductive logic, reductionism, and quantification, which came to be perceived as legitimate approaches to organizational study.

Finally, the common view of Barnard (1968); Mayo (1933); Simon (1997); Taylor (1917); and Weber et al. (1977) was that management had the primary objective of maintaining equilibrium, which could be achieved by manipulating and controlling the workers and their working conditions.

3. Contingency Theory

Under both classical and neoclassical theory, conflict was seen as problematic since it could disturb the equilibrium. Contingency theorists responded by taking the view that conflict is inevitable, but can be managed.

Four major US companies were examined by Chandler (1962), who suggested that organizations would develop naturally in order to adapt to their own strategies, on the grounds that form will follow function. Organizations would therefore operate in a linear and rational manner in response to the changes in their environment. Meanwhile, Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) also investigated that ability of companies to change to fit their circumstances. Where industries face high volatility, it is necessary to allow managers at all levels the freedom to take decisions within their area of control, depending on the immediate and changing needs in the current situation.

4. Systems Theory

Ludwig von Bertalanffy was the first to propose systems theory, in 1928, although its use in the context of organizational behavior only began in recent years (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1972; Scott, 1981). Systems theory holds that there is a relationship between all components of an organization,

and therefore changes made to one component can affect some or all of the others. Organizations can thus be considered as open systems which react to and influence their environments. Accordingly, organizations remain in dynamic equilibrium due to their constant adaptations to the changes they experience.

Systems thinking is discussed by Senge (1990) who describes the process as the understanding of how an individual's actions can create their reality. However, if an individual believes that they have no control over their own situation, then it is impossible for them to form their own vision of how to shape their future. In this way, systems thinking can provide confidence in the ability of individuals to create their own reality. Within systems theory, the central tenet is that there may be relationships between variables which are not linear, whereby a tiny change in one variable could result in an enormous shift in another. Similarly, large changes might bring about only minimal impacts. The idea of non-linear relationships is important when considering the complexity of organizations. In fact, the idea of non-linearity can support the argument that it is not possible to fully comprehend the relationships which exist between the variables in an organization.

5. Organizational Structure

Weber's perspective on bureaucracy has been followed by a majority of organizations until recent years, but as organizations have since become much more complex, there has developed a need for "federal decentralization" as Drucker (1986) described the evolving structures. Federal decentralization demands that organizations have numerous constituent units which all operate simultaneously, almost as autonomous businesses with their own tasks to accomplish. Under such structures, it has become necessary to diversify into different fields of business activity in order to mitigate risk. In particularly dynamic circumstances such as those involving technology, the project management organizational structure is known to be quite effective (French, Kast, & Rosenzweig, 1985). In such scenarios, the project manager controls the information about the project and directs the activities, with the aim of successfully integrating the resources of the organization in such a way as to accomplish the goals of the project. However, to use such a structure often involves changing the original structure, which alters the hierarchy and changes the relationships among personnel in terms of responsibilities and authority.

Finally, the project management structure can evolve to form the matrix

organizational structure (Kolodny, 1979). This can act as a compromise which combines elements of the bureaucratic and autonomous approaches. In a matrix organization there will be permanent departments around which project management techniques can be implemented. The matrix can be superimposed upon the hierarchy, leading to a situation where dual authority exists, and responsibilities are numerous. The resources are then allocated by these permanent functionality departments and are shared efficiently among those who need them.

Related Research Studies

This part composed with synthesis of relevant research. High performance Organization of NBTC means managing organizational resources including operational management with efficiency from 9 main factors and 32 sub-factors. This study consists of 9 main variables which the researcher gathers from literature reviews and in-depth interviews of experts. Then, the researcher analyzes the collected characteristics to find important components of those variables to create variables for this study. After that, the researcher develops a questionnaire to analyze reliability by calculating internal consistency that Cronbach's alpha equals to 0.976. The variables studied are as follow:

1) Technology is often discussed as an output of innovation (Erdener & Dunn, 1995; Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005), but in this research we are concerned with its role as an influencing factor. Technology discussed in this paper is concerned with the utilization of technology to facilitate innovation and innovative behavior within and between organizations.

2) Innovation process. Although a few authors (Amar, 2004; Bessant, Lamming, Noke, & Phillips, 2005; Cummings & O'Connell, 1978; Knight, 1987; Merx-Chermin & Nijhof, 2005) discuss the impact of operational processes on organizational innovativeness, in the context of this paper processes relate to the generation, development, and implementation of innovations.

3) Corporate Strategy, Strategy is a wide subject area and the definition can often be confusing. Strategy in this research refers to aspects of the corporate and innovation strategies of the organization (Damanpour & Evan, 1984; Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Read, 2000) and how they impact on the management of innovation. It also refers to the dissemination of the strategic vision throughout the organization.

4) Organizational structure has received much attention in the general management literature (Mintzberg, 1992) and often covers more than the simple

configuration of the organization. However, within this research organizational structure relates to the way the various parts of an organization are configured and how this impacts on an organization's ability to manage innovation.

5) Employees refer to the employees of the organization and the role they play in affecting innovation management. This factor takes into account the various personal characteristics associated with employees (Ahmed, 1998; Bharadwaj & Menon, 2000) and the motivation of employees to become innovative (Mostafa, 2005).

6) Organizational culture, Culture here refers to the culture of the organization, although organizational culture has been discussed widely in general management literature (Hofstede, 2001). It relates to the values and beliefs of the organization and how these impact the ability to manage innovation within the organization. It takes into consideration the organization's approach to collaboration, communication, and risk.

7) Resources relates to all the resources that the organization has, human, financial and physical, but they are discussed in relation to the level of slack resources (Subramanian & Nilakanta, 1996) and how resources are managed (Knight,

1987; Wan, Ong, & Lee, 2005) to impact on an organization's ability to manage innovation.

8) Knowledge management in this research refers to the management and utilization of knowledge for innovation management. This covers all aspects of knowledge, both internal and external to the organization. (Salavou, 2004) to impact on an organization ability.

9) Management style and leadership refers to the employees that have responsibility for the management of the organization. This factor is concerned with a number of aspects to the way management influences the management of innovation. (Hyland & Beckett, 2005; Pearson, Pearson, & Ball, 1989) and how management can motivate employees to become more innovative (Rivas & Gobeli, 2005; Roffe, 1999).

Methods and Data Collection Population and Sample Size

The populations are identified as NBTC's executives and all officers from the headquarters. The research employed purposive sampling in order to collect the data main employees in the NBTC's headquarters within the fiscal year 2017. The total numbers are 900 persons in the actual sample collection a total of 240. The researcher used formula for calculating proportions of Daniel (1999) calculates the

sample group by population proportion estimation formula with the confidence level of 95% which 5% error is acceptable. Besides, the proportion of the interested population significance level equals 0.5. For the size of the sample for this study, the sample size is 240 according to the concept of Comrey and Lee (1992). This number is suitable for Exploratory Factor analysis. From the consideration of the sample size, there should be at least 200 sample groups considered to be fair. If the number of factors is equal to 10 factors, there should be more than 150 samples.

Research Design

The researcher has designed a study that will be 2 steps as follow:

Step 1 for the study framework design, the researcher collects qualitative data by using in-depth interviews with experts who specialize in mass communication, organization management, and organization administration. The researcher selects experts by purposive sampling among 5 senior executives of the NBTC and 5 other scholars. Then, the researcher studies related studies to establish the study framework. Experts will decide or criticize to evaluate a correction and possibility until they all agree on answers. The developed framework is used to form a conclusion or link

information together in order to conclude and classify different factors. At the same time, the main issues are checked against the study's objectives and concluded factors of variables for 9 main factors as follows 1) Technology 2) Innovation process 3) Corporate strategy 4) Organizational structure 5) Employees 6) Organizational culture 7) Resources 8) Knowledge management 9) Management style and leadership and 32 sub-factors. Then, factors of high-performance organizations are asked to be matched and workshop definitions for every factor are covered in order to be used to collect data and carry out further quantitative analysis.

Step 2 for the data collection and quantitative analysis, the researcher quantitatively collects data through questionnaires. This study is an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) by factor extraction to find the Latent Variable from Observed Variable which is developed through the use of experts' questionnaire development. According to an assumption of this method of analysis, it will neither be studied as an independent variable or a dependent variable but it will study the characteristics of variables used in the study as mentioned in order to define factors of high-performance organizations of the NBTC.

Research Results

The research found that. Off 240 respondents, majority of the respondents were female represented 55.40 percent, ages were between 29-39 years old accounted for 57.90 percent, with 61.70 percent of held higher than bachelor degrees, with working experience less than 1.5 year accounted 55.00 percent, and had position as operation 91.70 percent.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Analysis of data suitability before entering into the use of Factor Analysis techniques important preliminary agreement the variance was determined by the KMO and Bartlett's Test. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) to check the suitability of the sample The KMO value is between 0-1. The KMO value should be greater than 0.5 if the size of the sample is appropriate. And the second test is Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. Is the metrics of the population correlated as a identity matrix, an identity matrix is a diagonal metric that has a value of 1 and above and below a diagonal of zero. If the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix, it means that each variable has no relation. Independent of each other. Therefore, grouping to achieve factor would not occur. The component cannot be analyzed from the sample's suitability check. As shown in table 1.

Table 1 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.825
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	33243.009
	df	5886
	p-value	0.000

Table 1 showed that (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy) to measure the suitability of the data to be analyzed using the Factor Analysis technique. The results found that KMO as 0.825 which is considered to be high (close to 1). It is concluded that. The data is suitable for use in Factor Analysis techniques and when testing the relationship between variables by Bartlett's Test of Sphericity.

From the interdependence test By Bartlett's Test, it was found that Test statistics are approximate Chi-Square equals 33243.009. The level of significance 0.000 it means that the variables are related which is less than 0.05. That is, the variables are related can be used for Factor Analysis techniques for the next step analysis.

Table 2 Factors of high-performance organizational management of NBTC

No	Factors name	Variables	Eigen values	Factor loading
1	Innovation Organization	60	24.940	0.400 – 0.725
2	Management and Personnel Development	29	19.946	0.371 – 0.994
3	Risk management	6	4.564	0.325 – 0.494
4	Organizational Culture	3	3.138	0.527 – 0.733
5	Collaboration	5	2.662	0.327 – 0.468
	Total	103		

The research concludes that high-performance organizational management factors of NBTC in Thailand. Consider the loading value from 0.3 and more than up (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995) The study found 5 influence factors sort by priority as follows: 1) Factor no.1 define name this factor as Innovation Organization with the factor loading between 0.400–0.725, Eigen values 24.940 Include 60 sub-variables, 2) Factor no.2 define name this factor as Management and Personnel Development with the factor loading between 0.371–0.994, Eigen values 19.946 Include 29 sub-variables, 3) Factor no.3 define name this factor as Risk management with the factor loading between 0.325–0.494, Eigen values 4.564 Include 6 sub-variables, 4) Factor no.4 define name this factor as Organizational Culture with the factor loading between 0.527–0.733, Eigen values 3.138 Include 3 sub-variables and, 5) Factor no.5 define name this factor as Collaboration. See the conclusions in the below chart with the factor loading between 0.327–0.468, Eigen values 2.662 Include 5 sub-variables.

Summary and Discussion

The factors of the management of a high performance organization of NBTC. Based on the findings from the research, there were 5 factors of the management

of high-performance organization of NBTC including 1) Innovation Organization 2) Human Resource Management and Development 3) Risk Management 4) Organizational Culture and 5) Collaboration All of them are necessary to move the organization forward. In other words, the operation of NBTC in views of the development of the organizational management for becoming a high-performance organization shall create the organization local and international competitive abilities that fulfill social demands, and efficient performance.

Innovation organization factors. As the NBTC develops into a high-performing organization, the Innovation Organization plays an important role in the success of the organization. The management trend of the NBTC is facing various changes Competitions and new challenges to develop the organization to be a high-performing organization. Need for innovation in management. Modify the operation method by adopting the innovative management model.

Innovation organization or implementation of management concepts in organizations businesses are becoming more and more involved in managing their businesses. Various businesses try to change themselves to create a strength and opportunity to be an important role in promoting the organization to succeed. In

corporate innovation the main reason is that the behavior that blocks innovation is not accepting or fearing what is going to change. So what is important to business organizations must be managed before implementing the innovation. Business organizations need to consider the following: 1) should understand the overall business environment. The suitability, the need for change 2) should understand the environment within a business organization whether it is ready to innovate an organization. The capital of personnel and 3) should understand the working environment with every department in the business organization. From executives to executives and 4) innovation is beneficial to business organizations. Not just a thought. It is the basic factor in organizational innovation that is to understand the overall environment, the environment within the organization, the people and the innovation to benefit. It will make enterprise innovation management can be effective and successful in the end. Consistent with Buytendijk (2006); De Waal (2005); Linder and Brooks (2004); Miller (2011); Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn, (2003).

Factor side: Management and personnel development factors. The results found element No. 2 explain that NBTC must have Management and Personnel Development. It is an activity that is organized about organi-

zation. Management must consider that to achieve that goal. What is the job? How can each work group be organized? At present, the NBTC has to face the changing environment all the time. Therefore, NBTC has to adjust to meet the conversion. Flexible management can be adjusted according to the situation. Develop staff to enhance their work skills the current business environment where competition is ever more open and intense. Human resource development capabilities of the organization can work together effectively. It is important and absolutely necessary how the organization works together to create value added value for the organization. It's easy to talk but difficult to implement. This is a major challenge for the organization to carry out. For this reason, organizations must prioritize management. Because of good management only to strengthen the organization and to be sustainable.

Human resource management and development are the enhancement of work expertise's efficiency also the change of personnel's attitude at all levels to be in the same direction. Personnel's efficiency enhancement can be done by training, orientation, oversea visit, including on-site and off-site seminars, etc. to support those personnel to work at their potential and can achieve targets of the organization. When

there are changes within the organization such as an extension, the organization needs to train and develop personnel to have more work efficiency. At the same time, if the organization needs to scale down, personal development is important because it will motivate employees to be more agile in their work. In case there are changes from outside the organization such as social, political, economic, etc., The organization needs to develop human resources so that they will always be ready to respond to external changes which are the benefits for the organization. Human resource development will increase productivity and reduce costs because when personnel are more skilled in their work, mistakes will be reduced. Therefore, human resource development is a way to help the organization to keep up with the advancement and able to compete with other businesses. Moreover, it will be a benefit for personnel themselves because when their efficiencies increase, the chance to be promoted will be increased as well. Human resource development will build relationships between employees and the organization. Therefore, personnel are dedicated and pay attention to their work to achieve the success of the organization as well. The value added to both the self and the organization is important to customers who are satisfied with the quality and service of the organiza-

tion. Comply with Buytendijk (2006); Carew et al. (2007); De Waal (2005); Jupp and Younger (2004); Linder and Brooks (2004); Miller (2011); Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2003).

Factor side: Risk management. A factor the priority, followed by No. 3 Explain that. NBTC must have Risk management because risk management is the direction of systematic management. Helps managers adapt to changing environment. Decisions can be made on the basis of the selection of strategies effectively to suit the management of the NBTC. Good risk management. It must be people in the organization with all relevant departments have participated in the analysis, assessment, and risk assessment. And the impact that may occur to the organization is always. It also plans to protect and control the mission to reduce the problem or avoid the risk of damage or loss to the organization effectively. Risk Management System It is an important management tool. It is a tool that makes the organization a certain degree of confidence that the performance of the mission will be able to achieve its objectives as prescribed Management must be aware of the importance of enterprise risk management. To provide organizations with quality and standard risk management regulatory. Approach of an Organization or

Organization with regard to compliance with objectives and the organizational goals of the organization.

In summary, Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is a systematic process that can be applied to all types of organizations to identify risk events. Risk assessment Priorities and risk management. This allows for the following effects. 1. Encourage organizations to consider acceptable levels of risk or would like to accept to create value for shareholders and 2. Establish a framework for the organization to manage uncertainty risk and opportunity of business effectively Comply with Buytendijk (2006); Carew et al. (2007); Jupp and Younge (2004); Linder and Brooks (2004); Miller (2011).

Factor side: Organizational Culture. A factor the priority, followed by No. 4 Explain that. NBTC must have Organizational Culture Organizations may have negative or positive values in their work. Treat employees as the valuable assets of the organization. It is what helps the organization members know. What should I do? In the organization the value of the organization is in a way that is not written. This is because the strong corporate culture and the power of any organization should reflect the values and beliefs of the employees. It helps to adapt to the external environment (External adaptation), which is related to work to achieve. These make the

members of the organization have a common experience and the development of mutual views. It helps organizations to achieve their goals easily. However, organizational culture will benefit the organization only when in proper condition. The suitability of corporate culture of each organization is different the environment of the organization. The organization culture, etc., and the need for a strong corporate culture requires longevity Leadership Strength and the cooperation of people in the organization as well Comply with Buytendijk (2006); Carew et al. (2007); Hunt and Osborn (2003); Linder and Brooks (2004); Schermerhorn.

Factor side: Collaboration. A factor the priority, followed by No. 5 Explain that. NBTC must have collaboration. The organization seeks cooperation from various organizations Due to various factors. The environment, the resources, the potential, the collaboration process is a collaborative connection or network. These processes encourage the organizations to work together. Therefore, the cooperation between organizations is important in the management of the rapid and to solve the problems of the organization's management. There are many. It is a matter of responsible personnel lack of knowledge Lack of coordination with relevant agencies. Lack of cooperation of entrepreneurs Lack of confidence in the activities of

those involved. Therefore, the readiness to be a high-performing organization, the NBTC must be equipped with the personnel. And the organization must be ready to work with other agencies. Create a work relationship with other agencies. Focus on creating a good collaboration in the workplace in order to be able to adapt to the changing environment successfully. Highly qualified organizations are designed to be designed for organizational learning. Information will be exchanged between various functions to improve the ability and use new situations. Use network related administration tools. Service centers, for example, work with other agencies in a networked manner Finding Strategic Partnerships Works with other organizations. For mutual success although it is a competitor Comply with Carew et al. (2007); Jupp and Younger, (2004); Linder and Brooks (2004); Miller (2011).

Suggestions

1. Executives and the executive selection system are the key factors to the qualification of executives in view of their leadership.

2. It is possible to use innovations for management, but building understanding among other staff in the organization regarding matter is required.

3. Heading to excellence must be implemented in a way that NBTC can receive the acceptance from external agencies. For the organization itself, operational standards should be determined. Management approaches should be adjusted for more efficiency. Fair recruitment should be conducted. Patronage system should be avoided.

4. For strategic management, executives should look at all issues of the organization as a whole. Then, they should consider them for the development and the management of knowledge as well as skills to personnel. Transferring those strategies into practice must also be regarded.

5. The development of networks is necessary and useful to the organization. Appropriate channels must be provided and not seen as its burden.

6. The organizational management of NBTC should be combined with control and flexibility. Executives should run policy control. Simultaneously, they should allow freedom of management to each unit.

7. Give precedence to a good governance system that leads to reliability, both in terms of organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Moreover, interested persons/ parties participating in idea exchange in any procedures should be concentrated as well.

Suggestions for Future Research

1. Factors influencing the organizational management of NBTC should be studied.

2. An in-depth study should be taken to explore the relations among the organizational management factors of NBTC.

3. A comparative study of the management styles between the high-performance organization of NBTC and other government agencies.

References

- Ahmed, P. K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 1(1), 30-43.
- Amar, A. D. (2004). Motivating knowledge workers to innovate: A model integrating motivation dynamics and antecedents. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(2), 89-101.
- Barnard, C. I. (1968). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bessant, J., Lamming, R., Noke, H., & Phillips, W. (2005). Managing innovation beyond the steady state. *Technovation*, 25(12), 1366-1376.
- Bharadwaj, S., & Menon, A. (2000). Making innovation happen in organizations: Individual creativity mechanisms, organizational creativity mechanisms or both? *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 17(6), 424-434.
- Buytendijk, F. (2006). The five keys to building a high-performance organization. *Business Performance Management Magazine*, 4(1), 24-47.
- Carew, J. S. et al. (2007). Targeting autophagy augments the anticancer activity of the histone deacetylase inhibitor SAHA to overcome Bcr-Abl-mediated drug resistance. *Blood*, 110(1), 313-322.
- Chandler, A. D., Jr. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the American industrial enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cummings, L. L., & O'Connell, M. J. (1978). Organizational innovation: A model and needed research. *Journal of Business Research*, 6(1), 33-50.
- Damanpour, F., & Evan, W. M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: The problem of "organizational lag". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(3), 392-408.
- Daniel, W. W. (1999). *Biostatistics: A foundation for analysis in the health sciences* (7th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- De Waal, A. A., (2005). Is your organization ready for beyond budgeting. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 9(2), 56-67.
- Drucker, P. F. (1986). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Erdener, C. B., & Dunn, C. P. (1995). Organizational values and technological innovation: A cross-national comparison of corporate annual reports. *International Journal of Management*, 12(2), 197-203.
- French, W. L, Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1985). *Understanding human behaviour in organizations*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Girdwichai, R., Gerdrueang, A., & Sophonthada, D. (2015). *Project performance monitoring and evaluation office of NBTC*. Bangkok: Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hyland, P., & Beckett, R. (2005). Engendering an innovative culture and maintaining operational balance. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12(3), 336-352.
- Jupp, V., & Younger, M. P. (2004). A value model for the public sector. *Outlook Journal*, 6(3), 42-51.
- Kast, F. E., & Rosenzweig, J. E. (1972). General systems theory: Applications for organizations and management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 15(4), 451-465.
- Knight, R. M. (1987). Corporate innovation and entrepreneurship: A Canadian study. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 4(4), 284-298.
- Kolodny, H. F. (1979). Evolution to a matrix organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 543-553.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1969). *Organization and environment*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Linder, J. C., & Brooks, J. D. (2004). Transforming the public sector. *Outlook Journal*, 6(3), 74-83.
- Madsen, S. R., Miller, D., & John, C. R. (2005). Readiness for organizational change: Do organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace make a difference? *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(2), 213-

233.

- Maharatskul, P. (2011). *Organization and management*. Bangkok: Panyachon.
- Martins, E. C., & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organizational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1), 64-74.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of industrial civilization*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Merx-Chermin, M., & Nijhof, W. (2005). Factors influencing knowledge creation and innovation in an organization. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(2), 135-147.
- Miller, A. R. (2011). The effects of motherhood timing on career path. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(3), 1071-1100.
- Mintzberg, H. (1992). The structuring of organizations. In H. Mintzberg, & J. B. Quinn (Eds.), *The strategy process: Concepts and contexts* (pp. 156-176). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mooney, J. D. (1931). *Onward industry: The principles of organization and their significance to modern industry*. New York: Harper & brothers.
- Mostafa, M. (2005). Factors affecting organizational creativity and innovativeness in Egyptian business organizations: An empirical investigation. *The Journal of Management Development*, 24(1), 7-33.
- Pascale, R. T. (1990). *Managing on the edge*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Pearson, G. J., Pearson, A. W., & Ball, D. F. (1989). Innovation in a mature industry: A case study of warp knitting in the U.K. *Technovation*, 9(8), 657-678.
- Read, A. (2000). Determinants of successful organizational innovation: A review of current research. *Journal of Management Practice*, 3(1), 95-119.
- Rivas, R., & Gobeli, D. H. (2005). Accelerating innovation at Hewlett-Packard. *Research Technology Management*, 48(1), 32-39.
- Roffe, I. (1999). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A review of the implications for training and development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 23(4/5), 224-241.
- Salavou, H. (2004). The concept of innovativeness: Should we need to focus? *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(1), 33-44.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osbourn, R. N. (2003). *Core concepts of organizational behavior*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Scott, W. R. (1981). *Organizations: Rational, natural and open systems*. Engle-

- wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Senge, P. (1990). The art & practice of the learning organization. In M. L. Ray, & A. Rinzler (Eds.), *The new paradigm in business: Emerging strategies for leadership and organizational change* (pp. 126-138). New York, NY: J.P. Tarcher/Perigee.
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Subramanian, A., & Nilakanta, S. (1996). Organizational innovativeness: Exploring the relationship between organizational determinants of innovation, types of innovations, and measures of organizational performance. *Omega*, 24(6), 631-647.
- Taylor, F. W. (1917). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Uris, A. (1986). *101 of the greatest ideas in management: And how to use them in your job*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wan, D., Ong, C. H., & Lee, F. (2005). Determinants of firm innovation in Singapore. *Technovation*, 25(3), 261-268.
- Weber, M., Henderson, A. M., & Parsons, T. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.