

Daftar Pustaka

- Aamodt, M. G. (2010). *Industrial organizational psychology: An applied approach* (6th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Abrishamkar, M. M., Abubakar, Y. A., & Mitra, J. (2021). The influence of workforce agility on high-growth firms: The mediating role of innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 22(3), 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750320973896>
- AERA, APA, & NCME. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing* (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (Eds.)). American Educational Research Association.
- Alamer, A. (2022). Exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) and bifactor ESEM for construct validation purposes: Guidelines and applied example. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(100005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2022.100005>
- Alavi, S., Wahab, D. A., Muhamad, N., & Shirani, B. A. (2014). Organic structure and organisational learning as the main antecedents of workforce agility. *International Journal of Production Research*, 52(21), 6273–6295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2014.919420>
- Appelbaum, M., Cooper, H., Kline, R. B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Nezu, A. M., & Rao, S. M. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for quantitative research in Psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(7), 947–947. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000389>
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (11th ed.). British Library.
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 16(3), 397–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903008204>



- Azwar, S. (2014). *Dasar dasar psikometrika* (2nd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Azwar, S. (2021). *Penyusunan skala psikologi* (3rd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Baran, B. E., & Woznyj, H. M. (2021). Managing VUCA: The human dynamics of agility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 50(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100787>
- Bock, R. D. (1997). The nominal categories model. In W. J. van der Linden & R. K. Hambleton (Eds.), *Handbook of modern item response theory* (pp. 33–50). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-2691-6_6
- Booth, T., & Hughes, D. J. (2014). Exploratory structural equation modeling of personality data. *Assessment*, 21(3), 260–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114528029>
- Braun, T. J., Hayes, B. C., DeMuth, R. L. F., & Taran, O. A. (2017). The development, validation, and practical application of an employee agility and resilience measure to facilitate organizational change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 703–723. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.79>
- Breu, K., Hemingway, C. J., Strathern, M., & Bridger, D. (2002). Workforce agility: The new employee strategy for the knowledge economy. *Journal of Information Technology*, 17(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02683960110132070>
- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (T. D. Little (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Guildford. <https://doi.org/10.1198/tas.2008.s98>
- Calnan, M., & Rozen, A. (2019). ING's agile transformation—teaching an elephant to race. *Journal of Creating Value*, 5(2), 190–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964319875601>
- Catano, V. M., Brochu, A., & Lamerson, C. D. (2012). Assessing the reliability of situational judgment tests used in high-stakes situations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(3), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00604.x>
- Catano, V. M., Wiesner, W. H., & Hackett, R. D. (2016). *Recruitment and selection in Canada* (M. Belcourt (Ed.); 7th ed.). Nelson. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203876336>



- Chang, H. K., Ahn, J. Y., Do, Y. J., & Kim, Y. M. (2023). Workforce agility during the COVID-19 pandemic: Validation of the workforce agility scale in care workers for frail elderly. *International Journal of Advanced ...*, 11(4). <https://www.earticle.net/Article/A440604>
- Cheng, Y., Shao, C., & Lathrop, Q. N. (2016). The mediated MIMIC model for understanding the underlying mechanism of DIF. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 76(1), 43–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164415576187>
- Chiorri, C., Marsh, H. W., Ubbiali, A., & Donati, D. (2016). Testing the factor structure and measurement invariance across gender of the big five inventory through exploratory structural equation modeling. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98(1), 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1035381>
- Cho, G., Schlaegel, C., Hwang, H., Choi, Y., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2022). Integrated generalized structured component analysis: On the use of model fit criteria in international management research. *Management International Review*, 62(4), 569–609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-022-00479-w>
- Christian, M. S., Edwards, B. D., & Bradley, J. C. (2010). Situational judgment tests: Constructs assessed and a meta-analysis of their criterion-related validities. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(1), 83–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01163.x>
- Cohen, R. J., Schneider, W. J., & Tobin, R. M. (2022). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Cooper, C. (2023). *An introduction to psychometrics and psychological assessment: Using, interpreting and developing tests* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003240181>
- Corstjens, J., Lievens, F., & Krumm, S. (2017). Situational judgement tests for selection. In H. W. Goldstein, E. D. Pulakos, J. Passmore, & C. Semedo (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of recruitment, selection and employee retention* (pp. 226–246). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118972472.ch11>
- Cox, W. C., Wolcott, M., Hahn, F., & McLaughlin, J. E. (2023). The relationship between a multiple mini-interview and situational judgment test for admissions. *American*

- Cyfert, S., Szumowski, W., Dyduch, W., Zastempowski, M., & Chudziński, P. (2022). The power of moving fast: responsible leadership, psychological empowerment and workforce agility in energy sector firms. *Heliyon*, 8(10). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11188>
- Das, K. P., Mukhopadhyay, S., & Suar, D. (2023). Enablers of workforce agility, firm performance, and corporate reputation. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 28(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2022.01.006>
- de Ayala, R. J. (2022). *The theory and practice of item response theory* (T. D. Little (Ed.); 2nd ed.). Guilford.
- Furr, R. M. (2022). *Psychometrics: An introduction* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Geisinger, K. F., Bracken, B. A., Carlson, J. F., Hansen, J.-I. C., Kuncel, N. R., Reise, S. P., & Rodriguez, M. C. (Eds.). (2013). *APA Handbook of testing and assessment in psychology, Vol 1: Test theory and testing and assessment in industrial and organizational psychology*. American Psychological Association Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14047-000>
- Goldstein, H. W., Pulakos, E. D., Passmore, J., & Semedo, C. (2017). *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of recruitment, selection and employee retention*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118972472>
- Goodboy, A. K., & Martin, M. M. (2020). Omega over alpha for reliability estimation of unidimensional communication measures. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 44(4), 422–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2020.1846135>
- Green, S. B., & Yang, Y. (2015). Evaluation of dimensionality in the assessment of internal consistency reliability: Coefficient alpha and omega coefficients. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 34(4), 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12100>
- Gunasekaran, A. (1999). Agile manufacturing: A framework for research and development. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(1), 87–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273\(98\)00222-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00222-9)



- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2018). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (8th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119409137.ch4>
- Helmi, A. F., Marvianto, R. D., Al Fariz, A. B., Anggoro, I. P., & Anggoro, W. J. (n.d.). *The development of situational judgement test (SJT): Workforce agility*.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Himmetoglu, B., & Bayrak, C. (2023). Development of workforce agility scale for academic staff: Validity and reliability studies. *HAYEF: Journal of Education*, 20(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.5152/hayef.2023.38>
- Hwang, H., Cho, G., & Choo, H. (2023). *GSCA Pro for Windows User's Manual*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28162.61127>
- Hwang, H., Cho, G., Jung, K., Falk, C. F., Flake, J. K., Jin, M. J., & Lee, S. H. (2021). An approach to structural equation modeling with both factors and components: Integrated generalized structured component analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 26(3), 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000336>
- Hwang, H., Sarstedt, M., Cho, G., Choo, H., & Ringle, C. M. (2023). A primer on integrated generalized structured component analysis. *European Business Review*, 35(3), 261–284. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2022-0224>
- Hwang, H., & Takane, Y. (2014). *Generalized structured component analysis: A component-based approach to structural equation modelling*. CRC Press.
- Jamali, J., Ayatollahi, S., & Jafari, P. (2018). The effect of cross-loading on measurement equivalence of psychometric multidimensional questionnaires in MIMIC model: A simulation study. *Materia Socio Medica*, 30(2), 121. <https://doi.org/10.5455/msm.2018.30.121-126>
- Jamali, J., Ayatollahi, S. M. T., & Jafari, P. (2017). The effect of small sample size on



measurement equivalence of psychometric questionnaires in MIMIC model: A simulation study. *BioMed Research International*, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/7596101>

Jöreskog, K. G. (1969). A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 34(2), 183–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289343>

Kim, E. S., Yoon, M., & Lee, T. (2012). Testing measurement invariance using MIMIC: Likelihood ratio test with a critical value adjustment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 72(3), 469–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164411427395>

Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38(1), 52. <https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52>

Kim, S., Lee, H., Kwon, Y., Yu, M., & Jo, H. (2016). Our journey to becoming agile: Experiences with agile transformation in Samsung electronics. *Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference*, 377–380. <https://doi.org/10.1109/APSEC.2016.064>

Kline, R. B. (2023). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (5th ed.). Guilford.

Korhonen, K. (2013). Evaluating the impact of an agile transformation: A longitudinal case study in a distributed context. *Software Quality Journal*, 21(4), 599–624. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11219-012-9189-4>

Kreitchmann, R. S., Abad, F. J., Ponsoda, V., Nieto, M. D., & Morillo, D. (2019). Controlling for response biases in self-report scales: Forced-choice vs. psychometric modeling of likert items. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(2309). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02309>

Krumm, S., Lievens, F., Hüffmeier, J., Lipnevich, A. A., Bendels, H., & Hertel, G. (2015). How “situational” is judgment in situational judgment tests? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 399–416. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037674>

Leitgöb, H., Seddig, D., Asparouhov, T., Behr, D., Davidov, E., De Roover, K., Jak, S., Meitinger, K., Menold, N., Muthén, B., Rudnev, M., Schmidt, P., & van de Schoot, R.



- (2023). Measurement invariance in the social sciences: Historical development, methodological challenges, state of the art, and future perspectives. *Social Science Research*, 110(September 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2022.102805>
- Marsh, H. W., Guo, J., Dicke, T., Parker, P. D., & Craven, R. G. (2020). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM), and set-ESEM: Optimal balance between goodness of fit and parsimony. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 55(1), 102–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2019.1602503>
- Marsh, H. W., Lüdtke, O., Muthén, B., Asparouhov, T., Morin, A. J. S., Trautwein, U., & Nagengast, B. (2010). A new look at the big five factor structure through exploratory structural equation modeling. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(3), 471–491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019227>
- Marsh, H. W., Morin, A. J. S., Parker, P. D., & Kaur, G. (2014). Exploratory structural equation modeling: An integration of the best features of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 10(November), 85–110. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153700>
- McNeish, D. (2018). Thanks coefficient alpha, We'll take it from here. *Psychological Methods*, 23(3), 412–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144>
- Morin, A., Myers, N., & Lee, S. (2020). Modern factor analytic techniques: Bifactor models, exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM), and bifactor-ESEM. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of Sport Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 1044–1073). John Wiley & Sons.
- Mosier, C. I. (1943). On the reliability of a weighted composite. *Psychometrika*, 8(3), 161–168.
- Muduli, A. (2017). Workforce agility: Examining the role of organizational practices and psychological empowerment. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 36(5), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21800>
- Munteanu, A. I., Bibu, N., Nastase, M., Cristache, N., & Matis, C. (2020). Analysis of practices to increase the workforce agility and to develop a sustainable and competitive business. *Sustainability*, 12(3545). <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12093545>



- Muthén, B. O. (1989). Latent variable modeling in heterogeneous populations. *Psychometrika*, 54(4), 557–585. <https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt40p8s1nw/qt40p8s1nw.pdf>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2017). *Mplus user's guide*. Muthén & Muthén.
- Patterson, F., Ashworth, V., Zibarras, L., Coan, P., Kerrin, M., & O'Neill, P. (2012). Evaluations of situational judgement tests to assess non-academic attributes in selection. *Medical Education*, 46(9), 850–868. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2012.04336.x>
- Peiker, S. (2023). *How workforce agility can help retention — even in a recession*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeshumanresourcescouncil/2023/04/19/how-workforce-agility-can-help-retention-even-in-a-recession/?sh=e0636d318c26>
- Petermann, M. K. H., & Zacher, H. (2022). Workforce agility: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(841862). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.841862>
- Plonka, F. E. (1997). Developing a lean and agile work force. *Human Factors and Ergonomics In Manufacturing*, 7(1), 11–20. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6564\(199724\)7:1<11::AID-HFM2>3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6564(199724)7:1<11::AID-HFM2>3.0.CO;2-J)
- Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Developmental Review*, 41, 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004>
- Qin, R., & Nembhard, D. A. (2015). Workforce agility in operations management. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science*, 20(2), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sorms.2015.11.001>
- Quy, N. N., & Vinh, P. T. (2021). Problematic issues of personality assessment in selection: An exploration study in Vietnam. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Emerging Challenges: Business Transformation and Circular Economy (ICECH 2021)*, 196(Icech), 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.211119.015>



- Raut, P. K., Das, J. R., Gochhayat, J., & Das, K. P. (2022). Influence of workforce agility on crisis management: Role of job characteristics and higher administrative support in public administration. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 61, 647–652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.08.121>
- Rios, J., & Wells, C. (2014). Validity evidence based on internal structure. *Psicothema*, 26(1), 108–116. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2013.260>
- Rubio, D. M. G., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., & Rauch, S. M. (2003). Validating a measure across groups: The use of MIMIC models in scale development. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 29(3), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1300/J079v29n03_03
- Saaatcioglu, F. M. (2022). Differential item functioning across gender with MIMIC modeling: PISA 2018 financial literacy items. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 9(3), 631–653. <https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1076464>
- Schmidtner, M., Doering, C., & Timinger, H. (2021). Agile working during COVID-19 pandemic. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 49(2), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2021.3069940>
- Sharifi, H., & Zhang, Z. (1999). Methodology for achieving agility in manufacturing organisations: An introduction. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(1), 7–22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273\(98\)00217-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00217-5)
- Sherehiy, B. (2008). *Relationships between agility strategy, work organization, and workforce agility*. University of Louisville.
- Sherehiy, B., & Karwowski, W. (2014). The relationship between work organization and workforce agility in small manufacturing enterprises. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 44(3), 466–473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ergon.2014.01.002>
- Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika*, 74(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-008-9101-0>
- Sommer, A. F. (2019). Agile transformation at LEGO group: Implementing agile methods in multiple departments changed not only processes but also employees' behavior



and mindset. *Research Technology Management*, 62(5), 20–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08956308.2019.1638486>

Sorrel, M. A., Olea, J., Abad, F. J., de la Torre, J., Aguado, D., & Lievens, F. (2016). Validity and reliability of situational judgement test scores: A new approach based on cognitive diagnosis models. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(3), 506–532.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116630065>

Souza, A. C. de, Alexandre, N. M. C., & Guirardello, E. de B. (2017). Psychometric properties in instruments evaluation of reliability and validity. *Applications of Epidemiology*, 26(3), 649–659. <https://doi.org/10.5123/S1679-49742017000300022>

Storme, M., Suleyman, O., Gotlib, M., & Lubart, T. (2020). Who is agile? An investigation of the psychological antecedents of workforce agility. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 39(6), 28–38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22055>

Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>

Tang, W., Cui, Y., & Psychology, E. (2014). Internal consistency: Do we really know what it is and how to assess it? *Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Science*, 2(2), 205–220.

Tessarini Junior, G., & Saltorato, P. (2021). Workforce agility: A systematic literature review and a research agenda proposal. *Innovar*, 31(81), 155–168.
<https://doi.org/10.15446/innovar.v31n81.95582>

Thayyib, P. V., & Khan, M. A. (2021). Do demographics influence workforce agility score of tax professionals in Bangalore, India? *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 40(4), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22084>

Tiffin, P. A., Paton, L. W., O'Mara, D., MacCann, C., Lang, J. W. B., & Lievens, F. (2020). Situational judgement tests for selection: Traditional vs construct-driven approaches. *Medical Education*, 54(2), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14011>

Tomás, I., Marsh, H. W., González-Romá, V., Valls, V., & Nagengast, B. (2014). Testing



- measurement invariance across spanish and english versions of the physical self-description questionnaire: An application of exploratory structural equation modeling. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36(2), 179–188. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2013-0070>
- Tóth-Király, I., Bőthe, B., Rigó, A., & Orosz, G. (2017). An illustration of the exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) framework on the passion scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(NOV). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01968>
- Tuomivaara, S., Lindholm, H., & Käsälä, M. (2017). Short-term physiological strain and recovery among employees working with agile and lean methods in software and embedded ICT systems. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 33(11), 857–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2017.1294336>
- van Zyl, L. E., & ten Klooster, P. M. (2022). Exploratory structural equation modeling: Practical guidelines and tutorial with a convenient online tool for Mplus. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12(795672). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.795672>
- Vaske, J. J., Beaman, J., & Sponarski, C. C. (2017). Rethinking internal consistency in Cronbach's alpha. *Leisure Sciences*, 39(2), 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2015.1127189>
- Viranda, C., & Safitri, I. (2023). Psychometric properties of the workforce agility scale. *Psychological Research on Urban Society*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.7454/proust.v6i2.1148>
- Wang, J., & Wang, X. (2020). *Structural equation modeling: Applications using Mplus*. Wiley.
- Webster, E. S., Paton, L. W., Crampton, P. E. S., & Tiffin, P. A. (2020). Situational judgement test validity for selection: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medical Education*, 54(10), 888–902. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14201>
- Weekley, J. A., & Ployhart, R. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Woods, C. M., & Edwards, M. C. (2007). Factor analysis and related methods. In *Handbook of Statistics* (Vol. 27, pp. 367–394). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169->



UNIVERSITAS
GADJAH MADA

7161(07)27012-9

Evaluasi Properti Psikometris Workforce Agility Situational Judgement Test

Annisa Puspita Inderasari, Prof. Dr. Avin Fadilla Helmi, M.Si.

Universitas Gadjah Mada, 2024 | Diunduh dari <http://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/>

- Wu, M., Tam, H. P., & Jen, T.-H. (2017). *Educational measurement for applied researchers*. Springer. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-981-10-3302-5>
- Yusuf, Y. Y., Sarhadi, M., & Gunasekaran, A. (1999). Agile manufacturing: The drivers, concepts and attributes. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 62(1), 33–43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273\(98\)00219-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(98)00219-9)