APEM journal

Advances in Production Engineering & Management
Volume 17 | Number 1 | March 2022 | pp 57–74
https://doi.org/10.14743/apem2022.1.421

ISSN 1854-6250
Journal home: apem-journal.org
Original scientific paper

The role of agility in responding to uncertainty: A cognitive perspective

Kim, Minkyun [a], **Chai, Sangmi** [b,*]

[a]Sogang University, Sogang Business School, Seoul, Republic of Korea
[b]Ewha Womans University, Ewha School of Business, Seoul, Republic of Korea

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the impact of external environment, cognitive factors, and behavioral dimensions in the context of implementing supply chain agility. It applies social cognitive theory to establish a link between various environments including business uncertainty and supply chain disruption risk, cognitive factors such as supply chain agility self-efficacy, trust, and supply chain cooperation, coordination, and communication attitude, and actions such as implementing supply chain agility as well as behavior to explain the decision-making process in implementation. Based on the survey data collected from 254 supply and purchasing managers in the Korean manufacturing industry, AMOS software with structural equation method was used for data analysis Our results support the concept that business uncertainty reduces self-efficacy in supply chain agility although both business uncertainty and supply chain disruption risk boosted trust in the supply chain as well as buyers' positive attitude toward supply chain cooperation, coordination, and communication. The concept of supply chain agility, self-efficacy, trust, and supply chain cooperation, coordination, and communication attitude have a positive impact on firm performance. Supply chain agility, self-efficacy, and trust in suppliers positively affects implementation of supply chain agility as well as firms' financial, operational, and supply chain performance. This research provides meaningful insights for considering external environments and cognitive factors while making decisions in implementing supply chain agility.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Supply chain;
Supply chain agility;
Uncertainty;
Business uncertainty;
Supply chain disruption risk;
Trust;
Performance;
Structural equation modeling (SEM);
Cognition;
Cognitive manufacturing

**Corresponding author:*
smchai@ewha.ac.kr
(Chai, Sangmi)

Article history:
Received 1 July 2021
Revised 4 March 2022
Accepted 7 March 2022

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (CC BY 4.0). Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.

References

[1] Gligor, D.M., Holcomb, M.C. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of supply chain agility: Establishing the link to firm performance, *Journal of Business Logistics,* Vol. 33, No. 4, 295-308, doi: 10.1111/jbl.12003.
[2] Dubeauclard, R., Kubik, K., Ngali, V. (2015). How agile is your supply chain, from *https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/operations/our-insights/how-agile-is-your-supply-chain*, accessed March 14, 2016.
[3] Braunscheidel, M.J., Suresh, N.C. (2009). The organizational antecedents of a firm's supply chain agility for risk mitigation and response, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 27, No. 2, 119-140, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2008.09.006.
[4] Swafford, P.M., Ghosh, S., Murthy, N. (2006). The antecedents of supply chain agility of a firm: scale development and model testing, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 24, No. 2, 170-188, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2005.05.002.
[5] Gligor, D.M., Holcomb, M.C., Stank, T.P. (2013). A multidisciplinary approach to supply chain agility: Conceptualization and scale development, *Journal of Business Logistics*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 94-108, doi: 10.1111/jbl.12012.
[6] Gligor, D.M., Esmark, C.L., Holcomb, M.C. (2015). Performance outcomes of supply chain agility: When should you be agile?, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 33-34, No. 1, 71-82, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2014.10.008.

[7] Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA.
[8] Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective, *Annual Review of Psychology,* Vol. 52, No. 1, 1-26, doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1.
[9] Kim, M., Chai, S. (2016). Assessing the impact of business uncertainty on supply chain integration, *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 463-485, doi: 10.1108/IJLM-11-2014-0175.
[10] Kim, M., Suresh, N.C., Kocabasoglu-Hillmer, C. (2015). A contextual analysis of the impact of strategic sourcing and E-procurement on performance, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing,* Vol. 30, No. 1, 1-16, doi: 10.1108/JBIM-01-2012-0010.
[11] Ambulkar, S., Blackhurst, J., Grawe, S. (2015). Firm's resilience to supply chain disruptions: Scale development and empirical examination, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 33-34, No. 1, 111-122, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2014.11.002.
[12] Li, Y., Zhen, X., Qi, X., Cai, G. (2016). Penalty and financial assistance in a supply chain with supply disruption, *Omega,* Vol. 61, No. 2, 167-181, doi: 10.1016/j.omega.2015.12.011.
[13] Trkman, P., McCormack, K. (2009). Supply chain risk in turbulent environments – A conceptual model for managing supply chain network risk, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 119, No. 2, 247-258, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.03.002.
[14] Wu, G.-C. (2013). The influence of green supply chain integration and environmental uncertainty on green innovation in Taiwan's IT industry, *Supply Chain Management,* Vol. 18, No. 5, 539-552, doi: 10.1108/SCM-06-2012-0201.
[15] Sitkin, S.B., Weingart. L.R. (1995). Determinants of risky decision-making behavior: A test of the mediating role of risk perceptions and propensity, *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 38, No. 6, 1573-1592, doi: 10.2307/256844.
[16] Kocabasoglu, C., Prahinski, C., Klassen. R.D. (2007). Linking forward and reverse supply chain investments: The role of business uncertainty, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 25, No. 6, 1141-1160, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2007.01.015.
[17] Keats, B.W., Hitt, M.A. (1988). A causal model of linkages among environmental dimensions, macro organizational characteristics, and performance, *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 31, No. 3, 570-598, doi: 10.5465/256460.
[18] Zhang, M., Huo, B. (2013). The impact of dependence and trust on supply chain integration, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management,* Vol. 43, No. 7, 544-563, doi: 10.1108/IJPDLM-10-2011-0171.
[19] Cai, S., Jun, M., Yang, Z. (2010). Implementing supply chain information integration in China: The role of institutional forces and trust, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 28, No. 3, 257-268, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2009.11.005.
[20] Corsten, D., Gruen, T., Peyinghaus, M. (2011). The effects of supplier-to-buyer identification on operational performance – An empirical investigation of inter-organizational identification in automotive relationships, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 29, No. 6, 549-560, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2010.10.002.
[21] Sahay, B.S. (2003). Understanding trust in supply chain relationships, *Industrial Management & Data Systems,* Vol. 103, No. 8, 553-563, doi: 10.1108/02635570310497602.
[22] Ding, H., Guo, B., Liu, Z. (2011). Information sharing and profit allotment based on supply chain cooperation, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 133, No. 1, 70-79, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2010.06.015.
[23] Huo, B., Zhang, C., Zhao, X. (2015). The effect of IT and relationship commitment on supply chain coordination: A contingency and configuration approach, *Information & Management*, Vol. 52, No. 6, 728-740, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2015.06.007.
[24] Jacobs, M.A., Yu, W., Chavez, R. (2016). The effect of internal communication and employee satisfaction on supply chain integration, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 171, Part 1, 60-70, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.10.015.
[25] Gligor, D., Gligor, N., Holcomb, M., Bozkurt, S. (2019). Distinguishing between the concepts of supply chain agility and resilience: A multidisciplinary literature review, *The International Journal of Logistics Management,* Vol. 30, No. 2, 467-487, doi: 10.1108/IJLM-10-2017-0259.
[26] Gligor, D.M., Holcomb, M.C., Feizabadi, J. (2016). An exploration of the strategic antecedents of firm supply chain agility: The role of a firm's orientations, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 179, 24-34, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2016.05.008.
[27] Lent, R.W., Ireland, G.W., Penn, L.T., Morris, T.R., Sappington, R. (2017). Sources of self-efficacy and outcome expectations for career exploration and decision-making: A test of the social cognitive model of career self-management, *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* Vol. 99, 107-117, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2017.01.002.
[28] Guan, P., Capezio, A., Restubog, S.L.D., Read, S., Lajom, J.A.L., Li, M. (2016). The role of traditionality in the relationships among parental support, career decision-making self-efficacy and career adaptability, *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* Vol. 94, 114-123, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.02.018.
[29] Chen, I.-S. (2017). Computer self-efficacy, learning performance, and the mediating role of learning engagement, *Computers in Human Behavior,* Vol. 72, 362-370, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2017.02.059.
[30] Wong, C.Y., Boon-itt, S., Wong, C.W.Y. (2011). The contingency effects of environmental uncertainty on the relationship between supply chain integration and operational performance, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 29, No. 6, 604-615, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2011.01.003.
[31] Lee, S.-Y., Klassen. R.D. (2016). Firms' response to climate change: The interplay of business uncertainty and organizational capabilities, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 25, No. 8, 577-592, doi: 10.1002/bse.1890.

[32] Chen, C.C., Greene, P.G., Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers?, *Journal of Business Venturing,* Vol. 13, No. 4, 295-316, doi: 10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00029-3.
[33] Krueger, N., Dickson. P.R. (1994). How believing in ourselves increases risk taking: Perceived self-efficacy and opportunity recognition, *Decision Sciences,* Vol. 25, No. 3, 385-400.
[34] Wei, H.-L., Wong, C.W.Y., Lai, K.-H. (2012). Linking inter-organizational trust with logistics information integration and partner cooperation under environmental uncertainty, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 139, No. 2, 642-653, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.05.036.
[35] Lai, K.-H., Bao, Y., Li, X. (2008). Channel relationship and business uncertainty: Evidence from the Hong Kong market, *Industrial Marketing Management,* Vol. 37, No. 6, 713-724, doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2007.05.017.
[36] Wang, L., Yeung, J.H.Y., Zhang, M. (2011). The impact of trust and contract on innovation performance: The moderating role of environmental uncertainty, *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 134, No. 1, 114-122, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2011.06.006.
[37] Fynes, B., de Búrca, S., Marshall, D. (2004). Environmental uncertainty, supply chain relationship quality and performance, *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management,* Vol. 10, No, 4-5, 179-190, doi: 10.1016/j.pursup.2004.11.003.
[38] Sharfman, M.P., Shaft, T.M., Anex. R.P. (2009). The road to cooperative supply-chain environmental management: Trust and uncertainty among pro-active firms, *Business Strategy and the Environment,* Vol. 18, No. 1, 1-13, doi: 10.1002/bse.580.
[39] Ellis, S.C., Henry, R.M., Shockley, J. (2010). Buyer perceptions of supply disruption risk: A behavioral view and empirical assessment*, Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 28, No. 1, 34-46, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2009.07.002.
[40] Ghosh, D., Ray, M.R. (1997). Risk, ambiguity, and decision choice: Some additional evidence, *Decision Sciences,* Vol. 28, No. 1, 81-104, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5915.1997.tb01303.x.
[41] Christopher, M., Lee, H. (2004). Mitigating supply chain risk through improved confidence, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management,* Vol. 34, No. 5, 388-396, doi: 10.1108/09600030410545436.
[42] Jüttner, U. (2005). Supply chain risk management: Understanding the business requirements from a practitioner perspective, *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 120-141, doi: 10.1108/09574090510617385.
[43] Wiengarten, F., Humphreys, P., Gimenez, C., McIvor, R. (2016). Risk, risk management practices, and the success of supply chain integration, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 171, Part 3, 361-370, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.03.020.
[44] Li, G., Fan, H., Lee, P.K.C., Cheng, T.C.E. (2015). Joint supply chain risk management: An agency and collaboration perspective, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 164, 83-94, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.02.021.
[45] Ritchie, B., Brindley, C. (2007). Supply chain risk management and performance: A guiding framework for future development, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* Vol. 27, No. 3, 303-322, doi: 10.1108/01443570710725563.
[46] Blos, M.F., Quaddus, M., Wee, H.M., Watanabe, K. (2009). Supply chain risk management (SCRM): A case study on the automotive and electronic industries in Brazil, *Supply Chain Management,* Vol. 14, No. 4, 247-252, doi: 10.1108/13598540910970072.
[47] Boyd, N.G., Vozikis. G.S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 18, No. 4, 63-77, doi: 10.1177/104225879401800404.
[48] Wilson, F., Kickul, J., Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 31, No. 3, 387-406, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00179.x.
[49] Chau, P.Y. (2001). Influence of computer attitude and self-efficacy on IT usage behavior, *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing,* Vol. 13, No. 1, 26-33, doi: 10.4018/joeuc.2001010103.
[50] Locke, E.A., Frederick, E., Lee, C., Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 69, No. 2, 241-251, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.69.2.241.
[51] Tierney, P., Farmer, S.M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance, *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 45, No. 6, 1137-1148, doi: 10.5465/3069429.
[52] Hsia, J.-W., Chang, C.-C., Tseng, A.-H. (2014). Effects of individuals' locus of control and computer self-efficacy on their e-learning acceptance in high-tech companies, *Behaviour & Information Technology,* Vol. 33, No. 1, 51-64, doi: 10.1080/0144929X.2012.702284.
[53] Handfield, R.B., Bechtel, C. (2002). The role of trust and relationship structure in improving supply chain responsiveness, *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 367-382, doi: 10.1016/S0019-8501(01)00169-9.
[54] Khan, K.A., Pillania, R.K. (2008). Strategic sourcing for supply chain agility and firms' performance: A study of Indian manufacturing sector, *Management Decision,* Vol. 46, No. 10, 1508-1530, doi: 10.1108/00251740810920010.
[55] Agarwal, A., Shankar, R., Tiwari, M.K. (2007). Modeling agility of supply chain, *Industrial Marketing Management.* Vol. 36, No. 4, 443-457, doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2005.12.004.
[56] Krishnan, R., Martin, X., Noorderhaven, N.G. (2006). When does trust matter to alliance performance?, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 5, 894-917, doi: 10.5465/amj.2006.22798171.
[57] Arranz, N., de Arroyabe. J.C.F. (2012). Effect of formal contracts, relational norms and trust on performance of joint research and development projects, *British Journal of Management,* Vol. 23, No. 4, 575-588, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00791.x.
[58] Capaldo, A., Giannoccaro, I. (2015). How does trust affect performance in the supply chain? The moderating role of interdependence, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 166, 36-49, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.04.008.

[59] Yusuf, Y.Y., Gunasekaran, A., Musa, A., Dauda, M., El-Berishy, N.M., Cang, S. (2014). A relational study of supply chain agility, competitiveness and business performance in the oil and gas industry, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 147, Part B, 531-543, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2012.10.009.
[60] Wieland, A., Wallenburg, C.M. (2013). The influence of relational competencies on supply chain resilience: A relational view, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management,* Vol. 43, No, 4, 300-320, doi: 10.1108/IJPDLM-08-2012-0243.
[61] Zhu, Q., Sarkis, J., Geng, Y. (2005). Green supply chain management in China: Pressures, practices and performance, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* Vol. 25, No. 5, 449-468, doi: 10.1108/01443570510593148.
[62] Da Silveira, G.J.C., Arkader, R. (2007). The direct and mediated relationships between supply chain coordination investments and delivery performance, *International Journal of Operations & Production Management,* Vol. 27, No. 2, 140-158, doi: 10.1108/01443570710720595.
[63] Wu, F., Yeniyurt, S., Kim, D., Cavusgil, S.T. (2006). The impact of information technology on supply chain capabilities and firm performance: A resource-based view, *Industrial Marketing Management,* Vol. 35, No. 4, 493-504, doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2005.05.003.
[64] Cao, M., Zhang, Q. (2011). Supply chain collaboration: Impact on collaborative advantage and firm performance, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 29, No. 3, 163-180, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2010.12.008.
[65] Fullerton, R.R., Kennedy, F.A., Widener, S.K. (2014). Lean manufacturing and firm performance: The incremental contribution of lean management accounting practices, *Journal of Operations Management,* Vol. 32, No. 7-8, 414-428, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2014.09.002.
[66] Chen, D.Q., Preston, D.S., Xia, W. (2013). Enhancing hospital supply chain performance: A relational view and empirical test, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 31, No. 6, 391-408, doi: 10.1016/j.jom.2013.07.012.
[67] Mentzer, J.T., Flint, D.J. (1997). Validity in logistics research. *Journal of Business Logistics,* Vol. 18, No. 1, 199-216.
[68] Doty, D.H., Glick, W.H. (1998). Common methods bias: Does common methods variance really bias results?, *Organizational Research Methods,* Vol. 1, No. 4, 374-406, doi: 10.1177/109442819814002.
[69] Podsakoff, P.M., Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects, *Journal of Management,* Vol. 12, No. 4, 531-544, doi: 10.1177/014920638601200408.
[70] Byrne, B.M. (2008). *Structural equation modelling using SPSS and AMOS*, Taylor & Francis Group, New York, USA.
[71] Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., Mena, J.A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* Vol. 40, 414-433, doi: 10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6.
[72] Fornell, C., Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error, *Journal of Marketing Research,* Vol. 18, No. 1, 39-50, doi: 10.1177/002224378101800104.
[73] Browne, M.W., Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit, In: Bollen, K.A., Long, J.S. (eds.), *Testing structural equation models*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California, USA, 136-162.
[74] Kim, M., Chai, S. (2017). The impact of supplier innovativeness, information sharing and strategic sourcing on improving supply chain agility: Global supply chain perspective, *International Journal of Production Economics,* Vol. 187, 42-52, doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.02.007.
[75] Kwon, I.-W.G., Suh, T. (2004). Factors affecting the level of trust and commitment in supply chain relationships, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 4-14, doi: 10.1111/j.1745-493X.2004.tb00165.x.
[76] Rosin, F., Forget, P., Lamouri, S., Pellerin, R. (2021). Impact of Industry 4.0 on decision-making in an operational context, *Advances in Production Engineering & Management*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 500-514, doi: 10.14743/apem2021.4.416.
[77] Koppenhagen, F., Held, T. (2021). The implications of product modularisation on the development process, supplier integration and supply chain design in collaborative product development, *Advances in Production Engineering & Management*, Vol.16, No. 1, 82-98, doi: 10.14743/apem2021.1.386.

APEM journal

Advances in Production Engineering & Management
Letnik 17 | Številka 1 | Marec 2022 | Strani 57–74
https://doi.org/10.14743/apem2022.1.421

ISSN 1854-6250
Spletna stran: apem-journal.org
Izvirni znanstveni članek

Vloga agilnosti pri odzivanju na negotovost: kognitivna perspektiva

Kim, Minkyun [a], **Chai, Sangmi** [b,*]

[a]Sogang University, Sogang Business School, Seoul, Republic of Korea
[b]Ewha Womans University, Ewha School of Business, Seoul, Republic of Korea

POVZETEK

Ta raziskava preučuje vpliv zunanjega okolja, kognitivnih dejavnikov in vedenjskih dimenzij na izvajanje agilnosti dobavne verige. Uporabljena je socialno kognitivna teorija za vzpostavitev povezave med različnimi okolji, vključno s poslovno negotovostjo in tveganjem za pojav motenj v dobavni verigi, kognitivnimi dejavniki ter ukrepi. Med kognitivne dejavnike sodijo agilnost dobavne verige, samoučinkovitost, zaupanje ter sodelovanje v dobavni verigi in usklajevanje ter komunikacijski odnos, med ukrepe pa sodita izvajanje agilnosti dobavne verige in vedenje, ki omogoči razumevanje procesa odločanja pri izvajanju. Za analizo anketnih podatkov, zbranih pri 254 vodjih dobave in nabave v korejski proizvodni industriji, je bila uporabljena metoda strukturnih enačb in programska oprema AMOS. Rezultati kažejo, da poslovna negotovost zmanjšuje samoučinkovitost pri agilnosti dobavne verige, čeprav tako poslovna negotovost kot tveganje za pojav motenj v dobavni verigi povečata zaupanje v dobavno verigo ter pozitivno vplivata na odnos kupcev do sodelovanja, koordinacije in komunikacije v dobavni verigi. Agilnost dobavne verige, samoučinkovitost, zaupanje in sodelovanje v dobavni verigi, koordinacija in komunikacijski odnos pozitivno vplivajo na uspešnost podjetja. Agilnost dobavne verige, samoučinkovitost in zaupanje v dobavitelje pozitivno vplivajo na izvajanje agilnosti dobavne verige ter finančno, operativno in dobavno uspešnost podjetij. Ta raziskava zagotavlja pomemben vpogled v upoštevanje zunanjega okolja in kognitivnih dejavnikov med sprejemanjem odločitev pri izvajanju agilnosti dobavne verige.

PODATKI O ČLANKU

Ključne besede:
Dobavna veriga;
Agilnost dobavne verige;
Negotovost;
Poslovna negotovost;
Tveganje za pojav motenj v dobavni verigi;
Zaupanje;
Uspešnost;
Modeliranje strukturnih enačb (SEM);
Spoznanje;
Kognitivna proizvodnja

**Kontaktna oseba:*
smchai@ewha.ac.kr
(Chai, Sangmi)

Zgodovina članka:
Prejet 1. julija 2021
Popravljen 4. marca 2022
Sprejet 7. marca 2022

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (CC BY 4.0). Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI.