

References and Research Sources

A consolidated bibliography of academic research, standards, policy guidance and project research consulted during the evolution from Lumina EDGE to Continuum.

Purpose. This document records the sources considered in the design process. It is not a claim that every cited source endorses Continuum, Talentbank or the current prototype.

Prepared by Mohd Hafiz Ali Bin Mohd Anuar

How to read this source record

The source list combines the original Lumina EDGE literature review with the standards and project research used in the Continuum refinement. Some sources are retained because they informed an explicit boundary: for example, personality and work-style research was reviewed, but Continuum does not implement personality typing, culture-fit scoring, a generic person ranking or automated hiring decisions.

Terminology clarification. The education-field classification used by Atlas is ISCED-F 2013 (International Standard Classification of Education Fields), not “ICESD”.

A. Selection, assessment and interview research

1. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
2. Zell, E., & Lesick, T. L. (2022). Big Five personality traits and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12683>
3. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2018). Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2018.195>
4. McDaniel, M. A., Hartman, N. S., Whetzel, D. L., & Grubb, W. L. (2007). Situational judgment tests, response instructions, and validity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00065.x>
5. Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., & McFarland, L. A. (2005). A meta-analysis of work sample test validity. *Personnel Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00714.x>
6. Campion, M. A., Pursell, E. D., & Brown, B. K. (1988). Structured interviewing: Raising the psychometric properties of the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00630.x>
7. Wingate, T. G., et al. (2025). The validity of structured interviews: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12494>
8. Sackett, P. R., Zhang, C., Berry, C. M., & Lievens, F. (2022). Revisiting meta-analytic estimates of validity in personnel selection. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000994>
9. Sackett, P. R., et al. (2023). Revisiting the design of selection systems in light of new findings regarding the validity of widely used predictors. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2023.20>

B. Skills, competency and career-readiness language

1. O*NET Resource Center. (n.d.). The O*NET Content Model. <https://www.onetcenter.org/content.html>
2. Putka, D. J., Kell, H. J., Voss, N., Oswald, F. L., & Lewis, P. (2024). Revisiting the Work Styles Domain of the O*NET Content Model. https://www.onetcenter.org/reports/Work_Styles_New.html

3. Pittenger, D. J. (2005). Cautionary comments regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57(3), 210-221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.57.3.210>
4. Nye, C. D., Su, R., Rounds, J., & Drasgow, F. (2012). Vocational interests and performance: A quantitative summary of over 60 years of research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(4), 384-403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612449021>
5. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2023). Is cognitive ability the best predictor of job performance? New research says it is time to think again. <https://www.sio.org/tip-article/is-cognitive-ability-the-best-predictor-of-job-performance-new-research-says-its-time-to-think-again/>
6. Webster, C. S., et al. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the validity of situational judgement tests. *Medical Education*, 54(10), 888-902. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.14201>
7. Bartram, D. (2005). The Great Eight competencies: A criterion-centric approach to validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1185-1203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1185>
8. National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2024). Competencies for a Career-Ready Workforce. <https://www.naceweb.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/2024/resources/nace-career-readiness-competencies-revised-apr-2024.pdf>
9. O*NET OnLine. (n.d.). Work Styles. <https://www.onetonline.org/find/descriptor/browse/1.D>
10. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2014). ISCED Fields of Education and Training 2013 (ISCED-F 2013).
11. European Commission. (2021). Towards a structured and consistent terminology on transversal skills and competences.
12. European Commission / ESCO. (n.d.). Transversal knowledge, skills and competences.
13. Malaysian Qualifications Agency. (n.d.). Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF), 2nd Edition.

C. Data protection, privacy and AI governance

1. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (n.d.). Employment Tests and Selection Procedures. <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/employment-tests-and-selection-procedures>
2. Jabatan Perlindungan Data Peribadi Malaysia. (n.d.). Personal Data Protection Act 2010 (Act 709). <https://www.pdp.gov.my/ppdpv1/en/akta/pdp-act-2010-en/>
3. Jabatan Perlindungan Data Peribadi Malaysia. (n.d.). Automated Decision-Making and Profiling Guideline. <https://www.pdp.gov.my/ppdpv1/en/akta/automated-decision-making-and-profiling-guideline-admp/>
4. Information Commissioner's Office. (2024). Thinking of using AI to assist recruitment? Our key data protection considerations. <https://ico.org.uk/about-the-ico/media-centre/news-and-blogs/2024/11/thinking-of-using-ai-to-assist-recruitment-our-key-data-protection-considerations/>
5. National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). AI Risk Management Framework 1.0. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>
6. McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00167>
7. Jabatan Perlindungan Data Peribadi Malaysia. (n.d.). Data Protection Impact Assessment Guideline. <https://www.pdp.gov.my/ppdpv1/en/>
8. Jabatan Perlindungan Data Peribadi Malaysia. (n.d.). Data Protection by Design Guideline. <https://www.pdp.gov.my/ppdpv1/en/>
9. Jabatan Perlindungan Data Peribadi Malaysia. (2024). Personal Data Protection (Amendment) Act 2024. <https://www.pdp.gov.my/ppdpv1/en/akta/personal-data-protection-amendment-act-2024/>
10. Information Commissioner's Office. (2024). AI in recruitment: Outcomes report. <https://ico.org.uk/media2/migrated/4031620/ai-in-recruitment-outcomes-report.pdf>

D. Project research and internal design materials

These project materials were used to preserve the unique Lumina evidence engine while refining Continuum into an evidence-to-outcome operating layer.

1. Lumina EDGE Full Context. Internal product context and evidence-engine specification.
2. Laporan Khas Lumina EDGE. Internal research report and reference compilation.
3. Kajian Strategi Hackathon Talentbank. Internal strategic research for the Talentbank hackathon context.
4. Analisis Mendalam Sistem Talentbank Baharu. Internal product and ecosystem analysis.
5. Laporan Deep Research PROJECT NAME Talentbank. Internal research synthesis.
6. Laporan Strategi Produk Bersatu Talentbank Lumina EDGE. Internal product architecture and decision record.

7. Laporan RedTeam Lumina. Internal red-team review of risks, trust boundaries and adoption issues.
8. Analisis Kritikal Sistem Talentbank Lumina. Internal critical review and product refinement record.
9. Talentbank Career OS Independent Research and Readiness Report. Internal Career OS positioning and readiness report.
10. Continuum System Specification and Atlas Diagram Brief. Current system vocabulary, graph structure and product boundaries.
11. Mentor discussion notes, Coach LENAgaz. Product direction, stakeholder logic, user journeys and demonstration decisions.

Reference integrity note

The bibliography keeps the source information available in the original Lumina EDGE reference list and the current Continuum research pack. Where an original report supplied a group author, “et al.” entry or undated web resource, that form is retained rather than reconstructed without verification.