

Note: The published version of this paper is available as follows:

Shek DTL, Lin L, Leung, H, et al. Content Validation of the Service Leadership Attitudes Scale. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev*. 2018;17(1):147-157.

Int J Disabil Hum Dev 2018;17(1):00-00.
Running title: Content validation

Content validation of the service leadership attitudes scale

Daniel TL Shek, PhD, FHKPS, BBS, SBS, JP¹⁻⁵, Li Lin, PhD¹, Hildie Leung, PhD¹, Lu Yu, PhD¹, Cecilia MS Ma, BEd, MPhil, PhD¹ and Xiang Li, PhD⁶

¹*Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, PR China*

²*Centre for Innovative Programmes for Adolescents and Families, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, PR China*

³*Department of Social Work, East China Normal University, Shanghai, PR China*

⁴*Kiang Wu Nursing College of Macau, Macau, PR China*

⁵*Division of Adolescent Medicine, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, Lexington, Kentucky, United States of America*

⁶*Psychological Studies Academic Group, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

Abstract: The notion of service leadership has been proposed to meet the demands of service economies. However, there is no scientific measure of people's attitudes to service leadership. We thus developed the 132-items Service Leadership Attitudes Scale (SLAS) with an objective to measure individuals' attitudes and beliefs toward leadership qualities and leadership practices upheld by service leadership model. The current study reports the content validation based on the responses of three judges of experts. Results showed that the items were perceived by the experts to be relevant to, clear, and representative of the construct measured. The development of SLAS has implications for leadership development and education.

Keywords: Service leadership attitudes scale, service leadership, content validation, core beliefs

Correspondence: Professor Daniel TL Shek, PhD, Associate Vice President (Undergraduate Programme) and Chair Professor of Applied Social Sciences, Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Hong Kong. Email: daniel.shek@polyu.edu.hk

Submitted: December 02, 2016. **Revised:** December 26, 2016. **Accepted:** January 02, 2017.

Introduction

There is a global trend of economic transformation from manufacturing mode to service mode (1, 2), which requires a paradigm shift in the conceptualization of leadership. In manufacturing economies, good leaders are often regarded as those with extraordinary competence and ability to achieve greatest productivity. A stereotypical image of a leader in that era would be a person with power and authority who completely controls the operation. However, with the emergence of the service era, previous effective leadership qualities become increasingly inappropriate. Instead, the service era demands people-orientation (vs. task-orientation), relationship orientation (vs. man-machine interaction), service-orientation (vs. manufacturing orientation), morality (vs. maximization of profits), and soft skills (vs. hard skills) in leaders (3,4). The shifting economic environment calls for a new ideology of leadership that increases the competitiveness of team in the service economies.

In response to this call, Chung (5) proposed the notion of service leadership and asserted that service leadership “is about satisfying needs by consistently providing quality personal service to everyone one comes into contact with, including one’s self, others, groups, communities, systems, and environments” (p.5). Chung and his colleagues further enriched the idea of service leadership within the framework of the Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) (6-9). The idea of service leadership is in sharp contrast to the traditional leadership style in the manufacturing economies where leaders’ control, hierarchy, bureaucratic efficiency, and self-interest are of prime concern (10). It is featured with seven core beliefs, which serve as the fundamental cognition of a service leader (11).

First of all, service leaders believe that leadership is “a service aimed at ethically satisfying the needs of self, others, groups, communities, systems, and environments” (Core Belief 1) (11). In contrast to the view regarding leadership as an instrument to obtain profit and fame, service leaders serve the needs beyond the self. During service provision, service leaders also believe that high-quality personalized service is important as it will influence the commitment and loyalty of the followers toward the leader. As a result, service leadership “is about creating appropriate personal service propositions in real time and constantly striving to provide the highest quality service one afford to everyone one comes into contact with and whose lives are affected by one’s actions or leadership” (Core Belief 5) (11). To service leaders, service activities are not regulated by external forces such as material reward or punishment alone. Instead, the drive for serving others and being served by others has been evolved over history and hard-wired into human nature. Service leadership is thus regarded as the “oldest, most competitive and longest serving business model” (Core Belief 6) (11).

Different from the idea that successful leadership is determined by one’s competence, service leadership model posits that “leadership effectiveness and service satisfaction are dependent on a leader or service provider possessing relevant situational task competencies plus being judged by superiors, peers, and subordinates as possessing character and exhibiting care” (Core Belief 3) (11). In brief, effective service leadership (E) is a function of one’s moral competence (M), competencies (C), and caring disposition (C) (i.e., $E=MC^2$). Service leadership model emphasizes moral character and caring disposition relative to competence, as they believe that demonstration of moral character and caring disposition helps to win trust and respect from the followers, which further benefit leaders, followers and the collective. The idea of “hire for character, train for skills” (7) well exemplifies this belief.

Besides service leadership skills, successful service leaders should also have positive beliefs about leadership development. Initially, they believe in average people's capacity to be a leader, specifically, "everyday, every human occupies a position of leadership and possesses the potential to improve his or her leadership quality and effectiveness" (Core Belief 2) (11). By holding this belief, service leaders are more likely to adopt distributed leadership, which encourages the initiative-taking and participation of followers into decision-making. Chung deeply believes that distributed leadership is the formula for building up a successful corporate culture in service business, and he explained that "the formula is very simple: give people something within their ability to decide and the power to do it, make this part of their daily life" (12). Furthermore, the Core Belief 2 implies the possibility for improving leadership. Actually, service leaders believe that "service includes self-development efforts aimed at ethically improving one's competencies, abilities, and willingness to help satisfy the needs of others" (Core Belief 4). A commitment to continuous improvement is required by service leadership. Such efforts in self-development would pay off, because "now and in the future, high-paying, high status positions and management promotions will go to people who have domain specific knowledge and skills plus service leadership competencies, appropriate character strengths and a caring social disposition" (Core Belief 7) (11).

Although the service leadership ideology has been delivered to many college students in Hong Kong via educational activities in the Fung Service Leadership Initiative (FSLI) (13), the theoretical underpinning of service leadership is still in its infancy. The initial ideas were primarily based on the business experience and wisdom of Po Chung, in particular, his experience as the co-founder of DHL International. Later, with the implementation of FSLI, scholars from the eight government-funded tertiary institutions in Hong Kong contributed to the theoretical development of service leadership. However, the theoretical model with its underlying assumptions and inferred propositions has been left untested, which hinders the transition of service leadership model from experiential wisdom to scientific theory. A lack of validated assessment instrument is apparently an obstacle for the further advancement. As argued by Slavec and Drnovšek (14), "effective measurement is a cornerstone of scientific research ... reliable and valid measures contribute to the legitimacy and development of a research field" (p. 39).

With the measure that assesses the attitudes and beliefs toward service leadership, multiple research questions can be tested. For example, Chung and Bell (6) mentioned that despite the service industries have contributed a large share to the Hong Kong GDP, many leaders still hold the traditional attitudes toward leadership inherited from the manufacturing era. This observation can be tested by assessing the degree of endorsement of service leadership attitudes and beliefs among leaders in different organizations. Additionally, what are the consequences of service leadership attitudes and beliefs is one of the top questions awaiting to be solved in this field. For example, would such attitudes and beliefs predict service leadership practice? Would such attitudes and beliefs benefit one's teamwork? As such, there is a need to develop and validate an assessment instrument that measures to what extent people evaluate service leadership.

Leadership attitudes scales

How one behaves as a leader is affected by one's beliefs about ideal leadership (15). However, compared to the abundance of measures assessing leadership behavior or practice, assessment instruments about leadership beliefs and attitudes are relatively rare. In the 1950s-70s, two scales were developed to understand the fundamental beliefs of people towards leadership, one is the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) developed by Fleishman (16) and the other is the

leadership belief questionnaire developed by Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (17). LOQ asks participants to report their attitudes toward leadership practice by evaluating how frequently they thought they should do the described behavior. It consists of two dimensions of behavior, including consideration (e.g., “help people in the work group with their personal problems”; “back up what people under you do.”) and initiating structure (e.g., “emphasize meeting of deadlines”; “meet with the work group at regularly scheduled times.”). This scale has been used in leaders from different kinds of organizations (16, 18). However, as the concepts of consideration and structure were criticized by the leadership scholars (19, 20), this scale gradually received less attention in leadership research.

Another scale on attitudes toward leadership primarily measures leaders’ fundamental beliefs toward democratic/participative vs. dictatorial/ authoritarian leadership (17). Specifically, it covers one’s beliefs about average people’s capacity for leadership and initiative, sharing information, participative management, and internal vs. external control of the individual toward the job. This scale was often used to examine the beliefs of leadership in different cultures (e.g., 17, 21). However, the construct validity of this scale was questioned by Bottger, Hallein, and Yetton (22), as the items measuring beliefs about leadership capacity referred to average people, while the rest of them referred to subordinate, which are not consistent. Similarly, this scale has been rarely used nowadays.

After the millennium, the most commonly used scale nowadays is Leadership Attitudes and Belief Scale (LABS) developed by Wielkiewicz (23). Adopting the ecological model of leadership (23, 24), he first developed a scale to assess serials of attitudes and beliefs about leadership in college students. In the original LABS (LABS-R), 86 items were generated with regard to attitudes toward authority (i.e., leaders’ authority status), ethics (i.e., the importance of ethics in leadership), learning orientation (i.e., importance of learning in personal development and organization), relationship orientation (i.e., the importance of cooperation), change (i.e., consideration of change in leadership process), positional leader dependence (i.e., dependence of leadership on position), systemic thinking (i.e., the influence of systemic process on leadership process). The initial scale later was narrowed down into two dimensions with 28 items (LABS-III) (25), including systemic thinking (e.g., “everyone’s ideas and concepts could make contributions to the organizational success”) and hierarchal thinking (e.g., “believing in the position determined organizational leadership”). In general, the LABS-III was widely used among college students regardless of whether they were taking a leadership position or not. For example, it was successfully used to investigate role of gender and college experience in leadership attitudes (26, 27).

Other researchers also developed their own attitudes scales, but were rarely used by other researchers. For example, Rao (28) developed the Supervisory and Leadership Beliefs Questionnaire (SLBQ) to investigate the leadership beliefs of supervisor for effectively guiding subordinates, and Hiller (29) developed the Orientation Toward Leadership Scale in the thesis aimed to measure of individuals’ conception of leadership.

The scales reviewed above cover some concepts related to service leadership model. For example, the LOQ measures leaders’ opinions about consideration which is similar to attitudes toward caring disposition in the service leadership model. Haire et al.’s (17) scale measures attitudes toward average people’s capacity to take leadership role, which is related to the attitudes toward the core belief “everyone can be a leader”. LABS-R measures individual attitudes about to what extent ethics should play an important role in leadership process, which is similar to attitudes

toward moral character. Finally, most of these measures concern democratic vs. authoritarian leadership attitudes, which is related to attitudes toward distributed leadership.

However, some essential components of service leadership were missing in the scale literature. The most obvious deficit is the lack of measures assessing individuals' attitudes toward the role of service in leadership (e.g., to what extent, a leader should serve others). Other critical attitudes such as the attitudes towards the importance of multiple competences in leadership, self-leadership, and the nature of service are absent in the leadership assessment instruments. More importantly, most of the existing scales were developed for people occupying specific leadership positions (e.g., LOQ and SLBQ). As service leadership model uphold the belief in everyone's capacity and potential to be a leader, it is necessary to understand how average people think about service leadership irrespective of their experience in their positions.

The Service Leadership Attitudes Scale (SLAS)

Against this background, we developed the Service Leadership Attitudes Scale (SLAS) which attempts to assess individuals' attitudes and beliefs about desirable leadership practices and leadership qualities within the SLAM framework. Specifically, it taps on one's attitudes and beliefs about what a desirable service leadership process should be, what kind of qualities a good leader is expected to possess, and what kind of functions a good service leader is expected to perform. A total of 10 aspects of attitudes / beliefs extracted from the core beliefs of the service leadership model were deemed important (7-9, 30), which serve as the conceptual framework for the scale development.

First, according to the definition of service leadership, service leaders regard leadership as a sort of service rather than a means to obtain profit and frame. Thus, service leaders should have a service orientation, which includes regarding leadership as a service and having the willingness to surpass self-interest to serve others. This is the fundamental attitude toward leadership that differentiates service leadership from other traditional leadership developed in the manufacturing economies. Second, service leadership model upholds the belief that "everyone can be a leader and has the potential to develop leadership qualities" (11). People who endorse this belief would have more confidence to assume leadership and improve their leadership qualities. Third, service leaders tend to regard distributed leadership as a desirable leadership practice. As noted by Chung and Bell (7), "distributed leadership suggests that an organization has been structured so that appropriate leadership decisions are pushed down to their lowest practical level" (p. 73). To adopt distributed leadership, leaders need to have favorable attitudes toward 1) shared decision-making such as allowing their subordinate to voice out their opinions and contribute to the decision-making process, 2) empowerment of followers such as encouraging their followers to take initiative and delegating greater authority to their followers, and 3) trust and respect towards followers' views such as acknowledging their views and trusting their abilities to make good decisions.

Fourth, service leaders tend to believe that service leadership increases one's employability. Specifically, service leaders believe that high-status and high-paying leadership positions will go to leaders who are willing and capable to serve others. Fifth, in the service economies, one-size-fits-all service is no longer an optimal choice. Instead, a good leader needs to create high-quality personalized service and sensitive to individual needs. Service leaders would consider providing personalized service as a desirable leadership practice. Sixth, service leaders believe that providing service is intrinsically enjoyable to the service providers, as the tendency to serve others has been evolved into the core of humanity. Service leaders would not regard service provision as regulated

by external force such as reward and punishment but motivated by human nature which has been evolved over history.

Seventh, service leaders believe that good leaders should have multiple intrapersonal competencies and interpersonal competence. There are four kinds of intrapersonal competencies that a good service leader should have, including IQ, EQ, AQ, and SQ. Intelligence quotient (IQ) includes comprehension and analytical abilities, independent thinking, critical thinking, logical reasoning and argumentation, flexibility (i.e., knowing how to improvise on the spot), and good problem-solving ability. Emotional quotient (EQ) includes understanding one's own emotions and others' emotions, and managing one's own emotions and relationship with others. Adversity quotient (AQ) includes the ability to accept and cope with kinds of adversity and bounce back from the adversity. Finally, spiritual intelligence quotient (SQ) includes the ability to use meaning, vision, and other spiritual resources to solve personal problems and motivate the followers (31). Service leaders would regard these competencies as important to a good leader. In addition, service leaders believe that good leaders should demonstrate interpersonal competencies in terms of being passionate about people, developing and maintaining positive social relationship, being assertive, being able to collaborate and cooperate with people, being able to resolve conflicts within the team/in the services, and having good communication skills.

Eighth, service leaders hold a view that good leaders should demonstrate moral character. It includes maintaining a well-developed personal code of ethics characterized by integrity, fairness and humanity, acting as an ethical role model, and believing in the power of morality which is about winning trust and respect from the followers by one's virtues instead of power. Ninth, service leaders believe that good leaders should demonstrate a caring disposition, including care and concern about others as well as taking care of others. For the care and concern, they believe that empathy and compassion are two major qualities that good leaders should have. For taking care of others, they believe that good leadership involves loving followers by showing benevolence, affection and forgiveness, supporting followers by providing physical and psychological resources to the followers, and developing followers by nurturing the growth of followers, coaching and mentoring the followers.

Finally, service leaders have a positive attitude toward commitment to continuous improvement. They would have a growth mindset rather than a fixed mindset about leadership, believing that leadership can be changed and nurtured. Regarding the malleability of human attributes, people usually have two kinds of mindsets. People who adopt a growth mindset believe that human attributes such as intelligence and personality could be developed through nurture while those who adopt a fixed mindset believe that human attributes are determined by nature (32). In contrast to the notion of "elite" or "inborn" leadership, the service leadership model asserts that everybody is (and can be) a leader. It adopts a humanistic perspective that every individual has potential to be a leader and that leadership qualities can be changed and improved. It emphasizes self-leadership and self-reflection and considers them as good practices for a leader. Before one can lead others, one must first be able to lead oneself. In addition, service leaders must engage in constant reflection on one's character, strengths, weaknesses, and service provision in order to seek for continuous improvement both professionally and personally. Generally, they believe in free will of human and tend to endorse Theory Y relative to Theory X about human behavior in organizations. Theory X and Y were proposed by McGregor (33) which concern the assumptions of human behavior in organizations. The underlying assumption of Theory X is that humans are inherently lazy, incapable of self-control, and have little to contribute to the effectiveness of the organization. On the contrary, Theory Y assumes that humans are not inherently lazy, but are

capable of self-direction and self-control, and are able to positively contribute to the organization. Theory X implies that leaders must closely monitor the behaviors and performance of followers, whereas Theory Y encourages distributed leadership through delegation and autonomy. Service leaders are supposed to endorse Theory Y.

Based on the theoretical propositions of the Service Leadership Model, the scale development was conducted by a team of four researchers with teaching and research experience in service leadership. The three junior researchers drafted the items and the senior research modified items and supervised the whole process. With several rounds of re-iteration, a total of 132 items were created. Respondents are requested to report the degree to which they agree or disagree with the 132 statements that describe desirable leadership qualities or leadership practices on a 6-point Likert scale. With the items ready, the first question we would like to address is whether this batch of items measure the target constructs. Therefore, we examined the content validity of this scale. Content validity refers to “the extent to which elements of an assessment instrument are relevant to and representative of the targeted construct for a particular assessment purpose” (34). In the scale development, many researchers used content validation as the first filter to select the good items (e.g., 35, 36). In this study, we relied on the evaluation of three judges of expert for the content validation.

Methods

Three experts who were familiar with service leadership, especially the framework of the Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management (SLAM), were invited to judge the content validity of the 132-item Service Leadership Attitudes Scale. All of them had a doctoral degree and were involved in the curriculum development and/or the teaching of the subject “Service Leadership”.

Instrument

The experts evaluated the scale independently via content validation form. The raters judged the content validity in the following aspects for each item:

- Relevance (1 = *Irrelevant*, 2 = *Unable to assess the relevance without item revision or item is in need of revision or otherwise would no longer be relevant*, 3 = *Relevant but needs minor amendment*, 4 = *Relevant*)
- Clarity (1 = *Very unclear*, 2 = *Unclear*, 3 = *Clear*, 4 = *Very clear*)
- Representativeness (1 = *Very unrepresentative*, 2 = *Unrepresentative*, 3 = *Representative*, 4 = *Very representative*)

They were invited to provide justifications if negative responses were given. Besides the ratings for individual item, the experts were invited to evaluate the overall quality of the scale with reference to the following questions:

1. Does this batch of multiple choice questions cover all the essential attitudes/beliefs in the service leadership framework?
2. Does this batch of multiple choice questions adequately represent the essential attitudes/beliefs in service leadership?

3. Overall speaking, are these multiple choice questions a valid measure of the basic body of attitudes/beliefs covered in the Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) model?
4. Additional attitude(s)/belief(s), if missing from the scale (open-ended question).
5. Other comments (open-ended question).

Results

In the present study, content validity was determined by the judgements of experts. Individual item content validity index (I-CVI) and average scale content validity index (S-CVI/ave) (37,38) were calculated to indicate the content validity of the scale. I-CVI was computed by the number of positive responses (option 3 or 4) divided by the number of experts (i.e., 3). S-CVI/ave was a mean score of the I-CVIs of all the items within each category or the overall scale. This approach has been used in previous scale validation studies (35).

On an individual level, most of the items had good I-CVI (see Table 1). Among 132 items, 129, 121, and 129 items were regarded as relevant, clear, representative, respectively, by all the judges. The items were modified according to the judges' comments. The S-CVI/ave for the whole scale indicated an excellent content validity (see Table 1). For each category, S-CVI/ave was also very good (see Table 2). Finally, all the judges showed favorable responses to the questions about the overall quality of the scale. They regarded it able to cover all the essential attitudes/beliefs of service leadership, adequate to represent the essential attitudes/beliefs of service leadership, and valid to measure basic body of attitudes/beliefs covered in the SLAM framework.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the content validity of a newly developed scale – The Service Leadership Attitudes Scale (SLAS). Consistent with the SLAM framework (6-9), we developed the Service Leadership Attitudes Scale to measure how individuals think about service leadership regardless of their leadership experience. To our best knowledge, this is the first scale assessing individuals' attitudes and beliefs toward leadership qualities and leadership process upheld by the SLAM framework. Besides, as there are very few leadership attitude scales, this study is also one of the few attempts to validate leadership attitudes scale.

The first question regarding the development of the scale is whether it measures what it is supposed to measure. Our results support the content validity of the scale based on the views of three experts. Results showed that almost all items were rated as relevant to the construct by all three judges of expert except three items. All but 11 items were rated as clear by all three judges. Only one item was regarded as unrepresentative of the construct by two judges and two items were regarded as unrepresentative of the construct by one judge. Items were revised with the suggestion of the judges. For example, the item that “good leader upholds the principle of ‘leading by personal example’” was created to measure the construct of role modeling in moral character, but it was regarded as irrelevant, unclear and unrepresentative of the construct by one expert. This item was thus revised as “a good leader sets an example for others to follow”. Another item “the views of leaders are always better than those of their subordinates” was replaced by the item “a good leader does not let their followers participate in the decision-making process” to represent the construct of shared decision making of distributed leadership, because it was regarded as unrepresentative of the construct by two judges. Generally speaking, the three judges regarded this batch of items covering the essential attitudes and beliefs within SLAM framework. Sample items were presented in the Appendix 1.

The development of the SLAS has theoretical and practical significance to the field of leadership theory and education. The attention toward leadership attitudes in the academia seems to fade out after 1980s, with leadership scholars and practitioners focusing more on the overt leadership behavior (39). The underlying attitudes/beliefs that a leader hold have been left under-examined or incorporated into leadership style (e.g., spiritual leadership) (40) for a long period of time. Although it is well-known that the link between attitudes/beliefs and actual behavior is not perfect (41), leadership attitude itself is important as it assesses the cognitive aspect of leadership development (42). Change in attitudes toward leadership (e.g., from a leader-centric perspective to a systemic perspective) signifies the development of leadership (27). The development of SLAS would contribute to our understanding of service leadership development. Practically speaking, it also helps with educational program evaluation. Specifically, this scale will help us know whether the current service leadership education or other learning experience is effective to transform people's views about leadership. Besides, understanding one's attitudes towards leadership also helps to understand the training needs of the respondents.

This study is not free of limitations. Obviously, the number and heterogeneity of the experts involved in this study was limited. Only three experts rated the scale, although it still met the minimum acceptable number of three experts proposed by Lynn (43). Obviously, the confidence in the robustness of the rating will increase with the increase in the number of judges (34). Additionally, the three experts were all in the academia, and thus their feedbacks were more scholastic-oriented. It is difficult to recruit other experts outside academia as the idea of service leadership has not been widely and deeply delivered yet. However, as suggested by Haynes et al. (34), population sampling can be used, in which the people from the target population can be invited to rate the scale. Thus, we can ask colleagues in the business field who have received training in service leadership to share their feedbacks on the items in the future. Moreover, the judges were required to rate the items only instead of all the elements of the scale. As recommended by Murphy and Davidshofer (44), all the elements of an assessment instruction including instructions, response format and scaling point should be under review. However, this study did not expressly request the judges to provide feedback on these elements, although one judge suggested to revise the scaling point from 6-point to 7-point in the open-ended question of "general comments". We can draw attention of judges to these elements in the future studies of content validation.

Despite these limitations, this study shows an initial yet important step in developing a scientific measure to assess people's attitudes toward service leadership. The scale was considered to be valid in terms of its content. Further studies on other aspects of validity await to be done.

Acknowledgments

This paper and the related research project on the development of the assessment tools for the Service Leadership Model are financially supported by the Victor and William Fung Foundation.

References

1. Giarini O. Basic features of services and some fundamentals of the (new) service economy. *Progress* 2001;33:20-8.
2. Shek DTL, Yu L, Ma CMS, Sun RCF, Liu TT. Development of a credit-bearing service leadership subject for university students in Hong Kong. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2013;25(4):353-61.

3. Kezar AJ, Carducci R, Contreras-McGavin M. Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution in research in higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2006.
4. Lusch RF, Vargo SL, O'Brien M. Competing through service: Insights from service-dominant logic. *J Retailing* 2007;83(1):5-18.
5. Chung P. Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management curriculum framework. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management, 2011.
6. Chung P, Bell A. Service reborn. New York: Lexingford, 2012.
7. Chung P, Bell A. The 25 principles of service leadership. New York: Lexingford, 2015.
8. Shek DTL, Chung P, Yu L, Merrick J, eds. Service leadership curriculum and higher education reform in Hong Kong. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):297-406.
9. Shek DTL, Chung P, Yu L, Merrick J, eds. Service leadership education for university students: Experience of Hong Kong. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):203-93.
10. Shek DTL, Chung P, Leung H. Manufacturing economy versus service economy: Implications for service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):205-15.
11. Shek DTL, Lin L. Core beliefs in the service leadership model proposed by the Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):233-42.
12. Luk M. Exercise of individual initiative underpins corporate success. *Career Times* 2005. URL: https://cthr.ctgoodjobs.hk/article/show_article.aspx/1174-10693-exercise-of-individual-initiative-underpins-corporate-success
13. Shek DTL, Chung P. eds. Promoting service leadership qualities in university students: The case of Hong Kong. *Quality of life in Asia*, vol. 6. Singapore: Springer, 2015.
14. Slavec A, Drnovsek M. A perspective on scale development in entrepreneurship research. *Econo Bus Rev* 2012;14(1):39-62.
15. Bass BM, Steidlmeier P. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadersh Q* 1999;10(2):181-217.
16. Fleishman EA. The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry. *J Appl Psychol* 1953;37(3):153-8.
17. Haire M, Ghiselli E, Porter L. Managerial thinking: An international study. New York: Wiley, 1966.
18. Clark AW, McCabe S. Leadership beliefs of Australian managers. *J Appl Psychol* 1970;54(1):1-6.
19. House RJ, Aditya RN. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *J Manage* 1997;23(3):409-73.
20. Yukl G, Van Fleet DD. Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In: Dunnette MD, Hough LM, eds. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1992:147-97.
21. Vardi Y, Shirom A, Jacobson D. A study on the leadership beliefs of Israeli managers. *Acad Manage J* 1980;23(2):367-74.
22. Bottger PC, Hallein IH, Yetton PW. A cross-national study of leadership: Participation as a function of problem structure and leader power. *J Manage Stud* 1985;22(4):358-68.
23. Wielkiewicz RM. The Leadership Attitudes and Beliefs Scale: An instrument for evaluating college students' thinking about leadership and organizations. *J Coll Stud Dev* 2000, 41(3):335-47.
24. Allen KE, Stelzner SP, Wielkiewicz RM. The ecology of leadership: Adapting to the challenges of a changing world. *J Leadersh Stud* 1998;5(2):62-82.

25. Wielkiewicz RM. Validity of the Leadership Attitudes and Beliefs Scale: Relationships with personality, communal orientation, and social desirability. *J Coll Stud Dev* 2002;43(1):108-18.
26. Wielkiewicz RM, Fischer DV, Stelzner SP, Overland M, Sinner AM. Leadership attitudes and beliefs of incoming first-year college students: A multi-institutional study of gender differences. *J Leadersh Educ* 2012;11(2):1-25.
27. Fischer DV, Wielkiewicz RM, Stelzner SP, Overland M, Meuwissen AS. Changes in leadership attitudes and beliefs associated with the college experience: A longitudinal study. *J Leadersh Educ* 2015;14(1):14-32.
28. Rao TV. Supervisory and Leadership Styles. In: Pareek U, Rao TV, Pestonjee DM, eds. *Behavioural processes in organisations*. New Delhi, India: Oxford IBH, 1981.
29. Hiller NJ. An examination of leadership beliefs and leadership self-identity: Constructs, correlates, and outcomes. Doctoral dissertation. ProQuest Information and Learning, 2006.
30. Chung P. Your second skin: Managing the 12 dimensions of your personal brand for the service age. Personal communication, 2015.
31. Shek DTL, Lin L. Intrapersonal competences and service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):255-63.
32. Dweck CS. Mindsets and human nature: Promoting change in the Middle East, the schoolyard, the racial divide, and willpower. *Am Psychol* 2012;67(8):614-22.
33. McGregor D. *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
34. Haynes SN, Richard D, Kubany ES. Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychol Assessment* 1995;7(3):238-47.
35. Leung JTY, Shek DTL. "All I can do for my child" – development of the Chinese Parental Sacrifice for Child's Education Scale. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2011;10(3):201-8.
36. Osman A, Kopper BA, Barrios F, Gutierrez PM, Bagge CL. Reliability and validity of the Beck depression inventory--II with adolescent psychiatric inpatients. *Psychol Assessment* 2004;16(2):120-32.
37. Polit DF, Beck CT. The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Res Nurs Health* 2006;29(5):489-97.
38. Rubio DM, Berg-Weger M, Tebb SS, Lee ES, Rauch S. Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Soc Work Res* 2003;27(2):94-104.
39. Avolio BJ, Walumbwa FO, Weber TJ. Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2009;60:421-49.
40. Fry LW. Introduction to The Leadership Quarterly special issue: Toward a paradigm of spiritual leadership. *Leadersh Q* 2005.16:619-22.
41. Kruglanski AW, Jasko K, Chernikova M, Milyavsky M, Babush M, Baldner C, Pierro A. The rocky road from attitudes to behaviors: Charting the goal systemic course of actions. *Psychol Rev* 2015;122(4):598-620.
42. Wielkiewicz RM, Prom CL, Loos S. Relationships of the leadership attitudes and beliefs scale with student types, study habits, life-long learning, and GPA. *Coll Stud J* 2005;39(1):31-44.
43. Lynn MR. Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nurs Res* 1986;35(6): 382-6.
44. Murphy KR, Davidshofer CO. *Psychological testing: Principles and applications*. 4th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2005.

Table 1. The frequency of I-CVI and the S-CVI/ave for the whole scale

Number of items (percentage)			
I-CVI	Relevance	Clarity	Representativeness
0.33	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)
0.67	3 (2.3%)	11 (8.3%)	2 (1.5%)
1.00	129 (97.7%)	121 (91.7%)	129 (97.7%)
S-CVI/ave	.99	.97	.99

Table 2. The S-CVI/ave for the subscales

No.	Domains	S-CVI/ave			
		No. of items	Relevance	Clarity	Representativeness
C1.	Service orientation	5	1.00	.93	1.00
C2.	Everyone can be a leader	4	1.00	1.00	1.00
C3.	Distributed leadership	13	.97	.95	.95
C4.	Employability	2	1.00	1.00	1.00
C5.	Personalized service	3	1.00	1.00	1.00
C6.	Attitudes toward service	2	1.00	1.00	1.00
C7.	Competencies	45	1.00	.99	1.00
C8.	Moral character	18	.98	.96	.98
C9.	Caring disposition	15	1.00	.98	1.00
C10.	Commitment to continuous improvement	25	.99	.96	.99

Appendix 1 Sample items

Domains	Sample items
Service orientation	Above self-interest: A good leader puts the interests of his/her followers above the interests of his/her own. Readiness to serve: A good leader serves others with a genuine heart.
Everyone can be a leader	Everyone can be a leader regardless of his/her current role and position.
Competence	IQ: One of the main qualities of a good leader is to have good analytical skills. EQ: The capacity of managing his/her emotions in a healthy manner is an important quality of a good leader. SQ: A good leader is able to articulate his/her vision of the organization. AQ: Good leaders are able to bounce back from adversity. Passionate about people: Good leaders are people-oriented. Positive social relationship: A good leader maintains positive and healthy relationships with others. Assertiveness: Effective leaders can defend their views while respecting others' feelings and rights. Collaboration: A good leader is able to collaborate with others. Conflict resolution: Effective leaders resolve conflicts in creative and constructive ways. Communication skills: An effective leader effectively communicates his/her thoughts and ideas.

(cont'd.)

Domains	Sample items
Moral character	<p>Integrity: The overt behavior of a good leader is consistent with his/her inner principles.</p> <p>Fairness: A good leader evaluates followers' performance in an unbiased and objective way.</p> <p>Humility: A good leader accepts criticisms from followers and other people.</p> <p>Role model: A good leader acts as an ethical model for the followers.</p> <p>Belief in the power of morality: A true leader wins trust and respect from the followers by his/her moral virtues.</p>
Caring disposition	<p>Empath: A good leader looks at things from other people's perspective.</p> <p>Compassion: Good leadership requires compassion for other people.</p> <p>Love followers: A good leader extends his/her kindness to others without expecting repayment.</p> <p>Support followers: A good leader helps followers tackle problems that hinder their work progress.</p> <p>Develop followers: A good leader coaches his/her followers for their professional development.</p>
Commitment to continuous improvement	<p>Fixed vs. growth mindset: Leadership competences can be developed.</p> <p>Self-Leadership: Leaders tend to be highly disciplined.</p> <p>Self-reflection: A leader should closely examine his/her own thoughts and behavior.</p> <p>Freedom vs. determinism: Human beings have the free will to change.</p> <p>Theory X: As most followers do not exercise self-control and self-motivation, leaders must exercise close supervision.</p>