

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

Shek DTL, Lin L, Leung, H, Yu L, Ma CMS, Li X. Development and Validation of the Service Leadership Knowledge Scale in a Chinese Context. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev*. 2018;17(1):125-136.

Int J Disabil Hum Dev 2018;17(1):00-00.

Running title: Content validation

## **Development and validation of the service leadership knowledge scale in a Chinese context**

Daniel TL Shek, PhD, FHKPS, BBS, SBS, JP<sup>1-5</sup>, Li Lin, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Hildie Leung, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Lu Yu, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Cecilia MS Ma, BEd, MPhil, PhD<sup>1</sup> and Xiang Li, PhD<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Applied Social Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, PR China*

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

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Social Work, East China Normal University, Shanghai, PR China*

<sup>4</sup>*Kiang Wu Nursing College of Macau, Macau, PR China*

<sup>5</sup>*Division of Adolescent Medicine, University of Kentucky College of Medicine, Lexington, Kentucky, United States*

<sup>6</sup>*Psychological Studies Academic Group, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

**Abstract:** The notion of service leadership has been proposed to capture the ideal leadership model in service economies. However, there has been a lack of scientific measures that can operationalize the service leadership model. We thus developed a knowledge scale to capture the essential knowledge points of service leadership model in a format of multiple-choice question. The current study reported the development and content validation of this Service Leadership Knowledge Scale with four experts. The results showed that the majority of the items were rated as relevant to, clear, and representative of service leadership model. The development of this knowledge scale helps further construct a theoretical model of service leadership.

**Keywords:** Content validation, knowledge scale, scale development, service leadership

**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

The service economy calls for leaders with qualities to serve others. It also calls for an updated leadership theory that can guide education, practice and research on effective leadership in the service era. This leadership theory and practice are highly important to Hong Kong, where the service economy constitutes 92.7% of the GDP derived from service industries (1). Against this background, Po Chung, the co-founder of DHL International and the Chairman of the Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management Limited (HKI-SLAM), proposed the notion of service leadership and service leadership education (SLAM curriculum framework) to meet the demands of leadership education in the service era (2). Po Chung believed that service leaders should provide high-quality services that meet the diverse needs of individuals, groups, communities, systems and environment (3). He also believed that domain specific knowledge and skills, moral character and caring disposition are the bedrocks of successful service and effective service leadership (2). Although these three qualities vary across individuals, service leadership notion upholds a belief that everyone can be a leader and has potential to improve their service leadership (4).

The content of the service leadership can be seen in two recently published special issues (4,5). There are several distinctive features of the service leadership model compared to other mainstream leadership models (6). First, the model places equal importance on emotional, behavioral, cognitive, spiritual, and physical dimensions of a leader, and it has a comprehensive knowledge framework that covers service leaders' personal development, leadership practice, interaction with others and the systems with a service orientation. Second, the model emphasizes that "the server is the service" (3) by highlighting both the intrapersonal and interpersonal qualities of service leaders, with competencies, moral character and caring disposition, as the fundamental qualities of successful service leaders. Third, self-leadership and reflection are critical service leadership qualities. Self-leadership includes self-management, self-reflection, intrinsic motivation to serve, goal setting and goal attainment. Service leadership is regarded as a constant reflection process for continuous improvement. Fourth, the service leadership model is applicable to multiple academic disciplines, professions in different service domains, and workers in different positions (e.g., from managers to frontline workers).

With the financial support of the Victor and William Fung Foundation, the Fung Service Leadership Initiative (FSLI) was launched in 2012 to support the development of service leadership education amongst the eight government-funded universities. As a member of the FSLI, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) has developed both credit-bearing courses and non-credit bearing programs on service leadership (7,8). In particular, multiple evaluation strategies including objective outcome evaluation, subjective outcome evaluation, and qualitative evaluation were used to evaluate the implementation and impact of the courses and programs (9). Results generally revealed that the students showed positive changes in their service leadership qualities after joining the course or program and they generally had positive perceptions of the courses and instructors. The related evaluation findings can be seen in two recent published special issues (9,10).

While promoting service leadership education based on service leadership model is important, there is still a lack of measures to operationalize the service leadership model. In other words, how to judge if an individual is a service leader remains a question. What kind of knowledge a service leader should have? What are the core beliefs of service leaders? What kind of behavioral qualities a service leader should demonstrate? Filling these gaps could help to further develop service leadership theory, improve service leadership education and provide guidance on the practice of service leadership. As such, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University initiated a research project entitled "Development and Validation of Measures Based on the Service Leadership Model" to develop and validate three scales on knowledge, attitude and

behavior of service leadership. In this paper, we reported a study on the development of the knowledge scale on service leadership and the related content validation findings.

The purpose of developing the knowledge scale is to measure individuals' understanding of the fundamental knowledge points that a service leader is expected to obtain, especially for those who receive service leadership education. The knowledge scale was created based on a knowledge framework of the service leadership education referring to different literature, including SLAM curriculum framework (2,3), the "25 principles" of service leadership (11), 12 dimensions of personal brand of service leaders (12), and the lecture content of the subject "Service Leadership" (4,5). In details, the knowledge framework covers the following important domains of service leadership:

**What is service leadership and what is it about?** The conceptualization of service leadership highlights service orientation (3,6). Service leadership is about providing high-quality services to satisfying the needs of oneself, others and systems (2). Service leaders are the ones who could influence the subordinates with their good personal qualities instead of manipulating others or giving commands and penalties (2). Character is more important than skills for job entrants in the service economy (3).

**Service leadership has three realms: self, others and systems.** Service leadership can be carried out in three realms – self, others, and systems. Self-leadership takes place within individuals. Service leaders need to develop personal qualities and intrinsic motivation to serve others and systems, including improving one's ability, skills and willingness to serve the needs of others and systems (2,13). Service leaders should be able to apply different motivation strategies to drive themselves to attain the goals (14-17). Otherwise, they are not qualified to lead others. People-leadership takes place in a team environment. It is manifested in service leaders' interaction with people and groups (2). Systems leadership takes place in communities, including the local community, local society, and international markets. It is manifested in the control over the community and society rather than individuals. Different realms of service leadership correspond to different Chinese philosophies, with Buddhism related to self, Confucianism to others, and Taoism to systems.

**Everyone can be a leader.** There is an important belief upheld by service leadership, which is "everyone can be a leader" (2,6). Service leadership model uses a broad definition of leadership, including leading oneself, leading people, and leading systems. Accordingly, people who are taking a leading role in any service transactions can be regarded as leaders and have the opportunity to practice and improve their leadership qualities. In addition, service leadership adopts an incremental belief about human attributes (18), and regards human attributes (including leadership) as changeable. In this tenet, service leadership qualities can be trained and improved. Therefore, everyone has the potential to be a service leader.

**The general principle of E=MC<sup>2</sup>.** The service leadership model proposes that leadership competencies, moral character, and caring disposition are three key attributes contributing to good service quality and effective service leadership (2). It can be summarized as a formula E=MC<sup>2</sup>, where "E" represents "effective service leadership", "M" represents "moral character", the two "Cs" represent "competence" and "caring disposition" (7). Among the different elements, trust, fairness, respect, and care are considered as the "secret ingredients" to differentiate satisfactory service from unsatisfactory one (11). Competencies, moral character, and caring disposition can enhance these "secret ingredients" so as to improve service qualities and leadership effectiveness. These three attributes are equally important for both leaders and followers in the service economy, and the attributes could be mutually influenced and improved between leaders and followers, thus raising their service leadership to a higher level.

**Competencies.** An effective service leader demonstrates good leadership competencies, service competencies, intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies to guide their personal

development and leadership practice (19,20). Leadership competencies refer to possessing leadership skills and capacity that help service leaders attain personal and organizational goals, solve problems and satisfy different needs of self, others and systems. Service competencies of service leaders refer to their understanding and endeavors of creating and providing high-quality service with regards to particular contexts (2). Moreover, intrapersonal competencies (i.e., IQ, EQ, AQ and SQ) and interpersonal competencies (e.g., conflict management, assertiveness, active listening) are core personal attributes that service leaders should continuously improve (19,20).

**Moral character.** The Service leadership model believes that professionals, elites or leaders without moral character are not true service leaders (20,21). Service leadership education fosters students' moral character by referring to two bodies of knowledge. The first one is about character strengths proposed by the Western researchers, which include six different domains – wisdom, courage, humanity, transcendence, temperance and justice (22,23). The second is about Chinese philosophies in Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, particularly the Confucian virtues, such as benevolence, righteousness and propriety (24,25). According to the Principle of Personal Ethics of service leadership, service leaders should know how to do the right things by following moral codes and ethics. In this way, they can gain trust and respect from their followers (11).

**Caring disposition.** A competent and moral service leader should also embrace caring disposition (2). A caring service leader demonstrates sincerity to learn and meet others' needs and to show genuine care via love, empathy and active listening (26). Caring disposition is commonly emphasized in many mainstream leadership models, such as servant leadership (6). In the service leadership model, caring disposition covers not only the intention of caring (concern for others) but also action to care for one's followers, service clients and other people in need, which can be manifested in, for instance, developing the followers' growth (26).

**Positive social relationship.** Service leaders should be able to create, develop and maintain healthy and positive social relationships, while trust, fairness, respect, care, behavioral consistency, and loyalty are regarded as important to positive social relationships (27). In particular, Chung and Bell (2,11) repeatedly emphasized that trust is the key to successful service and leadership in service economy. Positive social relationships would comprise useful social capital that enables service leaders to operate their environment well (28).

**Manufacturing economy versus service economy.** Service leadership is connected closely to the context of the service economy, which is in sharp contrast to the manufacturing economy in economic structure, organizational structure, and requirements for leadership qualities (29). In terms of the desirable leadership style and qualities, service economy calls for leaders that can carry out distributed leadership, in which they interact and communicate thoroughly with the followers and share the opportunity of decision-making with the followers. In addition, they can lead the organization in a transformational style, such as motivating followers to reach their potentials and empowering followers to work collaboratively and to achieve common goals (29). These characteristics are incorporated into service leadership model.

**Distinction of service leadership model and other leadership theories.** As mentioned above, service leadership model adopts many ideologies from other leadership models, such as service orientation proposed by service leadership. However, it has some unique features, which make it distinguished from other existing leadership models. For example, service leadership has seven core beliefs: 1) serve for oneself, others, and systems; 2) everyone can be a leader; 3) competencies, moral characters and caring are the three key attributes of service leaders; 4) competencies, willingness, abilities are important to service leaders themselves; 5) provide high quality of service; 6) evolutionary perspective of service leadership; 7) high paid

and high position will go to people with service leader attributes (2,10). Moreover, service leadership adapts a maritime leadership style (vs. continental leadership style), which incorporates both top-down and bottom-up approaches in leader-follower interaction with regard to different situations (long-term planning, emergency or crisis) (2,6).

**Other important knowledge points.** There are some more knowledge points that a service leader needs to know. For instance, service reputation is critical to service industry. Hence, the integrity of service leaders is important and they must try their best to avoid errors or immoral conducts which bring bad reputation (11). Service leaders should also understand the service, which is the core of humanity and has real value (11). Besides, service leadership also highlights the importance of mentorship and choice of leadership style. Service leadership model is an evolving leadership model. From the evolutionary perspective, humans possess moral and caring intuitions in a long development history. Thus, service leadership could be considered as the oldest and longest surviving business model (2,13).

After reviewing the above conceptual aspects of the service leadership knowledge framework, validated assessment tools that can measure the aforementioned knowledge of service leadership are needed. In particular, a knowledge scale with good validity and reliability is valuable for service leadership educators and researchers to examine the learning outcomes of effective service leadership education. First of all, the scale items need to be validated in terms of the extent to which scale items fall into the knowledge body of service leadership. As Rubio et al. (30) contended, “content validity refers to the extent to which the items on a measure assess the same content or how well the content material was sampled in the measure” (p. 94). Content validity usually informs us of “the degree to which elements of an assessment instrument are relevant to and representative of the target construct for a particular purpose”. (p.238) (31). The scale developers invited a panel of experts to evaluate the items and then the research team revised them according the collected feedback (32). The content of measures can be judged from several important perspectives: relevance, clarity, factor structure, representativeness, and comprehensiveness (20,33). In the current study, we mainly focused on relevance, clarity and representativeness of the knowledge scale.

## Methods

The current study addressed the development of knowledge scale of service leadership and its content validation. The development of item pool was primarily based on the service leadership model (2,5,6) with reference to the previous literature regarding the knowledge points (e.g., self-leadership) (14,15). The content validation was conducted by inviting four experts to rate the relevance, clarity, and representativeness of each item. The process of scale development is described below.

### *Scale development – construction of item pool*

The construction of item pool consists of three steps. First, we reviewed previous scales about leadership, which covers a wide range of leadership models: transformational leadership, authentic leadership, servant leadership, ethical leadership, leader-member exchange theory, spiritual leadership, participative leadership, relational leadership model, social exchange model of leadership development, leadership identity development model. Via this practice, we found that measures tapping into the knowledge of a specific leadership model are missing in the literature. The majority of the leadership scales measures individuals’ attitudes toward leadership and leadership behaviors (34-36). There were also attempts to examine leadership knowledge. For example, Payne (37) designed 15 items to measure communication competence in leadership by asking the participants to select the most effective communication response in different communication scenarios.

In addition, considering the unique features of service leadership model, existing leadership scales that can be referred are limited. In this case, we relied on the previous literature about service leadership, including Po Chung's books (3,11,12), Shek and colleagues' papers and book chapters (5,6), as well as SLAM curriculum framework (2). We first developed a conceptual framework based on this body of literature and developed items within this framework. The research team consisted of one senior researcher who provided supervision and three junior researchers who drafted, reviewed and cross-checked the items. All of them had doctoral degrees and had experience in research and teaching on service leadership.

### *The Service Leadership Knowledge Scale*

With several rounds of iteration on items revision within the research team, 200 items of knowledge scale in a format of the multiple-choice question were generated. This scale includes following 11 categories (C1- C11):

**C1. General description of service leadership (17 items).** This category covers the definition, nature, and functions of service leadership. The items assess the understanding of the general feature of service leadership and service leader, such as the service-orientation.

**C2. Three realms of service leadership (18 items).** This category includes the knowledge about service leadership in three realms - self, others, systems (2,7,11,13-17). The items measure knowledge about self-leadership, as well as the understanding of service leadership in oneself, teams and systems.

**C3. Everyone can be a leader (11 items).** This category includes the notion that everyone can be a leader. The items test the recognition of this notion and the theoretical root of this notion, including incremental theory about human attributes (2,6,11,18,38,39).

**C4. The general principle of  $E=MC^2$  (11 items).** This category includes the general description of the three determinants of effective service leadership – competence, moral character and caring disposition, as well as their nature and relevance to leaders and followers (2,7,11).

**C5. Competencies (35 items).** This category includes knowledge about competencies defined by SLAM framework (i.e., domain-specific competence, service competence, and leadership competence), as well as general intrapersonal competencies (IQ, EQ, AQ, SQ) and interpersonal competencies (conflict management, assertiveness, active listening) (2,19,20).

**C6. Moral character (23 items).** This category includes knowledge about moral character from a Western framework and Chinese philosophy. For the former, items assess the relevant concepts and knowledge character strengths using Action in Value (VIA) model, which include wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence (21,22). For the latter, items assess knowledge about Chinese virtue, particularly Confucian virtues, and its relation to service leaders (11,24,25).

**C7. Caring disposition (17 items).** This category includes knowledge about caring disposition within the SLAM framework (2). The items assess knowledge about three core components of caring disposition – love, empathy and active listening (26), as well as about the caring component of other leadership models (6).

**C8. Positive social relationship (11 items).** This category includes the knowledge about building, developing and maintaining positive social relationships. The items assess key factors to positive social relationship identified in the SLAM framework, general knowledge about relationship development (e.g., ABCDE model) (40) and social capital (2,11,27).

**C9. Manufacturing economy versus service economy (18 items).** This category includes knowledge about the differences of the features and leadership qualities between manufacturing economy and service economy (29) as well as the current societal status, particularly, the economic structure of Hong Kong.

**C10. Distinction of service leadership and other leadership theories (24 items).** This category addresses the knowledge about the unique features of service leadership model (2) compared with other leadership models in the literature. It is basically based on the Shek et al. (6)'s paper reviewing differences of service leadership and other leadership models (e.g., transformational leadership, servant leadership, spiritual leadership, ethical leadership).

**C11. Other important knowledge points (15 items).** This category includes the remaining knowledge points that are regarded as important in service leadership model, such as understanding of service, mentor-apprentice models and choice of leadership styles (2, 11, 13, 41).

The scale items were presented in various formats, such as filling the blank(s) of a concept or fact of service leadership, choosing the correct or incorrect descriptive statements of service leadership, and choosing a right combination of options to interpret a scenario of service leadership. Sample items of the scale can be seen in Appendix I.

#### *Content Validation of the Developed Scale*

With the item pool available, content validation was conducted to test how accurately the items assessed various aspects of service leadership knowledge. Four experts who are familiar with service leadership, especially the SLAM framework, were invited to judge the content validity of the 200-item Service Leadership Knowledge Scale. Three of them had a doctoral degree and were involved in the curriculum development and/or the teaching of the subject "Service Leadership". The fourth one was an expert on service leadership working with Po Chung. A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect the opinions of the experts with the following procedure. First, they were invited to rate each item based on three criteria of content validity:

- 1) **Relevance**, the extent to which the item is appropriate in assessing the knowledge point and falls within the boundary of the SLAM framework on a 4-point rating scale:  
*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*
- 2) **Clarity**, the extent to which the item is concise, accurate, and direct on a 4-point rating scale:  
*1 = Very unclear, 2 = Unclear, 3 = Clear, 4 = Very clear*
- 3) **Representativeness**, the extent to which the item adequately represents and encompasses the essence of the knowledge point on a 4-point rating scale:  
*1 = Very unrepresentative, 2 = Unrepresentative, 3 = Representative, 4 = Very representative*

While giving the ratings, the experts were also invited to provide suggested modifications of the items for the negative responses (option 1 or 2). After rating all the items, they judged the overall quality of the whole scale based on the following items:

- 1) Does this batch of multiple choice questions cover all the essential knowledge in the service leadership framework?
- 2) Does this batch of multiple choice questions adequately represent the essential knowledge points in service leadership?
- 3) Overall speaking, are these multiple choice questions a valid measure of the basic body of knowledge covered in the Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) model?

- 4) Additional knowledge point(s), if missing from the knowledge scale (open-ended question).
- 5) Other comments (open-ended question).

The ratings from the four experts were used for analyses of content validity, while their suggested modification and written feedbacks were taken into account when further revising the developed items.

## Results

Individual item content validity index (I-CVI) and average scale content validity index (S-CVI/ave) (30,42) were calculated to indicate the content validity of the scale. I-CVI was computed by the number of positive responses in each item (option 3 or 4) divided by the number of experts. S-CVI/ave was an average score of the I-CVIs of all the items within each category or the overall scale. An I-CVI of .80 or higher indicates good content validity while S-CVI is at least .80, but preferably .90 or higher (42). Considering we only had four judges, an I-CVI of .75 was considered to be acceptable. This approach has been used in previous scale validation studies in Hong Kong (43,44).

As seen in Table 1, on an individual level, most of the items had good I-CVI. All items had I-CVI(relevance) > .75, indicating that four experts agreed that all scale items were relevant to the service leadership knowledge under the SLAM curriculum framework. Except item 11, 17, 160 and 186, all items had I-CVI(clarity) > .75, showing that all experts considered most of the scale items were concise, accurate and direct. The four items with a fair I-CVI in clarity (I-CVI(clarity) = .5) were modified according to the suggestions from the experts. All items had I-CVI(representativeness) > .75, in the views of the experts, all the scale items could adequately represent the knowledge points of service leadership.

In regards to the overall scores, all the experts rated very positively the overall quality of the scale in terms of relevance, clarity, and representativeness, with S-CVI/ave(relevance) = .99, S-CVI/ave(clarity) = .93, and S-CVI/ave(representativeness) = .98, respectively (see Table 1). As can be seen in Table 2, for each category (total 11 categories), the results of S-CVI/ave were also good, S-CVI/ave(relevance) > .96, S-CVI/ave(clarity) > .87, S-CVI/ave(relevance) > .96.

## Discussion

The primary purpose of this paper is to report the development of a scale to capture the knowledge of service leadership proposed by Chung (2) and the content validation of this study. The individual item content validity index (I-CVI) and average scale content validity (S-CVI) both indicate that the Service Leadership Knowledge Scale assesses various aspects of service leadership knowledge. The majority of the items were considered to be relevant to the body of knowledge about service leadership, clear and easy to understand, and representative of service leadership knowledge. The research team also reviewed and discussed the suggested modification of particular items. Some items were modified before putting in the further validation studies.

The construction of the Service Leadership Knowledge Scale is a pioneering attempt to empirically assess the notion of service leadership proposed by Chung (2). Since the launch of FSLI, substantial effort has been taken on promoting service leadership education, but the fundamental knowledge base of service leadership has been left unaddressed. The FSLI allows independent development of the curriculum of service leadership education, and thus the understanding of service leadership actually varies more or less across different institutions. This practice grants a great degree of autonomy for each institution to develop service leadership education and obtained great attainment to nurture a good number of university students into qualified service leaders (45). However, there is still a strong need to specify the



fundamental knowledge base of service leadership. Our current study initiated the endeavor to address this question, which indicates a good progress in the journey of the construction of service leadership theory. Of course, behind content validation effort, other means of scale validation should be conducted to clarify the content validity of the scale.

The present study had some limitations. First, we only had four experts for the content validation, although it still met the minimum acceptable number of three experts proposed by Lynn (46). This is primarily because of the notion of service leadership is new and researchers or professionals who are working on it are rare. However, it limits the generalizability. Future research can consider inviting students who participated in service leadership course to rate the items. In addition, three out of four invited experts were academic researchers. Their understanding of the knowledge points of service leadership is mainly based on their research and teaching of the subject in an educational setting. They may not be fully aware of other practical knowledge point(s) of service leadership in an organizational field. Hence, experts from the field should be recruited. Lastly, the length of the current scale is very long, which possibly elicited fatigue in the raters. Hence, they might ignore some problems in the later part of the scale. Future studies may consider presenting the items in a different order to different raters, so as to reduce the effect of fatigue on the later part of the scale.

## References

1. The World Bank. Services, etc., value added (% of GDP) 2016. Accessed 2016. URL: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.SRV.TETC.ZS>.
2. Chung P. Hong Kong institute of service leadership and management curriculum framework. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Service Leadership and Management, 2011.
3. Chung P, Bell A. Service reborn. New York: Lexingford, 2012.
4. 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):297-8.
5. Shek DTL, Chung P, Yu L, Merrick J, eds. Service leadership education for university students: The Hong Kong experience. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):203-4.
6. Shek DTL, Chung P, Leung H. How unique is the service leadership model? A comparison with contemporary leadership approaches. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):217-31.
7. Shek, DTL, Yu L, Ma C, Sun RC, 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.
8. Shek DTL, Zhu X, Lin L. Evaluation of an intensive service leadership course in mainland China. *Int J Child Adolesc Health*, in press.
9. Shek DTL, Lin L. Evaluating service leadership programs with multiple strategies. In 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;197-211.
10. 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.
11. Chung P, Bell A. *The 25 principles of service leadership*. New York: Lexingford, 2015.
12. Chung P. *Your second skin: Managing the 12 dimensions of your personal brand for the service age*, in press.
13. Shek DTL, Sun RCF, Liu TT. Evolution and realms of service leadership and leadership models. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):243-54.
14. Manz CC. *Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in*

- organizations. *Acad Manage Rev* 1986;11(3):585-600.
15. Manz CC. Leading employees to be self-managing and beyond: Toward the establishment of self-leadership in organizations. *J Manage Syst* 1991;3(3):15-24.
16. Stewart GL, Courtright SH, Manz CC. Self-leadership: A multilevel review. *J Manage* 2011;37:185-222.
17. Shek DTL, Ma CMS, Liu TT, Siu AMH. The role of self-leadership in service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):343-50.
18. Dweck CS, Leggett EL. A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychol Rev* 1988;95(2):256-73.
19. Shek DTL, Lin L. Intrapersonal competencies and service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):255-63.
20. Shek DTL, Yu L, Siu AMH. Interpersonal competence and service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):265-74.
21. Shek, DTL, Yu L. Character strengths and service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):299-307.
22. Park N, Peterson C. Character strengths: Research and practice. *J Coll Character* 2009;10(4):1-10.
23. Park N, Peterson C, Seligman MEP. Strengths of character and well-being. *J Soc Clin Psychol* 2004;23:603-19.
24. Shek DTL, Sun RCF, Liu TT. Character strengths in Chinese philosophies: Relevance to service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):309-18.
25. Shek DTL, Yu L, Fu X. Confucian virtues and Chinese adolescent development: A conceptual review. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2013;25(4):335-44.
26. Shek DTL, Li X. The role of caring disposition in service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):319-32.
27. Shek DTL, Lin L. Factors leading to creation, development and maintenance of positive social relationship. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(4):333-42.
28. Brass DJ, Krackhardt D. The social capital of twenty-first-century leaders. In Hunt JG, Phillips RL. eds. *Out-of-the-box leadership challenges for the 21st century army*. Amsterdam: Elsevier BV, 1998:179-94.
29. Shek DTL, Chung P, Leung H. Manufacturing economy vs. service economy: Implications for service leadership. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2015;14(3):205-15.
30. 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.
31. 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.
32. Grant JS, Davis LL. Selection and use of content experts for instrument development. *Res Nurs Health* 1997;20:269-74.
33. Davis LL. Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Appl Nurs Res* 1992;5(4):194-7.
34. Hulpia H, Devos G, Rosseel Y. Development and validation of scores on the distributed leadership inventory. *Educ Psychol Meas* 2009;1-22.
35. Neider LL, Schriesheim CA. The authentic leadership inventory (ALI): development and empirical tests. *Leadership Quart* 2011;22(6):1146-64.
36. Yukl G, Mahsud R, Hassan S, Prussia GE. An improved measure of ethical leadership. *J Leadersh Organ Stud* 2013;20(1):38-48.
37. Payne HJ. Reconceptualizing social skills in organizations: Exploring the relationship between communication competence, job performance, and supervisory roles. *J Leadership Organ Stud* 2005;11(2):63-77.

38. Dweck CS, Chiu CY, Hong YY. Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A word from two perspectives. *Psychol Inq* 1995;6(4):267-85.
39. Molden, DC, Dweck CS. Finding" meaning" in psychology: a lay theories approach to self-regulation, social perception, and social development. *Am Psychol* 2006; 61(3):192-203.
40. Levinger G. Development and change. In Kelley HH, Berscheid E, Christensen A, Harvey J, Huston TL, Levinger G, Peterson DR. eds, *Close relationships*. New York: WH Freeman, 1983:315-59.
41. Kram KE. *Mentoring at work: developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1985.
42. 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.
43. 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):201-08.
44. Leung JTY, Shek DTL. Expecting my child to become "dragon" – Development of the Chinese Parental Expectation on Child's Future Scale. *Int J Disabil Hum Dev* 2011;10(3):257-65.
45. 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.
46. Lynn MR. Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nurs Res* 1986;35:382-5.

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

<b>Number of items (percentage) (n=200)</b>			
<b>I-CVI</b>	<b>Relevance</b>	<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Representativeness</b>
0.25	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
0.5	0 (0%)	4 (2%)	0 (0%)
0.75	9 (4.5%)	50 (25%)	14 (7%)
1.00	191 (95.5%)	146 (73%)	186 (93%)
S-CVI/ave	.99	.93	.98

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

No.	Category	No. of items	S-CVI/ave		
			Relevance	Clarity	Representativeness
C1.	General description of Service Leadership	17	.96	.87	.96
C2.	Three realms of Service Leadership	18	1.00	.93	1.00
C3.	Everyone can be a leader	11	1.00	.91	1.00
C4.	General description of the principle $E=MC^2$	11	.98	.91	.98
C5.	Competencies	35	.99	.91	.99
C6.	Moral character	23	1.00	.98	.99
C7.	Caring disposition	17	.99	.91	.99
C8.	Positive relationship	11	1.00	1.00	.98
C9.	Manufacturing vs. service economies and current societal status	18	.99	.93	.99
C10.	Distinction of Service Leadership and other leadership theories	24	1.00	.96	.98
C11.	Other knowledge points in SLAM curriculum framework	15	.98	.88	.97

## Appendix I: Sample items (with adaptation) of the knowledge scale

Knowledge Point	Multiple Choice Question
<b>C1. General description of service leadership</b>	
1. Leadership is a service that ethically satisfies a wide range of individual, group, community, system and environmental needs.	<p>Bill has the following understanding of leadership. Which one is <i>NOT</i> consistent with the Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) Model?</p> <p>A. Service leadership includes ethically serving oneself.</p> <p>B. A leader should regard his/her leadership as a service.</p> <p>C. As a leader, individual needs should surpass service recipients' needs.</p> <p>D. As a leader, one should provide service to ethically satisfy a wide range of needs, including the needs of individual, group, and system.</p> <p>(correct answer: C)</p>
<b>C2. Three realms of service leadership.</b>	
19. Service leadership claims that leadership can be carried out in three realms, including self, others, and system.	<p>The realms of service leadership include_____.</p> <p>A. life, family, and work</p> <p>B. self, others, and system</p> <p>C. friendship, organization, and society</p> <p>D. microsystem, macrosystem, and ecosystem</p> <p>(correct answer: B)</p>
<b>C3. Everyone can be a leader.</b>	
36. Every day, every human occupies a position of leadership and possesses the potential to improve his leadership quality and effectiveness.	<p>Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) Model asserts that everyone can be a leader. Which of the following statements is <i>NOT</i> the rationale underlying this proposition?</p> <p>A. Self-development can be regarded as one sort of leadership.</p> <p>B. Every day, there are many service transactions in which one can take a leading role.</p> <p>C. Leadership quality is malleable and improvable.</p> <p>D. Leadership is an inborn quality.</p> <p>(correct answer: D)</p>
<b>C4. The general principle of <math>E=MC^2</math>.</b>	
48. Learning and habituating leadership competencies, which include character strengths and a caring disposition, can enhance	<p>According to the Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) Model, if Kate wants to become an effective service leader, she needs to:</p>

one's leadership effectiveness.	<p>① develop her leadership, intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies.</p> <p>② have excellent scholastic achievement.</p> <p>③ enhance her moral character.</p> <p>④ consider the needs of others and provide care to others when they are in need.</p> <p>A. ①②</p> <p>B. ①③</p> <p>C. ①②③</p> <p>D. ①③④</p> <p>(correct answer: D)</p>
<b>C5. Competencies.</b>	
65. Generally speaking, intrapersonal competencies process information of the self and involve a wide range of abilities related to self-understanding and self-management.	<p>Generally speaking, intrapersonal competencies process information of _____ and involve a wide range of abilities related to _____.</p> <p>A. the service system; serving others</p> <p>B. the service system; serving the society</p> <p>C. the self; self-understanding</p> <p>D. the self; serving others</p> <p>(correct answer: C)</p>
<b>C6. Moral character.</b>	
115. “Ai” is affection for one’s fellow human beings, marked by interpersonal relationships with care, respect and humanity. “Ren” refers to benevolence or humanity, pertaining to “loving people”.	<p>Among different Confucian virtues, which one is most relevant to caring disposition required in service leadership?</p> <p>A. Trustworthiness</p> <p>B. Wisdom</p> <p>C. Harmony and Peace</p> <p>D. Benevolence and Affection</p> <p>(correct answer: D)</p>
<b>C7. Caring disposition.</b>	
<p>124. Three major components of caring disposition</p> <p>Three major components of caring disposition: 1) love; 2) listening; 3) empathy.</p>	<p>Which of the following attributes is one of the three major components of caring disposition covered in the Service Leadership and Management (SLAM) Model?</p> <p>A. Individual consideration</p> <p>B. Mentoring</p> <p>C. Listening</p> <p>D. Coaching</p> <p>(correct answer: C)</p>
<b>C8. Positive social relationship.</b>	
140. Five stages of relationship building—the ABCDE Model Regarding the relationship development, the most	<p>According to Levinger (1983)’s five-stage model of relationship building, what is the correct sequence of the stages?</p>

<p>influential theory is the five-stage model (i.e., ABCDE Model) proposed by Levinger (1983), a relationship begins with acquaintance (A), goes through building-up (B) and continuation (C), and (alternatively) experiences deterioration (D) and finally ends (E).</p>	<p>A. Acquaintance; building-up; continuation; deterioration (alternative); end  B. Acquaintance; continuation; building-up; deterioration (alternative); end  C. Building-up; acquaintance; continuation; deterioration (alternative); end  D. Building-up; acquaintance; deterioration (alternative); continuation; end</p> <p>(correct answer: A)</p>
<p><b>C9. Manufacturing economy versus service economy and current societal status.</b></p>	
<p>153. Leaders in the service economy should be flexible, high in openness, collaborative and motivated. Trust, fairness, respect and care are the “secret ingredients” that distinguishes successful service experiences from unsuccessful ones.</p>	<p>Leaders in the service economy should primarily possess the following attribute:  A. Show respect toward the followers  B. High intelligence  C. Good academic achievement  D. Good political sensitivity</p> <p>(Correct answer: A)</p>
<p><b>C10. Distinction of service leadership and other leadership theories.</b></p>	
<p>170. A maritime (distributed) leadership style that is both top-down and bottom-up is more productive, competitive, profitable, and sustainable in service industries.</p>	<p>A maritime leadership style is:  ① Authoritarian in nature  ② Distributed in nature  ③ Top-down  ④ Bottom-up</p> <p>A. ①③  B. ②④  C. ①③④  D. ②③④</p> <p>(correct answer: D)</p>
<p><b>C11. Other important knowledge points.</b></p>	
<p>193. The value of service is co-created by the service providers and consumers.</p>	<p>Which of the following statements about service is correct?  A. The value of service is determined by the service providers.  B. The value of service is determined by the consumers.  C. The value of service is co-created by providers and consumers.  D. The value of service is determined by the product managers.</p> <p>(Correct answer: C)</p>