



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Content Validity of the Charismatic Leadership Instrument based on Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Model

Nazariyah Jonid¹, Mohd Effendi Ewan Mohd Matore^{2*}^{1,2} Faculty of Education, The National University of Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: Nov 27, 2024 Accepted: Jan 19, 2025	Charismatic leadership is an increasingly prominent approach to leadership in today's context. Charismatic means aura owned by someone that able to attracts, influences, and inspires people by their personal qualities. However, this leadership approach is still underexplored in educational studies in Malaysia. Excellent leadership was not only meant by the intellectual competency only, but also the ability to influence people surround them. It is important for researchers to take step ahead to validate the existing instrument. Hence, this study aims to validate an instrument of charismatic leadership adapted from the Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Model and modified to fit the Malaysian context. Twelve experts were selected through purposive sampling to evaluate and validate the questionnaire content using the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) method. The instrument was developed involving five constructs with a total of 34 items. The analysis findings indicate that the instrument has good content validity with a Content Validity Index (CVI) of 0.922. All 34 items were retained as the final instrument after improving two items that did not meet the minimum CVR value. This finding has important implications for developing the instrument that can be used to assess charismatic leadership among department heads in the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE). In future investigations, it might be possible to apply modern measurement analysis like Rasch model, to confirm the suitability of each item in the study. This also can spark the ideas to generate more items that can reflects charismatic leadership for particular setting.
Keywords	
Charismatic Leadership	
Department Head	
Content Validity	
Content Validity Ratio (CVR)	
Panel of Experts	
*Corresponding Author: effendi@ukm.edu.my	

1. INTRODUCTION

Various leadership styles are employed in various educational settings. The fundamental tenet that guides institutions in their development is the principal's style of leadership, include instructional leadership, distributed leadership, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, servant leadership, visionary leadership, and charismatic leadership. Research on charismatic leadership is beneficial since, in addition to a leader's technical skills, charisma also plays a role in how well they can forge a stronger bond with their followers. The current emphasis on charismatic leadership can be attributed to all the dimensions of this leadership style that represent improvements over earlier leadership philosophies (Jonid & Matore, 2023). For teaching context, the teachers also need to lead the students in teaching. Competence in teaching is very important to ensure that educators provide a teaching method and strategy that can achieve the objectives of a lesson especially for Teaching 4.0 Competencies (Masdoki et al., 2021).

Research on charismatic leadership has been conducted in Malaysia, but it is not as popular as other leadership studies. According to researcher reference, studies on charismatic leadership in educational institutions have been carried out as case studies and remain unpublished (Rahmah, 2013; Jemon et al., 2010). In addition, development of economic progress may also lead to changing leadership styles over time. To stimulate innovation and sustainable development in society, academia should conduct research and development to better understand effective leadership tactics

(Jonid & Matore, 2024). Therefore, this type of leadership needs to be elevated and studied to contribute to the discourse on charismatic leadership in the context of education in Malaysia, as conducted by Murgaya & A. Hamid (2020) and Neo & Ling (2017). The good leader not only rely on knowledge and skills, but also need to have complete package such as Adversity Quotient (AQ), Intellectual Quotient (IQ), Emotional Quotient (EQ) and Spiritual Quotient (SQ) as stated in National Educational Philosophy (Mohd Effendi Ewan Mohd Matore et al., 2018)

This study proposed an instrument of charismatic leadership that comprises characteristic of Malaysian educational context. Division at Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE) are the department responsible for designing the basis of education in Malaysia, therefore, the special characteristics of charismatic leadership need to be assessed to ensure successful influence over employees, educators, teachers, or followers. The instrument is based on the charismatic leadership model presented by Conger and Kanungo in 2011 because it has clear conceptual characteristics related to each dimension. According to this model, a charismatic leader possesses six qualities. However, the two traits of charismatic leaders by Conger and Kanungo (2011) which are self-assurance in handling challenges and strong commitment to accomplishing objectives seem to overlap, resemble, and may be combined. Therefore, Conger-Kanungo Charismatic Leadership Model was adapted into five components for the evaluation, customized to meet Malaysian education leaders. Thus, a validation process must be carried out to ensure the application of the criteria in the context of the study and produced instrument is applicable as a legitimate and trustworthy measuring tool. This study focuses on content validity through expert agreement, and analysis of content validity ratio (CVR).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Charismatic leadership

Characteristics of a charismatic leader include radicalism, unconventionality, risk-taking, entrepreneurialism, and setting an example for others (Conger & Kanungo, 1998). The leader's charisma determines success in forming a more unified influence on followers (Yukl, 2006). Like other leadership philosophies, charisma should be seen as an assessment made by followers who watch a leader at an organization and their actions (Vlachos et al., 2013). The attitudes of followers toward accepting the proclaimed vision and doing what is required to make it a success may change under charismatic leadership (Jarutirasarn & Thirapatsakun, 2023). According to House (1977), charismatic leaders can inspire radical behaviors and a clear vision in their followers. These actions then foster the belief that the leader is endowed with extraordinary powers and elicit strong emotional bonds that drive followers to high levels of compliance and a commitment to the leader's vision. The study of charismatic leadership in education field is conducted globally, for example, in countries like Indonesia, United State, Jordan, and Malaysia. The number of characteristics and constructs proposed in the study varies among each researcher as described in Table 1 (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 2011; Neo & Ling, 2017; Dwapatesty et al., 2021; Muali et al., 2022; Hamzeh et al., 2023).

Table 1: Construct of charismatic leadership research

Country	Research	Constructs / Characteristics of Charismatic Leadership
United State	Bennis & Nanus (1985)	(1) clear and compelling vision or a sense of mission, (2) ability to communicate their vision to followers, (3) demonstrate consistency and focus, and (4) fully recognize strengths.
United State	Conger & Kanungo (2011)	(1) self-assurance in handling challenges, (2) a strong commitment to accomplishing objectives, (3) the ability to clearly communicate the vision, (4) extraordinary behavior,

Malaysia	Neo & Ling (2017)	(5) ability to effect change, and (6) sensitive to the needs of subordinate staff.
Indonesia	Dwapatesty et al. (2021)	(1) self-confidence, (2) have an ideal goal towards a better future, (3) able to express the vision clearly, (4) out of the ordinary behavior, and (5) have strong beliefs regarding the visions.
Indonesia	Chusnul et al. (2022)	(1) strong personality aura, (2) responsible, (3) visionary, and (4) being an example.
Jordan	Hamzeh et al. (2023)	(1) having a vision, (2) communication, (3) meeting the needs of individuals, (4) creativity and innovation, (5) personal appearances, (6) stimulating motivation, and (7) school environment.

Source: Author's own

In general, charismatic leaders refer to leaders who are capable of managing various internal and external expectations of the organization by influencing employees through engaging behavior. After analyzing the various constructs mentioned in previous studies, this research will utilize only five dimensions, which are modifications from Conger and Kanungo's (2011) theory and model of charismatic leadership, as follows: (1) visionary in making changes, (2) sensitive to officer needs, (3) extraordinary behavior, (4) effective communication, and (5) confident in goal's achieving. In the context of this study, the definition of each dimension is explained below.

2.1.1 Visionary in making changes

Charismatic leaders have the ability to create new organizational culture and set of strategies, to inspire staff members to take ownership of implementing changes, and to develop a vision for the organization. Effective leaders are said to be able to change their organization from an existing state to a dynamic state with achievement goals. Charismatic leaders can bring about a drastic shift by promoting ideals and beliefs (House, 1977). Changes in organizations always occur due to rapid global changes in terms of economics, social, politics and information technology (Carnall, 2007). Adiguzel and Sonmez Cakir (2020) found that charismatic leadership positively affects the speed of innovation, innovation performance, and business performance.

2.1.2 Sensitive to officer needs

This dimension refers to a leader's ability to build relationships and emphasize humanity. The characteristics and behaviors that define a leader who is sensitive to the needs of their officers include: (i) having empathy; (ii) proficient in communication skills; (iii) acknowledge and appreciate their officers; (iv) offering resources and support; (v) approachable; (vi) give guidance; (vii) lead by example; and (ix) encouraging work-life balance. Charismatic leaders with these traits will create positive and productive working relationships. The modesty of charismatic leaders inspires others to share their thoughts, pitch new concepts, and accept the perspectives of others (Tangney, 2000; Ou et al., 2015).

2.1.3 Extraordinary behavior

The extraordinary behavior of a charismatic leader refers to the ability of a leader to have special personality qualities, have a very impressive attraction, have a powerful and enduring power, and trusted by his followers. The practice of empowering subordinates is a key component of management and organizational effectiveness (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Charismatic leaders inspire and attract others with their vision (Shamir et al., 1993; Md Nawi, 2020). Charismatic leadership is

based on a special personality quality, having a very impressive appeal, so that it can obtain a large number of followers (Rossian & Loisa, 2019).

2.1.3 Effective communication

Jamal & Bakar (2022) stated that charismatic leadership communication is a unique set of leader behaviors that are directed towards the optimization of hierarchical relationships. Charismatic leaders conduct communication openly and encourage feedback (Md Naw, 2020). Based on the analysis of organizational communication that occurred between King Osiris and the Egyptian society, communication was found to occur between two parties, but did not involve direct communication (Rossian & Loisa, 2019). Therefore, communication carried out by charismatic leaders is seen as effective because it is not solely conducted orally; rather, the interpersonal aspect is a significant factor played by the leader in inspiring and influencing their employees.

2.1.4 Confident in goal's achieving

The ability of a leader to motivate employees in a unique and diverse way as well as to reduce conflict and improve cooperation among the workers for the achievement of the goal. House (1977) stated that charismatic leaders inspired radical behavior and clear vision towards their followers. This behavior can realize a strong emotional bond to bring followers to a high level of obedience to the vision set by a charismatic leader. They also have high self-confidence and a strong establishment in realizing beliefs and ideals (Rossian & Loisa, 2019).

2.2 Content validity ratio

Content validity refers to the ability of a measuring instrument to measure an element that should be measured (Mohamat et al., 2022; Omar et al., 2021; Kamaluddin et al., 2017; Sekaran & Bougie, 2016; Siti Rahayah, 2008). The elements or questions in a measurement tool, such test, or questionnaires, are referred to as content in this sense. The number of experts involved depends on the type of instrument used and the study's requirements. The determination of the number of experts is influenced by the techniques and methods employed by the researcher to obtain the expert agreement rate (Kamaruddin, 2022). Lynn (1986) stated that a minimum of three experts is required. Recent studies still follow Lynn's (1986) recommendation, arguing that this number is sufficient because the selection of experts considers their expertise, knowledge, and experience (Mohd Sajari et al., 2023; Johari, 2023; Zubir, 2021).

In research and measurement, the term content validity describes how well a measurement tool can capture all pertinent facets of the idea being assessed. Content validity assesses how closely the instrument's content conforms to the measuring scale in use (Amatan et al., 2021). To assess content validity, measuring the suitability between the items' content and overall content is crucial (Romero Jeldres et al., 2023). This process makes sure that the measuring tool accurately captures the idea it is meant to test and produce findings that may be regarded as accurate and trustworthy.

To make sure that the instrument includes significant and pertinent parts of the idea being measured, content validity is evaluated by content analysis or review by subject-matter experts. A panel of experts is used to examine the content validity of the instrument by rating its aspects according to their representativeness and relevance to the content topic (Almanasreh et al., 2019). Content validity by subject-matter experts who looked over each question to make sure it was relevant and appropriate (Penagos-Corzo et al., 2024). Expert panels consist of people who are actively involved in the area, have a thorough understanding of it, and have direct access to other people who are also actively involved in it (Lawshe, 1975). For the statistical test to be valid, the researcher must plan for the type of statistical analysis that will be performed with the responses received when deciding the number of experts. The number of participants chosen must be equal to or greater than the minimum number of judges. (Tristán-López, 2008). Increasing the number of expert panels can yield more information on the variables to be measured (Mohd Matore, 2015).

A research technique called Content Validity Ratio (CVR) is used to evaluate the relevance of items in an instrument or the dependability of the content. One of the methods that is frequently used to compute CVR is Lawshe's method (Romero Jeldres et al., 2023; Amatan et al., 2021; Zainal et al., 2020; Mohd Matore et al., 2017). To determine its significance in measuring the intended construct, each question is assessed by a panel of experts. The experts were requested to assign a three-level

criterion to each item in order to assess its relevance: (1) essential; (2) useful but not essential; and (3) not necessary (Lawshe, 1975). Consensus among assessors regarding the level of importance of an item in an instrument are measured, and the CVR for each item is then calculated by adding all these ratings (Zainal et al., 2020). Lawshe (1975) emphasize the use of two indices: (1) content validity ratio (CVR), which gauges panellists' agreement on an item, and (2) content validity index (CVI), which displays the average of the CVR and serves as the final instrument.

The minimum inter-judge agreement should be 50% based on sociological principles (Lawshe, 1975; Romero Jeldres et al., 2023). The higher the content validity, the more scale of item represents the measured domain of a concept. (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). To decide whether to keep or remove an item from the instrument, the derived CVR for each item will be compared to the critical CVR (Lawshe, 1975; Almanasreh et al., 2019; Zainal et al., 2020; Yaw & Mohd Matore, 2024). Critical CVR values can be used to determine how many panel members need to agree an item essential and thus which items should be included or discarded from the final instrument (Ayre & Scally, 2014). The critical CVR value decreases with the number of content validity experts involved, increasing the likelihood of keeping and saving items from removal (Yaw & Mohd Matore, 2024).

There are improvements to the critical CVR table when studies by Wilson et al. (2012) try to identify the method used by Schipper to calculate the original CVR critical values in Lawshe (1975). Wilson et al. (2012) and Lawshe (1975) have both calculated CVR critical values for panel sizes of 10 or more based on a normal approximation of the binomial distribution. In this context of study, a simplified table of CVR critical values, which includes the number of experts required to agree any given item is 'essential' becomes a reference as in Table 2.

Table 2: CVR critical values with number of experts required to agree an item essential

Panel Size	N _{critical} (Minimum Number of Experts Required)	CVR Critical	Panel Size	N _{critical} (Minimum Number of Experts Required)	CVR Critical
5	5	1.00	23	16	.391
6	6	1.00	24	17	.417
7	7	1.00	25	18	.440
8	7	.750	26	18	.385
9	8	.778	27	19	.407
10	9	.800	28	19	.357
11	9	.636	29	20	.379
12	10	.667	30	20	.333
13	10	.538	31	21	.355
14	11	.571	32	22	.375
15	12	.600	33	22	.333
16	12	.500	34	23	.353
17	13	.529	35	23	.314
18	13	.444	36	24	.333
19	14	.474	37	24	.297
20	15	.500	38	25	.316
21	15	.429	39	26	.333
22	16	.455	40	26	.300

Source: Ayre & Scally (2014)

3. METHODOLOGY

The process of assessing the content validity of a measurement instrument using CVR analysis places great importance on the selection of experts, both in terms of number and the criteria used to determine their expertise. Table 3 shows the number of experts involved in determining content validity agreement in several past studies.

Table 3: Number of experts involved in several CVR studies

Number of Experts	Previous Studies
3	Mohd Sajari et al. (2023)
4	Lawshe (1975); Yusoff et al. (2018)
7	Romero Jeldres et al. (2023)
8	Yaw & Mohd Matore (2024); Ibrahim et al. (2024)
11	Zainal et al. (2020)
12	Kamaruddin (2022); Amatan et al. (2021)
37	Mohd Matore et al. (2017)

In the context of this study, 12 experts were involved via purposive sampling technique to ensure more accurate item measured. Feedback from more than ten expert panels can help evaluate the Lawshe Model's validity more successfully (Allahyari et al., 2011). Selection of experts must meet certain criteria such as academic qualifications, work experience, and publications (Zainal et al., 2020; Noor Azimah et al., 2019; Rubio et al., 2003). For research conducted in an educational setting, experts typically consist of colleagues working in relevant institutions or individuals directly involved in the field being studied (Miller et al., 2013; Mohd Matore et al., 2017).

In the context of this study, the following criteria were set for the selection of experts, along with the reasoning behind them. Candidates of panel expert must:

- (1) At least have 5 years of work experience in education. Five years of experience was chosen because it was mature enough to make an assessment. The experience of less than three years is still new and is categorized as a novice.
- (2) Holding a minimum of a Doctorate degree. Expert with a doctoral qualification demonstrates the highest level of mastery and expertise in an educational setting.
- (3) Possessing expertise in the specified field, such as leadership, measurement and evaluation, or organizational management. The diversity of fields is very important in the selection of experts, for example the field of leadership is related to this study, which is charismatic leadership. Likewise, experts in the field of organizational management are very suitable for testing items in management, especially involving organizations. Experts in the field of measurement and evaluation are responsible for testing the items that are used to measure well and describe what is to be measured.

Identification information of experts in the studied field is by obtaining lecturers' curricula vitae from university websites. A letter of initiation as an expert panel is emailed to the professors and MOE officials who confirm their acceptance to the offer as an expert. Among the 12 experts involved in the instrument review, seven are professional experts, namely lecturers at Malaysia higher education institutions, while the other five are field experts, specifically officers from the MOE with expertise in the study's field. Information about the experts involved in this study is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Information of expert panel

Expert Code	Title	Institution	Expertise	Service Period (years)
P1	Senior Lecturer (AP Dr.)	Islamic Science University of Malaysia (USIM)	Human Resource Management/ Development & Training/ Organizational Behavior	19
P2	Senior Lecturer (AP Dr.)	Tun Hussein Onn University of Malaysia (UTHM)	Leadership and Management	16
P3	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Sultan Idris Education University (UPSI)	Leadership/ Educational Management/ Knowledge Management	26
P4	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Putra University of Malaysia (UPM)	Leadership and Educational Management	24

Expert Code	Title	Institution	Expertise	Service Period (years)
P5	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Tun Hussein Onn University of Malaysia (UTHM)	Leadership/ Public Administration	24
P6	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Kuching Sarawak Polytechnic	Leadership and Educational Management	19
P7	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Perlis Universiti of Malaysia (UniMAP)	Human Resource Management/ Leadership Development/ Organizational Behavior	7
P8	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Aminuddin Baki Institute (IAB), MOE	Leadership and Educational Management	30
P9	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Aminuddin Baki Institute (IAB), MOE	Leadership	25
P10	Senior Lecturer (Dr.)	Aminuddin Baki Institute (IAB), MOE	Leadership and Educational Management	22
P11	Assistant Director (Dr.)	Inspection Committee, MOE	Competency Development/ Training/ Measurement and Evaluation	22
P12	Lecturer (Dr.)	Malaysia Teacher Education Institute (IPGM), MOE	Measurement and Evaluation	17

4. RESULTS

The expert agreement was obtained by conducting a quantitative content validity assessment through the analysis of CVR and Content Validity Index (CVI). This analysis determines whether each item constructed in the instrument appropriately and clearly represents the measured constructs, needs refinement, or should be dropped (Polit & Beck, 2006). The minimum CVR value that must be met for a panel of 12 experts is 0.667 (Lawshe, 1975). A CVR value that does not meet the specified minimum indicates that the item has issues from the experts' perspective (Zainal et al., 2020). Researchers need to review the feedback provided by the expert panel before deciding whether to drop or refine the item. The overall assessment of the instrument is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of expert assessment

Dimension	Total Item	Total Expert Assessment	CVR
Visionary in making changes	5	58	0.933
Sensitive to officer needs	7	84	1.000
Extraordinary behaviour	7	78	0.857
Effective communication	8	94	0.958
Confident in goal's achieving	7	78	0.857
Total	34		0.922

Table 5 shows that a high content validity index (CVI) value of 0.922 was obtained for the expert assessment of the charismatic leadership construct. This value indicates that the expert panel has acknowledged the items within the construct as capable of measuring the content aspects for each dimension to be assessed. However, to further clarify the expert agreement on the construct to be measured, this section is broken down according to the charismatic leadership dimensions in Table 6 until Table 10.

Table 6: Assessment of 'visionary in making changes' dimension

Item No.	Expert Panel												Total Agreed	CVR	Item Status
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
B1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted

B4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
Total													58	0.933	

Table 7: Assessment of 'sensitive to officer needs' dimension

Item No.	Expert Panel												Total Agreed	CVR	Item Status
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
B6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
Total													84	1	

Table 8: Assessment of 'extraordinary behavior' dimension

Item No.	Expert Panel												Total Agreed	CVR	Item Status
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
B13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B16	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	0.5	Make Amendment
B17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B18	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	0.667	Accepted
B19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
Total													78	0.857	

Table 9: Assessment of 'effective communication' dimension

Item No.	Expert Panel												Total Agreed	CVR	Item Status
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
B20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B21	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
Total													94	0.958	

Table 10: Assessment of 'confident in goal's achieving' dimension

Item No.	Expert Panel												Total Agreed	CVR	Item Status
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12			
B28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
B29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B30	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted

B31	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Accepted
B33	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	0.5	Make Amendment
B34	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0.833	Accepted
Total													78	0.857	

A total of 32 items obtained CVR values exceeding or equal to the critical CVR value of 0.667. There are 23 items that received full agreement from 12 experts (CVR=1.00), 8 items received agreement from 11 experts (CVR=0.833), and one item received agreement from 10 experts (CVR=0.667). Two items, B16 and B33, showed a CVR value of 0.5. These two items were reviewed by experts as not to measure the construct accurately. However, the experts suggested improvements to the item statement. Therefore, these items will be refined in their wording and retained as measurement items in the questionnaire for pilot study.

5. DISCUSSION

CVR analysis of the charismatic leadership measurement items shows that 32 out of 34 items are within the accepted range as good items, exceeding the critical CVR value of 0.667. The two items (B16 and B33) showing a CVR value of 0.5, are still retained in the instrument despite being below the critical CVR value for the involvement of 12 experts. This situation parallels with the proposal that a minimum of 50% inter-judge agreement should be reached on social principles (Lawshe, 1975; Romero Jeldres et al., 2023). However, items B16 and B33 need to be improved before the pilot study is conducted, considering the experts' suggestions that these items can be retained with revised wording. Improvements to other items can also be made based on the experts' comments and suggestions, even though they have been accepted as "important" (Mohd Matore et al., 2017).

The findings of the CVR analysis show that there is no elimination for charismatic leadership items. Being compared to study by Zainal (2020), three items were eliminated out of the total 34 items tested, seven of which had CVR values lower than the CVR critical. This action taken by the researcher as suggested by the experts due to redundancy in the measurement items. It same goes with study by Ibrahim et al. (2024), three items were eliminated as they are not suitable and not representing the study concept. In other hand, some researcher retained all items despite expert suggestions to eliminate certain items deemed unnecessary or less suitable for the measured construct, as well as item redundancy (Yaw & Mohd Matore, 2024; Amatan et al., 2023). The retention of items in the pilot study was due to plans for further validity analysis, such as the Rasch model and exploratory factor analysis (Amatan et al., 2023). This can be concluded that no items were commented on as redundant because they had undergone a rigorous review process with the supervisor, and all items that appeared redundant or inappropriate were eliminated before the expert review process began. On the other hand, it will be better if the raters ability also need to be check to avoid rater bias (Mohd Noh & Mohd Matore, 2022). The Rasch analysis can help to improve the measurement for the items after experts valuation as mentioned from previous researches (Mohd Matore et al., 2021; Sovey et al., 2022).

6. CONCLUSION

Twelve experts in the study were successfully obtained through the content validation process, consisting of five field experts and seven professional experts. A total of 34 items are permitted based on the CVR value analysis. The instrument's elements were well-conceived and applied, as evidenced by the fact that only two items needed to be revised. After item refinement, the 34 produced items can therefore be used in the pilot study. Consensus among experts can be clearly seen shows the power of using CVR analysis. CVR provides an objective measurement based on expert agreement on the importance of each item, helping to reduce subjectivity in the item selection process. By using CVR and involvement of a large number of experts, it allows the research concepts to be measured comprehensively. With a high CVI values of 0.922, this study has demonstrated that the adapted Conger and Kanungo charismatic leadership instrument has high content validity and is suitable for

the assessment of charismatic leadership among department heads in the MOE. Therefore, this research contributes to the clarity in the process of leadership instrument development and validation, thereby enhancing the reliability and validity of the research findings. The designed leadership instrument can be utilized to apply the leadership tactics used by educational leaders in Malaysia, in various institutions. Further measurement of item validity, such as Rasch analysis, can be conducted to reinforce the findings of the expert evaluation.

Appreciation: Authors acknowledge the Faculty of Education, The National University of Malaysia for funding under GG – 2024 - 024. Appreciation is also recorded for Kumpulan Penyelidikan Universiti Penilaian Pendidikan (UKM UKMKPU -2023 -043), The National University of Malaysia (UKM).

REFERENCES

- Adiguzel, Z., & Sonmez Cakir, F. (2020). Role of diversity management and charismatic leadership on innovation and performance in the globalized era. *International Journal of Innovation - IJI*, São Paulo, 8(3), 489-515. doi.org/10.5585/iji.v8i3.17595
- Allahyari, T., Rangi, N. H., Khosravi, Y., & Zayeri, F. (2011). Development and evaluation of a new questionnaire for rating of cognitive failures at work. *International Journal of Occupational Hygiene*, 3(1), 6-11.
- Almanasreh, E., Moles, R. & Chen, T. F. (2019). Evaluation of methods used for estimating content validity. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 15(2), 214-221.
- Amatan, M. A., Han, C. G. K., & Pang, V. (2021). Kesahan kandungan soal selidik faktor konteks, input dan proses terhadap penerimaan pelaksanaan elemen pendidikan STEM dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran guru menggunakan nisbah kesahan kandungan (CVR). *International Journal of Advanced Research in Future Ready Learning and Education*, 23 (1), 10-22. <https://akademiabaru.com/submit/index.php/frle/article/view/3923>.
- Ariffin, S.R. (2008). *Inovasi dalam pengukuran dan penilaian pendidikan*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Ayre, C., & Scally, A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio: Revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 47(1), 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175613513808>
- Bennis, W. G. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. Harper & Row.
- Carnall, C. (2007). *Managing change in organizations* (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. SAGE Publications.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (2011). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Dwapatesty, E., Gistituati, N., & Rusdinal. (2021). Hubungan gaya kepemimpinan karismatik terhadap motivasi kerja guru. *Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(5), 3000-3006. doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v3i5.1001
- House, R. J. (1977). A theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, 189-207. Southern Illinois University.
- Ibrahim, A., Mohamed, I., Satar, N. S. M., & Hasan, M. K. (2024). Master data quality management framework: Content validity. *Scalable Computing: Practice and Experience*, 25(3), 2001-2012.
- Ishaq, F. R., Hamzeh, M., & Tabieh, A. A. S. (2023). The degree of charismatic leadership practice among school principals from teachers' perspective. *Educational Administration Theory and Practice Journal*, 29, 58-75. doi: 10.17762/kuey.v29i1.454.
- Jamal, J., & Bakar, H. (2022). The mediating role of charismatic leadership communication in a crisis: A Malaysian example. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 54(4), 369-393.
- Jarutirasarn, P. & Thirapatsakun, T. (2023). The effectiveness of project implementation recognizing the interaction between LMX and charismatic leadership attainment. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 20, 1826-1838. doi: 10.37394/23207.2023.20.160
- Jemon, T. Tuan Soh, T.R. & Shafie, S. 2010. *Amalan kepimpinan karismatik pengetua di Sekolah Menengah Taman Universiti 2 Johor Bahru*. [Master dissertation, Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia].

- Johari, M.I. (2023). Pengetahuan pedagogi isi kandungan dan efikasi sendiri guru matematik sekolah rendah dalam pendidikan STEM. [Master dissertation, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].
- Jonid, N., & Matore, M. E. @ E. M. (2023). Give me 30 minutes and accelerate your barrier to measuring charismatic leadership! *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 12(2), 2489–2502. doi:10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i2/17626.
- Jonid, N., & Matore, M. E. @ E. M. (2024). The role of cost assessment in enhancing charismatic leadership competence based on Quadruple Helix Model. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13 (2), 184-194.
- Kamaluddin, M. R., Nasir, R., Wan Sulaiman, W. S., Khairudin, R., & Zamani, Z. A. (2017). Validity and psychometric properties of malay translated religious orientation scale-revised among Malaysian adult samples. *Akademika*, 87 (2), 133-144.
- Kamaruddin, M. (2022). *Pembinaan dan pengesahan psikometrik instrumen IB Learner Profile (10IBLP-I) untuk International Baccalaureate World School (IBWS) Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia (KPM)*. [Master dissertation, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563–575. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
- Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research*, 35, 382-385.
- Masdoki, M., Din, R., & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2021). Teaching 4.0 competency in higher learning institutions: A systematic mapping review. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(10), 217–231. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.12>
- Md Nawi, N. H. (2020). *Kepemimpinan dan kecerdasan emosi dalam psikologi organisasi*. Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Sabah
- Miller, L. A., Lovler, R. L., & McIntire, S. A. (2013). *Foundations of psychological testing: A practical approach* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Mohamat, R., Sumintono, B., & Abd Hamid, H. S. (2022). Analisis kesahan kandungan instrumen kompetensi guru untuk melaksanakan pentaksiran bilik darjah menggunakan Model Rasch pelbagai faset. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, 47(1), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/JPEN-2022-47.01-01>.
- Mohd Matore, M. E. E (2015). *Pembinaan Instrumen Kecerdasan Menghadapi Cabaran (IKBAR) bagi pelajar Politeknik menggunakan Model Rasch*. [Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Sains Malaysia].
- Mohd Matore, M. E. E., Idris, H., Abdul Rahman, N. & Khairani, A. Z. (2017). Kesahan kandungan pakar instrumen IKBAR bagi pengukuran AQ menggunakan nisbah kesahan kandungan. *Proceeding of International Conference on Global Education V (ICGE V): Global Education, Common Wealth and Cultural Adversity*, 979–997.
- Mohd Matore, M. E. E, Khairani, A.Z, Maat, S.M., Ahmad, N.A, & Mohd Matore, E.R. (2018). The Influence of Intellectual Quotient (IQ), Emotional Quotient (EQ) and Spiritual Quotient (SQ) against Adversity Quotient (AQ) on polytechnic students in Malaysia. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology, Special Issue*(2018), 83–91.
- Mohd Matore, M. E. E., Zainal, M. A., Mohd Noh, M. F., Khairani, A. Z., & Abd Razak, N. (2021). The Development and Psychometric Assessment of Malaysian Youth Adversity Quotient Instrument (MY-AQi) by Combining Rasch Model and Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *IEEE Access*, 9(Mi), 13314–13329. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3050311>
- Mohd Noh, M. F., & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2022). Rater severity differences in English language as a second language speaking assessment based on rating experience, training experience, and teaching experience through many-faceted Rasch measurement analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(July), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.941084>
- Mohd. Sajari, F. F., Zulkifli, H., & Surat, S. (2023). Validity and reliability of a GPI readiness instrument implementing the j-QAF Tasmic Model. *Journal of Quran Sunnah Education & Special Needs*, 7(1), 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jqss.vol7no1.183>
- Muali, C., Ridwan, R., Huda, H., & Akbar, A. R. (2022). Improving teacher work discipline in madrasah through charismatic leadership. *AL-TANZIM: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(1), 281-294.

- Murgaya, T., & A. Hamid, A. (2020). Kepimpinan karismatik pentadbir dan hubungannya terhadap motivasi guru sekolah rendah. *International Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 2(4), 415-429.
- Neo, Bibie & Ling, Ying-Lei. (2017). Gaya kepemimpinan karismatik dan kesejahteraan kerja di Politeknik Malaysia. *Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*, 4(4), 1-11.
- Omar, A., Hamzah, S. A., & Kee, C. P. (2021). Validity and reliability of ethnic boundary instruments at the northern zone primary schools in Peninsular Malaysia, *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 18(3), 253-269.
- Ou, A. Y., Waldman, D. A., & Peterson, S. J. (2015). Do humble CEOs matter? An examination of CEO humility and firm outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 44 (3), 1147-1173. doi: 10.1177/0149206315604187
- Penagos-Corzo JC, Ortiz-Barrero MJ, Hernandez-Ramírez R, Ochoa-Ramírez Y, Gonzalez Ehlinger R & Perez-Acosta AM. (2024). Development and psychometric properties of a self-medication behavior inventory. *Front. Psychol.* 15:1366284. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1366284.
- Polit, D. F. & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing and Health*, 29, 489-497.
- Md Yusof, R. (2013). Pendekatan terkini kepemimpinan karismatik dalam pengurusan sekolah. *Seminar Nasional Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan Ke-20 2013*. Institut Aminuddin Baki, Bandar Enstek, 17 September 2013
- Romero Jeldres M, Díaz Costa E & Faouzi Nadim T. (2023). A review of Lawshe's method for calculating content validity in the social sciences. *Front. Educ.* 8:1271335. doi: 10.3389/educ.2023.1271335
- Rossian, W., & Loisa, R. (2019). Analisis gaya komunikasi kepemimpinan kharismatik (Kepemimpinan Dewa Osiris dalam film "God of Egypt"). *Koneksi*, 3(1), 89-98.
- Rubio, D. M. G., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S. & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research*, 27(2), 94-104.
- Sovey, S., Osman, K., & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2022). Rasch Analysis for Disposition Levels of Computational Thinking Instrument Among Secondary School Students. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 18(3), 1-15.
- Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2016). Research method for bussiness: A skill building approach (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept-based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577-594. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.4.577>
- Tangney, J. P. (2000). Humility: Theoretical perspectives, empirical findings, and directions for further research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(1), 70-82. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.70
- Tristán-López, A. (2008). Modifying the Lawshe model to dictate the content of an object instrument. *Advances in Medicine*, 6, 37-48.
- Vlachos, P. A., Panagopoulos, N. G., & Rapp, A. A. (2013). Feeling good by doing good: Employee CSR-induced attributions, job satisfaction, and the role of charismatic leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(3), 577-588.
- Wilson F. R., Pan W., Schumsky D. A. (2012). Recalculation of the critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 45, 197-210. [Crossref ISI](#).
- Yaw, P.W. & Mohd Matore, M.E.E. (2024), Development and validation of an instrument to measure Science teachers' understanding of Fink's Taxonomy. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 8937-8949. doi: 10.53555/kuvey.v30i4.2932
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Yusoff, H. M., Hamzah, M. I., & Surat, S. (2018). Kesahan dan kebolehppercayaan instrumen indeks pemupukan kreativiti dalam pengajaran guru dengan elemen Islam (I-CFTI) berdasarkan pendekatan Model Rasch. *Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia*, 43(03), 77-88.
- Zainal, M.A. (2020). *Pengaruh efikasi sendiri guru dan kepemimpinan transformasi pengetua/guru besar terhadap tingkah laku inovatif guru*. [Master dissertation, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].

- Zainal, M. A., Mohd Matore, M. E. E., Musa, W. N. W., & Hashim, N. H. (2020). Kesahan kandungan instrumen pengukuran tingkah laku inovatif guru menggunakan kaedah nisbah kesahan kandungan (CVR). *Akademika*, 90, 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.17576/akad-2020-90IK3-04>
- Zubir, M.I. (2021). *Pemindahan latihan dan pembangunan profesional perguruan dalam sistem pendidikan di Malaysia*. [Master dissertation, Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia].