THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF MALAYSIAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEADERSHIP INVENTORY

LING MEI TENG

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH
2016

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF MALAYSIAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEADERSHIP INVENTORY

LING MEI TENG

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

FACULTY OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH
2016

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the material in this thesis is my own except for quotations, excerpts, equations, summaries and references, which have been duly acknowledged.

31 August 2016

_____

Ling Mei Teng
PT1211274T

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

CONFIRMATION

NAME	:	**LING MEI TENG**
MATRIC NO.	:	**PT1211471T**
TITLE	:	**THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF MALAYSIAN SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' LEADERSHIP INVENTORY**
DEGREE	:	**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (EVALUATION IN EDUCATION - TESTING AND MEASUREMENT)**
VIVA DATE	:	**25 July 2016**

CERTIFIED BY

1. SUPERVISOR
Prof. Dr. Vincent Pang Signature

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Dr. Vincent Pang of the Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah who has been patient enough to advise, guide and supervise me throughout the past few years. His continuous encouragement provided me the necessary impetus to complete the research and publish this thesis. With his patience and help, I managed to publish three articles in Scopus indexed journal in one year.

I would like to acknowledge the generosity, assistance and support of psychometric experts such as Prof. Margaret Wu, Prof. Trever Bond, Dr. Mohd. Zali bin Mohd. Nor, and Mr. J.Y. Cheung. Besides that, I would like to thank Dr. Steward Tubb who gave me his permission to use his Leadership Competency Model to develop the instrument and also lent me a hand in reviewing and advising me in leadership field. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Prof Ramayah Thurasamy who had guided me in PLS-SEM analysis. For all the teachers (Mr. Robert John, Mr. Sivasanggar a/l Subramaniom and Mr. Mohd. Affendi Arifin) and experts (Profesor Madya Dr Hj Baharom Mohamad, Mr. Roshaimmi Bin Mohamad, Mrs. Fazaidah Mohd. Gan and Mrs. Ng Lee Fong) who had helped me in content validation, I am grateful to all of you. Thank you to all the language experts (Dr. Azlena Zainal, Dr. Wan Muna Ruzanna Wan Mohammad, Mrs. Cheong Shaw Mei and Mrs. Stephania Albert Jonglai) who did the back-to-back translation and proofread in my questionnaire. An appreciation also to the staff and students at the research websites such as Doctorate Support Group, RASCH Measurement Model - Malaysian Chapter, who so willingly shared their expertise with me.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my parents who always believe in the value of education; my parents-in-law, for their continued generosity and assistance; and my handsome husband, Ethan Wong, for his constant love, unconditional support and unwavering belief in me. Finally, many thanks also to those who had contributed to this study as well.

Ling Mei Teng
31 August 2016

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

ABSTRACT

Leadership skill is one of the elements that is emphasised in the Malaysian Education Development Plan 2013-2025. A valid and reliable scale to measure leadership among secondary school students is still unavailable in schools and student leadership is not specifically evaluated in schools. This study aimed to develop the Malaysian Secondary School Students' Leadership Inventory (M3SLI) and to determine the related psychometric properties by using the Rasch Rating Scale Measurement Model and Hierarchical Component Model (HCM). In an effort to develop a new instrument, Design and Development Research (DDR) design provides the basis for this research design. The newly developed questionnaire was administered to 2340 students from 26 schools in four main divisions of Sabah. The validity and reliability of the M3SLI are acceptable to measure the leadership potential of secondary school students. The evidence of Differential Item Functioning (DIF) does not exist, indicates that personality, values and competencies constructs in M3SLI function similarly on different genders, school locations and forms. There are no collinearity issues in formative indicators and first order components and all the outer weight are significant. The item-person map confirmed the predictive validity of M3SLI. Eight types of leaders were proposed in this study based on their personalities, values and competencies. Re-testing of the instrument and improvement of items have to be applied before the measurement scale of M3SLI can be used as an established instrument. School administrators should be based on the student leadership profile when come to selecting head prefect or any other important leadership positions in school.

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Keywords: Measurement, Validation, Psychometric, Scale, Student leadership

ABSTRAK

PEMBANGUNAN DAN PENGESAHAN INVENTORI KEPIMPINAN PELAJAR SEKOLAH MENENGAH MALAYSIA

Kemahiran kepimpinan adalah salah satu elemen yang ditekankan dalam Pelan Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia 2013-2025. Skala yang sah dan boleh dipercayai untuk mengukur kepepimpinan dalam kalangan pelajar sekolah menengah masih tidak wujud dan tidak dinilai secara khusus. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk membangunkan Inventori Kepepimpinan Pelajar Sekolah Menengah Malaysia (M3SLI) dan menentukan sifat-sifat psikometrik dengan menggunakan Model Skala Penilaian Pengukuran Rasch dan Model Komponen Hierarki (HCM). Dalam usaha membangunkan instrumen baru ini, Penyelidikan Mereka bentuk dan Pembangunan (DDR) menjadi asas kepada reka bentuk kajian ini. Soal selidik diedarkan kepada 2340 orang pelajar dari 26 buah sekolah menengah di empat bahagian Sabah. Kesahan dan kebolehpercayaan M3SLI diterima untuk mengukur kepimpinan pelajar sekolah menengah. Keputusan menunjukkan kesan Differential Item Functioning (DIF) tidak wujud, ini menunjukkan konstruk personality, nilai-nilai dan kompetensi dalam M3SLI berfungsi dengan sama dalam jantina, lokasi sekolah dan tingkatan yang berbeza. Tidak terdapat isu-isu kolineariti dalam indikator formatif dan komponen peringkat pertama dan kesemua pemberat luaran adalah signifikan. Peta Item-Person menunjukkan kesahan ramalan M3SLI. Kajian ini mencadangkan lapan jenis pemimpin yang dicadangkan berdasarkan personaliti, nilai-nilai dan kompetensi. Pengujian semula instrumen dan penambahbaikan item perlu diaplikasikan sebelum skala pengukuran M3SLI boleh digunakan sebagai instrumen yang mantap. Pentadbir sekolah seharusnya memilih ketua pengawas atau jawatan pemimpin yang lain di sekolah berdasarkan profil kepimpinan pelajar.

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Kata kunci: Pengukuran, Pengesahan, Psikometrik, Skala, Kepepimpinan pelajar

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pages
TITLE		i
DECLARATION		ii
CONFIRMATION		iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		iv
ABSTRACT		v
ABSTRAK		vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS		vii
LIST OF TABLES		xii
LIST OF FIGURES		xxii
LIST OF APPENDIX		xxv
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS		xxvi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION		1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Problem Statement	4
1.3	Objectives of study	8
1.4	Research questions	8
1.5	Significane of the study	9
1.6	Defination of terms	10
	1.6.1 Personality	10
	1.6.2 Values	11
	1.6.3 Competency	13
	1.6.4 Student leader	16
1.7	Limitations and delimitations of the study	16
1.8	summary	17
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW		18
2.1	Organization of chapter	18
2.2	Reviews of related concept, teories and models	18

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

2.2.1 Student leader 18
2.2.2 Student leadership 20
2.2.3 Student leadership approach 22
2.2.4 Student leadership model 27
2.2.5 Student leadership instrument 42
2.2.6 Types of student leader 50
2.2.7 Psychometric properties 51
2.3 Psychometric issues in instrument developement 65
2.4 Theoretical framework 70
2.5 Conceptual framework 71
2.6 summary 73

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 74
3.1 inroduction 74
3.2 Research approach 74
3.3 Research design 74
3.4 Population and sample 75
3.4.1 Population 75
3.4.2 Sample size determination 75
3.4.3 Sampling method 77
3.5 Instrument development process 80
3.5.1 Stage 1: instrument designed and developement 82
3.5.2 Stage 2: Instrument testing and refining 91
3.5.3 Stage 3: instrument validation 96
3.6 Data analysis procedure 97
3.6.1 Validation of items 97
3.6.2 Measurement invariance 108
3.6.3 Predictive validity 110
3.6.4 Validation of constructs 111
3.6.5 Descriptive analysis 118
3.7 Human research approval 121
3.8 summary 121

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

CHAPTER 4: PILOT STUDY 122
4.1 introduction 122
4.2 Demographic information of sample 122
4.3 Data analysis of personality construct 122
4.3.1 Construct diagnosis 123
4.3.2 Item misfit diagnosis 129
4.3.3 Unidimentionality diagnosis 133
4.3.4 Separation diagnosis 139
4.3.5 Categorical function diagnosis 144
4.4 Data analysis of value construct 145
4.4.1 Construct diagnosis 146
4.4.2 Item misfit diagnosis 147
4.4.3 Unidimentionality diagnosis 150
4.4.4 Separation diagnosis 152
4.4.5 Categorical function diagnosis 154
4.5 Data analysis of competencies(C) construct 155
4.5.1 Construct diagnosis 155
4.5.2 Item misfit diagnosis 164
4.5.3 Unidimentionality diagnosis 174
4.5.4 Separation diagnosis 182
4.5.5 Categorical function diagnosis 187
4.6 Summary of findings in pilot study 189
4.6.1 Item Misfit Diagnosis 189
4.6.2 Item Polarity Diagnosis 192
4.6.3 Principal Component Analysis of Rasch Residual (PCAR) Diagnosis 193
4.6.4 Separation Diagnosis 195
4.6.5 Category Function Diagnosis 196

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS 198
5.1 Introductions 198

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

5.2	Demographic information	198
5.3	Validation and realibility of item	199
	5.3.1 personality	201
	5.3.2 values	229
	5.3.3 competencies	257
5.4	Measurement invariance	286
	5.4.1 Personality	287
	5.4.2 Values	290
	5.4.3 Competencies	293
5.5	Predictive validity	297
	5.5.1 Personality	297
	5.5.2 Values	300
	5.5.3 Competencies	303
	5.5.4 Stdent leadership	306
5.6	Validation of construct	308
	5.6.1 Collinearity issues	308
	5.6.2 Significance and relevance	308
5.7	Leadership type determination	310
	5.7.1 Characteristics of each type of leader	310
5.8	Student leadership profile	317
	5.8.1 Leadership profile based on gender	320
	5.8.2 Leadership profile based on school locations	321
5.9	summary	322

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION 330

6.1	introduction	330
6.2	Summary of findings	330
6.3	Discussion of the findings	332
	6.3.1 Validity and realibility of itmes	330
	6.3.2 Measurement Invariance	339
	6.3.3 Predictive validity	350
	6.3.4 Validation of construct	350

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

6.3.5 Characteristics and types of leadership 352
6.3.6 Secondary school students' profile (SSSLP) 360
6.4 Implication and futher suggestions 362
6.5 conclusion 364

REFERENCES 366
APPENDICIES 382

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1:	The differences between student and organizational leaderships	21
Table 2.2:	Four basic leadership styles	24
Table 2.3:	Summary of theories in Situational Approach	26
Table 2.4:	Summary of theories in New Leadership Approach	27
Table 2.5:	Personalities in the Big Five Factors	35
Table 2.6:	Rokeach and Schwartz Value	36
Table 2.7:	Definition of Rokeach and Schwartz Value System	36
Table 2.8:	Elements Rokeach and Schwartz value system	37
Table 2.9:	Examples of leadership competencies instrument from overseas	49
Table 2.10:	The six leadership styles of Goleman	51
Table 2.11:	The differences between CTT and IRT	53
Table 3.1:	Number of school in every division in Sabah	75
Table 3.2:	Proportionate stratified sampling of schools in each division	78
Table 3.3:	Items to measure leadership competencies	87
Table 3.4:	Items to measure personality	89
Table 3.5:	Items to measure values	90
Table 3.6:	Sections, contents and number of items in M3SLI	91
Table 3.7:	Modification of items: inappropriateness of content	93
Table 3.8:	Modification of items: inappropriateness of language level	94
Table 3.9:	Interpretation of parameter level MNSQ fit statistics	101
Table 3.10:	Z-Std and the statistical significance value of chi-square	103
Table 3.11:	Research questions and type of data analysis for item quality validation	108
Table 3.12:	Research questions and data analysis of measurement invariance	110

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 3.13:	Research questions and data analysis of predictive validity	111
Table 3.14:	Validity tests for formative construct	116
Table 3.15:	Research questions and type of data analysis of construct validation	118
Table 3.16:	Categories of student leaders	119
Table 3.17:	Research questions and descriptive data analysis	120
Table 4.1:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in ES v.1	129
Table 4.2:	Item statistics after CP16 deleted	130
Table 4.3:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in EX v.1	130
Table 4.4:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in AG v.1	131
Table 4.5:	Item statistics after CP20 deleted	131
Table 4.6:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in CS v.1	132
Table 4.7:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in OP v.1	132
T able 4.8:	Item statistics after CP17 deleted	133
Table 4.9:	PTMEA Corr. for items in ES	133
Table 4.10:	PTMEA Corr. for items in EX	134
Table 4.11:	PTMEA Corr. for items in AG	134
Table 4.12:	PTMEA Corr. for items in CS	135
Table 4.13:	PTMEA Corr. for items in OP	135
Table 4.14:	Item reliability: emotional stability	140
Table 4.15:	Item reliability: extroversion	141
Table 4.16:	Item reliability: agreeableness	142
Table 4.17:	Item reliability: conscientiousness	143
Table 4.18:	Item reliability: openness to experiences	144
Table 4.19:	Summary of category structure for grouping level of agreement in Personality v.1	144
Table 4.20:	Item Statistics: Misfit order of item in Values construct v.1	147
Table 4.21:	Item Statistics: Misfit order of item in Values construct v.1	148
Table 4.22:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	150

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 4.23:	Item reliability: Values construct	152
Table 4.24:	Person reliability: Value	153
Table 4.25:	Summary of category structure for grouping level of importance for 5-point rating scale of Values Construct v.1	154
Table 4.26:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in UBP v.1	164
Table 4.27:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in ATT v.1	165
Table 4.28:	Item statistics after delete nine person outliers in ATT v.1	166
Table 4.29:	Item statistics after delete LS23 in ATT v.1	166
Table 4.30:	Item statistics after delete LS2 in ATT v.1	166
Table 4.31:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in DF v.1	167
Table 4.32:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in LC v.1	168
Table 4.33:	Item statistics after delete eight person in LC v.1	169
Table 4.34:	Item statistics after delete LS27 in LC v.1	169
Table 4.35:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in COM v.1	170
Table 4.36:	Item statistics after delete LS23 in COM v.1	171
Table 4.37:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in CI v.1	171
Table 4.38:	Item statistics after delete outliers person in CI v.1	172
Table 4.39:	Item statistics after delete LS12 in CI v.1	173
Table 4.40:	Item statistics: misfit order of item in TMW v.1	174
Table 4.41:	PTMEA Corr. for items in UBP v.1	174
Table 4.42:	PTMEA Corr. for items in ATT v.1	174
Table 4.43:	PTMEA Corr. for items in DF v.1	176
Table 4.44:	PTMEA Corr. for items in LC v.1	177
Table 4.45:	PTMEA Corr. for items in COM v.1	177
Table 4.46:	PTMEA Corr. for items in CI v.1	178
Table 4.47:	PTMEA Corr. for items in TMW v.1	179
Table 4.48:	Item reliability: UBP v.1	183
Table 4.49:	Item reliability: ATT v.1	184
Table 4.50:	Item reliability: DF v.1	184
Table 4.51:	Item reliability: LC v.1	185

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 4.52:	Item reliability: COM v.1	186
Table 4.53:	Item reliability: CI v.1	186
Table 4.54:	Item reliability: CI v.1	187
Table 4.55:	Summary of category structure for grouping level of agreement in Competencies	188
Table 4.56:	Summary of item fit analysis in M3SLI	190
Table 4.57:	Summary of PTMEA Corr. for all items in M3SLI	192
Table 4.58:	Summary of PCAR for all constructs in M3SLI	194
Table 4.59:	Summary of item separation and reliability	196
Table 4.60:	Summary of category function diagnosis	197
Table 5.1:	Demographic data of respondents	200
Table 5.2:	Summary of item misfit analysis for urban Form 1 students	202
Table 5.3:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	203
Table 5.4:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for urban Form 1 students	204
Table 5.5:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for urban Form 1 students	204
Table 5.6:	Summary of item misfit analysis for urban form 2 students	205
Table 5.7:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	206
Table 5.8:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for urban form 2 students	206
Table 5.9:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for urban form 2 students	207
Table 5.10:	Summary of item misfit analysis for urban form 4 students	208
Table 5.11:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	208
Table 5.12:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for urban form 4 students	209
Table 5.13:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for urban form 4 students	209

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.14:	Summary of item misfit analysis for rural form 1 students	210
Table 5.15:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	211
Table 5.16:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for rural form 1 students	211
Table 5.17:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for rural form 1 students	212
Table 5.18:	Summary of item misfit analysis for rural form 2 students	213
Table 5.19:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	214
Table 5.20:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for rural form 2 students	214
Table 5.21:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for rural Form 2 students	215
Table 5.22:	Summary of item misfit analysis for rural form 4 students	216
Table 5.23:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Personality construct	216
Table 5.24:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Personality for rural form 4 students	217
Table 5.25:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Personality for rural form 4 students	217
Table 5.26:	Item Distribution according to level of difficulty to endorse of Personality	219
Table 5.27:	List of Misfit Items, Infit and Outfit MNSQ for the Item in Personality v.2	220
Table 5.28:	Analysis of PTMEA Corr. in Personality	221
Table 5.29:	Summary of item statistics for personality in M3SLI v.2	223
Table 5.30:	Summary of person statistics for personality in M3SLI v.2	223
Table 5.31:	Summary of Category Structure of Personality	224
Table 5.32:	Threshold of 5-Rating Scale of Personality	224
Table 5.33:	Person Reliability: Personality After Recode	226
Table 5.34:	Item Reliability: Personality after Recode	226
Table 5.35:	Threshold after collapsing category in Personality	228
Table 5.36:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for urban form 1 students	230

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.37:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	230
Table 5.38:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for urban form 1 students	231
Table 5.39:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for urban form 1 students	231
Table 5.40:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for urban form 2 students	233
Table 5.41:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	234
Table 5.42:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for urban form 2 students	234
Table 5.43:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for urban form 2 students	235
Table 5.44:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for urban form 4 students	236
Table 5.45:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	236
Table 5.46:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for urban form 4 students	237
Table 5.47:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for urban form 4 students	237
Table 5.48:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for rural form 1 students	238
Table 5.49:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	239
Table 5.50:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for rural form 1 students	240
Table 5.51:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for rural form 1 students	240
Table 5.52:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for rural form 2 students	241
Table 5.53:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	242
Table 5.54:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for urban form 1 students	242

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.55:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for urban Form 1 students	243
Table 5.56:	Summary of item misfit of Values construct for rural form 4 students	244
Table 5.57:	PTMEA Corr. for items in Values construct	245
Table 5.58:	Summary of PCAR analysis of Values for urban form 1 students	245
Table 5.59:	Summary of item separation and reliability of Values for rural Form 4 students	246
Table 5.60:	Item distribution according to level of difficulty to endorse of Value	247
Table 5.61:	Analysis of PTMEA Corr. in Values	248
Table 5.62:	Table of standardize residual variance of Values	248
Table 5.63:	Standardized residual loadings for items in Values V.2	249
Table 5.64:	Summary of item statistics for Values in M3SLI v.2	250
Table 5.65:	Summary of person statistics for Values in M3SLI v.2	251
Table 5.66:	Summary of Category Structure of Values	252
Table 5.67:	Threshold of 5-Rating Scale of Values	252
Table 5.68:	Threshold after collapsing category of Value	254
Table 5.69:	Person Reliability: Values After Recode	254
Table 5.70:	Item Reliability: Values after Recode	255
Table 5.71:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for urban form 1 students	258
Table 5.72:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	260
Table 5.73:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for urban form 1 students	260
Table 5.74:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for urban form 1 students	261
Table 5.75:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for urban form 2 students	262
Table 5.76:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	263

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.77:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for urban form 2 students	263
Table 5.78:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for urban form 2 students	264
Table 5.79:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for urban form 4 students	265
Table 5.80:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	266
Table 5.81:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for urban form 4 students	266
Table 5.82:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for urban form 4 students	267
Table 5.83:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for rural form 1 students	268
Table 5.84:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	269
Table 5.85:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for rural form 1 students	269
Table 5.86:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for rural form 1 students	270
Table 5.87:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for rural form 2 students	271
Table 5.88:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	272
Table 5.89:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for rural form 2 students	272
Table 5.90:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for rural form 2 students	273
Table 5.91:	Summary of item misfit of competencies construct for rural form 4 students	274
Table 5.92:	PTMEA Corr. for items in competencies construct	275
Table 5.93:	Summary of PCAR analysis of competencies for Rural form 4 students	275
Table 5.94:	Summary of item reliability and separation diagnosis for rural form 4 students	276

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.95:	Item distribution based on level of difficulty to endorse in Competencies	277
Table 5.96:	Analysis of PTMEA Corr. in Competencies	278
Table 5.97:	Table of Standardize Residual Variance of Competencies	279
Table 5.98:	Item suggested to be omitted in Competencies	279
Table 5.99:	Summary of item statistics for Competencies in M3SLI v.2	281
Table 5.100:	Summary of person statistics for Competencies in M3SLI v.2	281
Table 5.101:	Summary of Category Structure of Leadership Competencies	282
Table 5.102:	Person Reliability: Competencies After Recode	284
Table 5.103:	Item Reliability: Personality after Recode	284
Table 5.104:	Threshold after collapsing category in Competency	286
Table 5.105:	Significant GDIF in Personality	287
Table 5.106:	Significant LDIF in Personality	288
Table 5.107:	Significant FDIF in Personality	289
Table 5.108:	Significant GDIF in Values Construct	290
Table 5.109:	Significant LDIF in Values Construct	291
Table 5.110:	Significant FDIF in Values Construct	292
Table 5.111:	Significant GDIF in Competencies	293
Table 5.112:	Significant LDIF in Competencies	294
Table 5.113:	Significant FDIF Analysis in competencies	296
Table 5.114:	Item anchoring in Personality	298
Table 5.115:	Person logits and positions in Personality	299
Table 5.116:	Item anchoring in Values	300
Table 5.117:	Person logits and positions in Values	302
Table 5.118:	Item anchoring in Competencies	303
Table 5.119:	Person logits and positions in Personality	305
Table 5.120:	Person logits and positions in student leadership	307
Table 5.121:	Outer weight significance testing results for formative indicators	309

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Table 5.122:	Outer weight significance testing results for first order components	310
Table 5.123:	UMEAN and USCALE of Personality, Values and Competencies	311
Table 5.124:	Descriptive Statistics of Item Measure	311
Table 5.125:	Cut-off point of Personality	312
Table 5.126:	Cut-off point of Values	313
Table 5.127:	Cut-off point of Competencies	315
Table 5.128:	Descriptive statistics of person measure	319
Table 5.129:	Type of student leader	319
Table 5.130:	Cross tabulation type of leader based on gender	321
Table 5.131:	Cross Tabulation Type of Leader Based On School Locations	322
Table 5.132:	Summary of data analysis	323
Table 6.1:	Types of student leaders	357
Table 6.2:	Types of student leader in set formula	359
Table 6.3:	characteristics for eight types of student leader	360

UMS
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1:	The Leadership Grid	25
Figure 2.2:	Tubbs Leadership Competency Model	31
Figure 2.3:	Item Characteristic Curve	57
Figure 2.4:	The same scale of the distribution of students and item	59
Figure 2.5:	Theoretical Framework	71
Figure 2.6:	Conceptual framework	72
Figure 3.1:	Sampling procedures	79
Figure 3.2:	Instrument development and validation process	81
Figure 3.3:	Rasch analysis diagnostic procedure	98
Figure 3.4:	Example of DIF	110
Figure 3.5:	Hierarchical component model of leadership	113
Figure 3.6:	First stage for the formative-formative type measurement model for HCM analysis	114
Figure 3.7:	Second stage for the formative-formative type measurement model for HCM analysis	115
Figure 4.1:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in ES v.1	123
Figure 4.2:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in EX v.1	125
Figure 4.3:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in AG v.1	126
Figure 4.4:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in CS v.1	127
Figure 4.5:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in OP v.1	128
Figure 4.6:	Standardize residual variance of ES v.1 (before delete	136
Figure 4.7:	Standardized residual loadings for items in ES v.1	136
Figure 4.8:	Standardize residual variance of ES v.1 (after delete CP16)	137
Figure 4.9:	Standardize residual variance of EX v.1	137
Figure 4.10:	Standardize residual variance of AG v.1	138
Figure 4.11:	Standardize residual variance of CS v.1	138
Figure 4.12:	Standardize residual variance of OP v.1	139
Figure 4.13:	Category probability of response in Personality	145

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

Figure 4.14:	Mapping difficulty item – respondent agreeability in Values v.1	146
Figure 4.15:	Guttmann scalogram of outliers responses in Values v.1	149
Figure 4.16:	Invariance of person measures with different number of	149
Figure 4.17:	Standardize residual variance of values v.1	151
Figure 4.18:	Standardize residual contrast of Values v.1	151
Figure 4.19:	Items with loading contrast more than 0.60 in Values v.1	152
Figure 4.20:	Category probability of response in Values	154
Figure 4.21:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of UBP v.1	156
Figure 4.22:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of ATT v.1	157
Figure 4.23:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of DF v.1	158
Figure 4.24:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of LC v.1	159
Figure 4.25:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of COM v.1	161
Figure 4.26:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of CI v.1	162
Figure 4.27:	Difficulty item-respondent agreeability map of TMW v.1	165
Figure 4.28:	Guttmann scalogram of outliers responses in ATT v.1	167
Figure 4.29:	Invariance of person measures in ATT v.1	168
Figure 4.30:	Guttmann scalogram of outliers responses in LC v.1	168
Figure 4.31:	Invariance of person measures in LC v.1	170
Figure 4.32:	Guttmann scalogram of responses in COM v.1	171
Figure 4.33:	Guttmann scalogram of outliers responses in CI v.1	172
Figure 4.34:	Invariance of person measures in CI v.1	173
Figure 4.35:	Standardize residual variance of UBP v.1	179
Figure 4.36:	Standardize residual variance of ATT v.1	180
Figure 4.37:	Standardize residual variance of DF v.1	180
Figure 4.38:	Standardize residual variance of LC v.1	181
Figure 4.39:	Standardize residual variance of COM v.1	181
Figure 4.40:	Standardize residual variance of CI v.1	182
Figure 4.41:	Standardize residual variance of TMW v.1	182
Figure 4.42:	Category probability of response in Competencies	188
Figure 4.43:	Threshold category curve of Competencies	189
Figure 4.44:	Standardized Residual Contrast Plot in Personality	195

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH