



Research Article

© 2024 Bafadal et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 21 September 2023 / Accepted: 4 December 2023 / Published: 5 January 2024

Convergent and Discriminant Validity of the Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire in Indonesian Context

Ibrahim Bafadal¹

Adi Atmoko²

Asep Sunandar³

Paul Arjanto^{4*}

Maria Imaculada da Conceição Soares⁵

¹Professor, Educational Management, Faculty of Education Sciences,
Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

²Professor, Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education Sciences,
Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

³Professor, Educational Management, Faculty of Education Sciences,
Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

⁴Student, Doctoral Program in Education Management,
Faculty of Education Sciences, Universitas Negeri Malang,
Malang, Indonesia

⁵Doctor, Education Management, Faculty of Education Sciences,
Instituto Superior Cristal, Dili, Timor-Leste

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2024-0014>

Abstract

Objective: This study aims to address the lack of quantitative, culturally contextualized measures for evaluating moral leadership in Indonesian primary schools. The objectives are threefold: 1) to assess the convergent validity of Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ) within the Indonesian educational setting; 2) to evaluate the discriminant validity of the BLMQ; and 3) to derive actionable insights for administrators and policymakers based on the findings. *Method:* A quantitative survey-based approach was employed, gathering data from 362 prospective school principals in East Java, Indonesia. A series of scales including the BLMQ, Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ), Moral Competency Inventory (MCI), Self-Esteem Scale (SES), and Locus of Control (LoC) were administered. *Results:* The study revealed significant positive correlations between the BLMQ and other moral metrics such as the MFQ and MCI, suggesting convergent validity. On the other hand, low and non-significant correlations were found between the BLMQ and scales like the SES and LoC, which suggests discriminant validity. Notably, the correlation between the BLMQ and MCI was not statistically significant. *Conclusion:* The BLMQ demonstrates both convergent and discriminant validity, as it aligns closely with other moral metrics like the MFQ but not with unrelated scales like the SES and LoC. However, the non-significant correlation between the BLMQ and MCI suggests that these two instruments may be capturing different facets of moral competency.

Keywords: Moral, Leadership, Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity, Primary Schools

1. Introduction

The important role of moral leadership in the world of education is increasingly recognized, following important contributions from scholars (Sergiovanni, 1992). A plethora of empirical evidence highlights the substantive influence of moral leadership in shaping school culture, enhancing employee effectiveness, and positively impacting various educational outcomes (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Lin et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2019). Despite its apparent importance, the concept of moral leadership remains conspicuously under-researched in specific cultural settings, notably in Indonesia. Although moral leadership is a burgeoning field of study, Indonesian primary schools have been largely overlooked in the extant literature. Existing studies have predominantly utilized qualitative methodologies, focusing mainly on case studies and in-depth interviews (Alase, 2017; Bafadal et al., 2020; Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021). While these qualitative approaches yield valuable insights, they do not fully meet the demand for empirically rigorous, quantitative metrics that can be generalized across different settings (Kline, 2016; Podsakoff et al., 1990). Further complicating the issue is the heavy reliance on ambiguous terms like 'moral self' and 'moral integrity' that lack specificity (Black & Reynolds, 2016; Ford & Richardson, 1994).

Moreover, the literature is lacking in terms of instruments that are tailored to measure moral leadership in an Indonesian context. While several scales and questionnaires exist, these are often developed for general populations or specific demographic subgroups, lacking a cultural and contextual focus (Brown et al., 2005; Northouse, 2019). Therefore, custom tools are essential for capturing the nuances of moral leadership within Indonesian primary schools (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012; Hill & Roberts, 2010).

To address these gaps, this study has three main aims: 1) to evaluate the convergent validity of Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ) within the Indonesian educational setting; 2) to assess the discriminant validity of the BLMQ in the same environment; 3) to generate actionable recommendations for school administrators and policymakers based on the study's findings. This study aspires to contribute a culturally contextualized and empirically robust instrument for evaluating moral leadership among school principals in Indonesia. Its insights could prove invaluable for both theoretical and practical applications. Policymakers could leverage the findings to formulate evidence-based leadership development programs, and scholars will benefit from a validated instrument for future research.

2. Literature Review

The exploration of morality across various disciplines offers a multifaceted understanding of the concept, serving as a foundational layer for grasping its role in other contexts like leadership and educational institutions. As emphasized in the literature, morality acts not only as a framework for decision-making but also as a mechanism for social control, especially when choices are to be made in morally ambiguous situations (Falikowski, 1990; Lind, 2019). Such complexity has birthed a discourse encompassing multiple theories, from Kohlberg's cognitive developmental approach (Kohlberg, 1963, 1984) to those based on evolutionary psychology (Pinker, 2009; Trivers, 1971), all aimed at reconciling the biological and cultural origins of morality. Yet, despite the variations and culturally relative elements, there seem to be universal moral principles such as justice and fairness that traverse cultures and societies (Ayala, 2012; Schwartz, 2007).

Complementing this general understanding of morality, ethical theories advanced by philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Bentham offer nuanced perspectives on what it means to lead an ethical life. These theories range from Plato's and Aristotle's teleological views focusing on self-realization and rationality (Aristotle, 1984; Plato, 1976; Runkle, 1982) to Kant's deontological perspective, which stresses rational duty (Kant, 1963). Bentham's utilitarianism, on the other hand, presents a more practical, outcome-focused lens, emphasizing the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain (Beauchamp et al., 2021). Although disparate in their foundations, these

theories collectively contribute to a broader, multi-dimensional understanding of morality.

Parallel to this is the growing body of work that tackles the psychological dimensions of moral development. From Freud's initial constructs of id, ego, and super-ego (Freud, 1923) to Piaget's focus on the moral reasoning of children (Piaget, 1932), and Kohlberg's more structured, stage-wise approach (Kohlberg, 1963; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977), the psychological aspect of morality has seen significant evolution. Rest's introduction of "social justice" adds yet another layer, detailing how moral actions are a result of multiple components like moral sensitivity, judgment, and character (Rest, 1980; Rest & Narváez, 1995).

While the preceding literature provides general theories and psychological perspectives, the research on moral leadership, particularly in educational settings, offers real-world applications. In the Indonesian context, moral leadership in schools is governed by specific regulations and qualifications, with a focus on balancing both academic and administrative responsibilities (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Syafira Ariyanti, et al., 2021; Brewster & Klump, 2005; Maisyaroh et al., 2023). This brand of leadership emphasizes the three pillars of spiritual morals, nationality morals, and humanity morals, establishing it as an ethical and integrative approach (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021).



Figure 1: Construct of the Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ)

Source: (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021)

The text explores the multi-dimensional concept of "spirituality morals," situating it as a foundational element in educational leadership and moral development. Drawing from various studies and models (Arifin, 2015; Peterson & Seligman, 2004), the text dissects how moral spiritual values like beneficence, patience, practical wisdom, and forgiveness function in learning environments. It identifies moral spirituality as the integration of religious and spiritual beliefs that influence individual and collective behavior. These values not only serve as the backbone for school leadership but also impact the moral reasoning and sensitivity of individuals within the educational ecosystem. The text also delves into specific virtues like "istiqomah" (consistency), patience, gratitude, and sincerity, contextualizing them within the roles of educators and school leaders (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021; Bafadal & Nurabadi, 2019; Junça-Silva et al., 2023; Schnitker et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2020). These virtues are framed as cognitive and emotional supplements that reinforce community reciprocity and moral obligations. Overall, the text suggests that moral spirituality can be a powerful tool for fostering ethical behavior, altruism, and meaningful learning environments.

The literature on "Nationality Morals" focuses on the critical role it plays in educational settings, particularly in schools which act as a second home to students (Krettenauer, 2021). The concept

permeates curricula, learning environments, school culture, and even the artifacts displayed within schools. It emphasizes integrating national values, such as Indonesia's Pancasila principles, into broader civic and national life. The educational leadership that champions national morality practices is one that also advocates democratic values, such as freedom, tolerance, and equality (Çelik et al., 2022; Flanagan & Faison, 2001; Ohrn, 2001; Selvi, 2006), and fosters an "Archipelago Insight," understanding the nation's collective ideology and objectives (Gumuruh & Adinata, 2020; Risnain et al., 2021). It also promotes national resilience, measured through factors like patriotism, trust, and optimism (Canetti et al., 2014; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Furthermore, it seeks to instill a thorough understanding of civic rights and responsibilities as defined by Indonesian law. The underlying premise is that educational settings are not just for academic growth but also crucial for moral and civic development, thereby reducing anti-social behavior and increasing community cohesion (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

The literature underscores the significance of "Humanity Morals" in educational leadership, highlighting its multifaceted role in fostering an ethical, empathic, and socially just learning environment. Pijanowski situates the concept as a measure of how a school leader treats others, advocating actions that elevate the human condition (Pijanowski, 2002). This is supplemented by Bafadal et al., who identify five key dimensions: recognizing equality, appreciating others, respecting others, empathy, and caring for others (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021). Notably, Danopoulos emphasizes the role of fairness in recognizing equality (Danopoulos, 2017), while Peterson & Seligman argue for the importance of moral reasoning in decision-making processes (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). In the realm of appreciation and respect, various studies point to the psychosocial benefits and moral imperatives. For example, Sennett speaks to the intrinsic value of respect (Sennett, 2003). Moreover, empathy and caring are depicted not just as affective traits but also as cognitive skills essential for human connection (Cuff et al., 2016; Durgun Ozan et al., 2020). Overall, the literature collectively argues that these aspects of humanitarian morality are not merely optional virtues but necessary components for effective educational leadership and societal well-being.

3. Methodology

3.1 Procedure

The study commenced by concentrating on data collection from prospective school principals. Prior to the initiation of the research, clearance was obtained from the East Java government. This approval guarantees that the research adheres to the essential ethical guidelines concerning studies involving human participants.

3.2 Data Collection

For the purpose of collecting comprehensive data, all participating teachers were given a secure online link that directed them to an exhaustive questionnaire, comprising of several measures including the Behavioral Leadership Moral Qualities Questionnaire (BLMQ), Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ), Moral Competency Inventory (MCI), Self-Esteem Scale (SES), and Locus of Control (LoC). These measures aimed to holistically assess their professional and personal competencies and beliefs. To ensure clarity and accessibility for the participants, all the scales were translated into the Indonesian language. In addition to the questionnaire, participants received an information sheet and a consent form which emphasized the voluntary nature of the study and guaranteed that all data shared would be confidential and anonymous. It was imperative that participants peruse these documents thoroughly before proceeding with the survey. The East Java provincial government and various city/regional governments sanctioned access to schools for this data collection process, which took place between March and June 2023. The confidentiality of the

data was paramount, with all the questionnaires being dispatched and returned using a delivery service to maintain anonymity.

3.3 Sample

The sample for this study was strategically selected in alignment with the criteria outlined in the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology's directive number 40 of 2021. Comprising a total of 362 teachers, the sample was drawn from diverse cities and districts within the province of East Java, Indonesia. Detailed demographic information concerning the participants is elaborated upon in Table 1.

Table 1. Details of Research Respondents

		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	113	31.20
	Female	249	68.80
Education Level	Bachelor (S1)	306	84.50
	Magister (S2)	56	15.50
Age	<30	16	4.42
	31-40	214	59.12
	41-50	109	30.11
	51-60	23	6.35
Region	Malang City	39	10.77
	Malang Regency	80	22.10
	Surabaya City	22	6.08
	Sidoarjo Regency	13	3.59
	Pasuruan Regency	39	10.77
	Mojokerto Regency	18	4.97
	Kediri Regency	32	8.84
	Sampang Regency	13	3.59
	Bondowoso Regency	22	6.08
	Blitar Regency	14	3.87
	Ngawi Regency	8	2.21
	Jember Regency	21	5.80
	Magetan Regency	1	0.28
	Trenggalek Regency	1	0.28
	Bojonegoro Regency	6	1.66
	Pamekasan Regency	1	0.28
	Mojokerto City	4	1.10
	Probolinggo Regency	2	0.55
	Gresik Regency	1	0.28
	Tulungagung Regency	1	0.28
	Bangkalan Regency	6	1.66
	Sumenep Regency	8	2.21
	Probolinggo City	1	0.28
	Pasuruan City	2	0.55
Jombang Regency	4	1.10	
Banyuwangi Regency	2	0.55	
Nganjuk Regency	1	0.28	

Source: Primary Data, processed in 2023

Demographically, the study sample was fairly diverse yet leaned in specific directions for some attributes. For instance, the age of the participants ranged from below 30 years to as high as 60, although a majority fell within the 31-40 years age bracket. Gender-wise, the sample was largely female, making up 68.8% of the total. The educational background was predominantly at the Bachelor's degree level, accounting for 84.5% of the sample. Furthermore, the teachers in the study

represented a broad spectrum of regions within East Java, highlighting the study's comprehensive reach.

3.4 Measures

3.4.1 Bafadal's Leadership Moral Qualities Questionnaire (BLMQ)

BLMQ is a newly developed instrument designed to assess the moral attributes of prospective school principals. The tool is organized into three primary moral dimensions, each encompassing specific moral competencies. The first dimension, spirituality morals, includes four competencies: consistent attitude, patience, gratitude, and sincerity. The second, nationality morals, comprises applying democratic values, having an archipelago insight, realizing national resilience, and understanding the rights and obligations as citizens. The third dimension, humanity morals, consists of five competencies: recognizing equality with others, appreciating others, respecting others, empathy for others, and caring for others (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021). Initial evaluations have shown the BLMQ to possess a robust psychometric foundation, with an average extracted variance (AVE) for the construct ranging between 0.733 and 0.935. Additionally, the instrument has demonstrated impressive internal consistency, as indicated by a Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.652 to 0.995.

3.4.2 Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ)

The MFQ was designed by Graham et al. and measures five dimensions of moral values: Care, Fairness, Loyalty, Authority, and Sanctity. The MFQ has shown good internal consistency Cronbach's $\alpha = .70-.80$ (Graham et al., 2011) and is widely used in moral psychology.

3.4.3 Moral Competency Inventory (MCI)

Developed by Martin & Austin, the MCI measures active attention to others and ethical action among other dimensions. The MCI has reported good internal consistency Cronbach's $\alpha = .82-.90$ (Martin & Austin, 2010).

3.4.4 Self-Esteem Scale (SES)

The SES, developed by Rosenberg, is a widely used self-report measure for evaluating self-esteem or self-acceptance. It has demonstrated good to excellent internal consistency across various samples Cronbach's $\alpha = .85-.90$ (Rosenberg, 1965).

3.4.5 Locus of Control (LoC)

This scale was developed by Levenson and measures the extent to which individuals believe they have control over their lives. The scale is known for its good internal consistency Cronbach's $\alpha = .78-.84$ (Levenson, 1981).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Convergent validity

Convergent validity is an essential component in evaluating the psychometric properties of measurement tools, including questionnaires related to morality or behavior (DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021; Hundleby & Nunnally, 1968). It aims to confirm that instruments measuring theoretically similar constructs actually

correlate with each other. For instance, the BLMQ, assumed to be a moral questionnaire, could be evaluated against established instruments like the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ), which measures moral dimensions such as care, fairness, and loyalty (Graham et al., 2011). A significant correlation between BLMQ and MFQ would suggest strong convergent validity for the BLMQ. This validation can be further strengthened by correlating BLMQ scores with another instrument like the Moral Competency Inventory (MCI), designed to assess ethical action and commitment to truth (Martin & Austin, 2010).

Table 2. Bivariate correlations between BLMQ and MCI

	ACO	TEA	OT	SF	OOM	AOnM	AOTM	HOT	MCI_TOT
BLMQ_TOT	.320**	.296**	.280**	.313**	.280**	.311**	.139**	-.167**	-0.054
SM	.308**	.285**	.268**	.298**	.270**	.312**	.151**	-.157**	-0.069
NM	.315**	.293**	.277**	.314**	.277**	.307**	.142**	-.161**	-0.054
HM	.326**	.302**	.284**	.317**	.284**	.307**	.127**	-.175**	-0.044
CA	.310**	.289**	.263**	.288**	.268**	.304**	.148**	-.166**	-0.064
P	.302**	.282**	.250**	.270**	.256**	.321**	.146**	-.160**	-0.056
G	.243**	.215**	.251**	.278**	.223**	.245**	.129**	-.102**	-0.056
S	.299**	.278**	.258**	.294**	.265**	.307**	.149**	-.149**	-0.076
ADV	.306**	.280**	.275**	.310**	.278**	.301**	.136**	-.149**	-0.039
AI	.301**	.283**	.270**	.312**	.259**	.304**	.153**	-.150**	-0.053
RNR	.314**	.294**	.277**	.315**	.281**	.305**	.141**	-.158**	-0.051
ROC	.318**	.294**	.271**	.303**	.276**	.303**	.137**	-.172**	-0.064
REO	.340**	.316**	.281**	.313**	.296**	.333**	.155**	-.184**	-0.057
AO	.291**	.262**	.268**	.300**	.255**	.278**	.122**	-.143**	-0.029
RO	.313**	.293**	.267**	.292**	.268**	.284**	.113**	-.180**	-0.052
EO	.309**	.291**	.283**	.319**	.272**	.288**	.100**	-.164**	-0.034
CO	.341**	.313**	.291**	.322**	.300**	.315**	.124**	-.185**	-0.030

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, CA = Consistent Attitude, P = Patience, G = Gratitude, S = Sincerity, ADV = Apply Democratic Values, AI = Archipelago Insight, RNR = Realizing National Resilience, ROC Understanding The Rights and Obligations of Citizens, REO = Recognizing Equality Among Others, AO = Appreciating Others, RO = Respect Others, EO = Empathy for Others, CO = Caring for Others, SM = Spirituality Moral, NM = Nationality Moral, HM = Humanity Moral, BLMQ = BLMQ Total, ACO = Active Care of Others, TEA = Taking Ethical Action, OT = Obligation to The Truth, SF = Self Forgivingness, OOM = Owning Ones Mistakes, AOnM = Accepting Own Mistakes, AOTM = Accepting Others Mistakes, HOT = Having Others Trust, MCI = MCI Total.

Source: Primary Data, processed in 2023

Table 2 presents the bivariate correlations between BLMQ and MCI, along with various moral attributes such as Spiritual Morals (SM), Nationality Morals (NM), and Humanity Morals (HM). To begin, it is notable that most of the correlations with BLMQ across various dimensions are positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This supports the notion that BLMQ and its various constructs have good convergent validity with the MCI, which was designed to measure a similar range of moral competencies such as active care for others and ethical action (Martin & Austin, 2010). Specifically, the Spirituality Morals (SM) dimension, which includes elements like Consistent Attitude, Patience, Gratitude, and Sincerity (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021; Caza et al., 2015; Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Schnitker et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2020), shows a high correlation with BLMQ. Similarly, the Nationality Morals (NM) dimension, encompassing Applying Democratic Values and Realizing National Resilience, also correlates well with BLMQ. However, it is noteworthy that the correlation between BLMQ and MCI is not statistically significant, with a value of -0.054. This indicates that although BLMQ and MCI's subdimensions are aligned, the overall scales may be capturing different facets of moral competency. This calls for further research to understand the nuances between the two instruments. On the other hand, negative correlations are observed in a few instances, particularly between BLMQ and Having Others' Trust (HOT), although the correlations are statistically significant. This suggests that while BLMQ tends to align with moral competencies like self-forgiveness and accepting one's mistakes (Martin & Austin, 2010), it may not necessarily correlate with interpersonal trust.

Table 3. Bivariate correlations between BLMQ and MFQ

		MFQ				
		HC	FR	IGL	AR	PS
BLMQ	BLMQ_TOT	.310**	.251**	.291**	.277**	.318**
	SM	.301**	.243**	.283**	.273**	.309**
	NM	.306**	.249**	.290**	.277**	.314**
	HM	.314**	.254**	.293**	.274**	.323**
	CA	.306**	.260**	.286**	.281**	.310**
	P	.276**	.213**	.271**	.241**	.272**
	G	.249**	.213**	.222**	.221**	.252**
	S	.294**	.222**	.277**	.269**	.312**
	ADV	.300**	.236**	.280**	.265**	.302**
	AI	.300**	.243**	.282**	.269**	.307**
	RNR	.299**	.244**	.289**	.274**	.309**
	ROC	.306**	.254**	.289**	.278**	.319**
	REO	.333**	.262**	.309**	.285**	.332**
	AO	.284**	.231**	.262**	.234**	.291**
	RO	.289**	.242**	.279**	.271**	.308**
	EO	.302**	.242**	.279**	.266**	.315**
CO	.328**	.266**	.303**	.277**	.323**	

Note. HC = Harm Care, FR = Fairness Reciprocity, IGL = In Group Loyalty, AR = Authority Respect, PS = Purity Sanctity.

Source: Primary Data, processed in 2023

The data in Table 3 provides a comprehensive view of the bivariate correlations between the BLMQ and the MFQ across various moral dimensions, indicating significant correlations at the 0.01 level. These correlations appear across different facets of the BLMQ, ranging from Spirituality Moral (SM) to Caring for Others (CO). Notably, the BLMQ Total score (BLMQ_TOT) demonstrates significant correlations with all dimensions of the MFQ, such as Harm Care (HC), Fairness Reciprocity (FR), and Purity Sanctity (PS), with coefficients ranging from .251 to .318. These significant correlations signify that the BLMQ has good convergent validity with the MFQ (Graham et al., 2011). When we dissect this further and align it with the Moral Competency Inventory (MCI) (Martin & Austin, 2010), it becomes apparent that various sub-components of the BLMQ also correlate well with the MFQ. For example, "Spirituality Moral" in BLMQ encompasses aspects like "Consistent Attitude," "Patience," "Gratitude," and "Sincerity," all of which show substantial correlations with various MFQ domains (Schnitker et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2020). Similarly, domains like "Nationality Moral" and "Humanity Moral" align with the principles of the MCI and correlate significantly with MFQ domains, suggesting that the BLMQ may be capturing a broad spectrum of moral competencies effectively (Bafadal, Nurabadi, Gunawan, Juharyanto, Adha, et al., 2021).

4.2 Discriminant Validity

In the evaluation of the BLMQ in an Indonesian context, Discriminant Validity serves as a crucial gauge to confirm that the instrument is isolating its primary construct of leadership morality from unrelated variables (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). To assess this, the study correlates BLMQ scores with established measures like the Self-Esteem Scale (SES) by Rosenberg (1965) and the Locus of Control (LoC) scale by Levenson (1981). Given that prior research suggests morality is theoretically independent of self-esteem and locus of control (Aquino & Americus II, 2002), a low or insignificant correlation between BLMQ scores and these other scales would confirm its Discriminant Validity, thereby establishing BLMQ as a reliable tool for assessing leadership morality within the Indonesian environment.

Table 4. Bivariate correlations between BLMQ and SES

		SES
BLMQ	BLMQ_TOT	-0.018
	SM	-0.035
	NM	-0.022
	HM	-0.003
	CA	-0.032
	P	-0.021
	G	-0.028
	S	-0.044
	ADV	-0.028
	AI	-0.038
	RNR	-0.025
	ROC	-0.009
	REO	-0.028
	AO	-0.006
	RO	-0.013
	EO	0.040
CO	-0.008	

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, SES = Self-Esteem Scale, CA = Consistent Attitude, P = Patience, G = Gratitude, S = Sincerity, ADV = Apply Democratic Values, AI = Archipelago Insight, RNR = Realizing National Resilience, ROC Understanding The Rights and Obligations of Citizens, REO = Recognizing Equality Among Others, AO = Appreciating Others, RO = Respect Others, EO = Empathy for Others, CO = Caring for Others, SM = Spirituality Moral, NM = Nationality Moral, HM = Humanity Moral, BLMQ = BLMQ Total.

Source: Primary Data, processed in 2023

Table 4 reports the bivariate correlations between scores on the Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ) and the Self-Esteem Scale (SES). Across various subscales of the BLMQ, including those measuring Consistent Attitude (CA), Patience (P), Gratitude (G), Sincerity (S), and others, the correlation coefficients with SES range from -0.044 to 0.040. Importantly, all the correlations are low and none of them are indicated as statistically significant at either the 0.01 or 0.05 levels. In line with the theories of Discriminant Validity (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), these findings support the notion that the BLMQ successfully isolates its primary construct of leadership morality from unrelated variables like self-esteem. Previous research has suggested that self-esteem (as measured by SES) should be unrelated to the moral dimensions that BLMQ aims to measure (Aquino & Americus II, 2002; Rosenberg, 1965). The low and statistically non-significant correlations between BLMQ and SES reinforce this argument, thereby strengthening the evidence for the Discriminant Validity of the BLMQ in an Indonesian setting.

Table 5. Bivariate correlations between BLMQ and LoC

		LoC
BLMQ	BLMQ_TOT	0.011
	SM	-0.012
	NM	0.025
	HM	0.013
	CA	0.009
	P	-0.037
	G	-0.023
	S	-0.017
	ADV	0.032
	AI	0.026
	RNR	0.025
	ROC	0.019
	REO	0.014
	AO	0.007
	RO	0.008
	EO	0.020
CO	0.010	

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, LoC = Locus of Control, CA = Consistent Attitude, P = Patience, G = Gratitude, S = Sincerity, ADV = Apply Democratic Values, AI = Archipelago Insight, RNR = Realizing National Resilience, ROC Understanding The Rights and Obligations of Citizens, REO = Recognizing Equality Among Others, AO = Appreciating Others, RO = Respect Others, EO = Empathy for Others, CO = Caring for Others, SM = Spirituality Moral, NM = Nationality Moral, HM = Humanity Moral, BLMQ = BLMQ Total.

Source: Primary Data, processed in 2023

Table 5 presents bivariate correlations between scores on the Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ) and the Locus of Control (LoC) scale. Across the various subscales of the BLMQ, the correlation coefficients with the LoC range from -0.037 to 0.032 . Notably, none of the correlation values are marked as statistically significant at either the 0.01 or 0.05 level. These findings further support the discriminant validity of the BLMQ in the Indonesian context (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). According to existing literature, locus of control should be theoretically unrelated to the moral dimensions that the BLMQ aims to assess (Aquino & Americus II, 2002; Levenson, 1981). The low and statistically non-significant correlations between the BLMQ and the LoC scale reaffirm the discriminant validity of the BLMQ. In sum, the observed low correlation coefficients lend credence to the notion that the BLMQ is a reliable and valid tool for measuring leadership morality, distinct from variables like locus of control, in an Indonesian setting.

4.3 Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice

The study's outcomes elucidate the value of convergent and discriminant validity in evaluating psychometric instruments, a perspective emphasized in prior research (DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021; Hundleby & Nunnally, 1968; Rodebaugh et al., 2000). Consistent with this, it emphasizes the theoretical proposition that measurement tools intended to evaluate analogous constructs should display meaningful correlations, echoing foundational thoughts outlined by Graham et al. (2011) and reinforced by Cronbach & Meehl, 1955. Curiously, the evident disconnect between BLMQ's cumulative scores and the MCI, despite clear correlations at subdimensional levels, hints at an undiscovered multi-dimensionality of moral competency (Haidt, 2001; Kohlberg, 1984). Additionally, the faint correlation between BLMQ and disparate constructs, like Self-Esteem, reinforces the theoretical distinction between morality and personal value.

From a scholarly lens, this investigation emphasizes the importance of comparing emerging tools, such as BLMQ, against established metrics like MFQ and MCI for comprehensive validity checks (Funder, 1995). The pronounced interrelations between BLMQ and MCI's sub-variables, against its detachment from the complete scale, signifies the need to explore deeper into the multifaceted realm of moral competency that every tool might be highlighting. The detected inverse correlation between BLMQ and elements like "Having Others' Trust" introduces new directions for probing into the intricacies of trust and morality, especially when they might diverge or conflict in certain circumstances (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). The fragile links between BLMQ and self-esteem measurements call for future research initiatives targeting the relationship between leadership moral stance and individual egoistic influences.

In application, BLMQ emerges as a promising measure to scrutinize leadership morality, with a particular relevance to the Indonesian context (Hofstede, 1984). This finding emphasizes its prospective integration into corporate and academic evaluation frameworks. The significant associations between BLMQ and constructs like Spirituality Moral, Nationality Moral, and Humanity Moral could potentially revolutionize leadership development programs (Schein, 1992). The discerned disconnect between BLMQ and the Self-Esteem Scale highlights the potential distinction between one's moral doctrines and self-concept. This observation necessitates devising unique leadership cultivation methodologies. Summarily, professionals need to be aware that while tools like BLMQ provide insights into certain moral dimensions, they might overlook aspects related to interpersonal trust—indicating the requirement for a diversified assessment approach.

4.4 Limitations

The validity and reliability of any psychometric tool are paramount to ensuring its utility and appropriateness in assessing the constructs it purports to measure (Frey, 2018). One of the limitations tied to the BLMQ is the over-reliance on convergent validity, using instruments such as the MFQ and MCI. Convergent validity is but a sliver of the overarching construct validity. Overemphasizing its

significance might overlook the broader capabilities of the instrument (Duckworth & Kern, 2011). This overemphasis is further evidenced by the non-significant correlation between the BLMQ and MCI total scores. Despite the apparent significant correlations with specific subdimensions, the non-significance on the total scores, casts doubt on the holistic moral competencies encapsulated by these tools (Wormley et al., 2023).

Unexpected findings also emerge with negative correlations with the "Having Others' Trust" metric. Such unanticipated outcomes may allude to the influence of unseen constructs or varying cultural interpretations on the responses provided (Su et al., 2022). This brings us to the limitation posed by the cultural context of the BLMQ. The instrument's primary assessment within the Indonesian milieu may curtail its applicability in diverse cultural environments. Morality interpretations might shift across societies due to inherent cultural nuances (Graham et al., 2016).

Another complexity is the possible overlap of constructs among the BLMQ's various dimensions, as indicated by Bafadal et al. (2021). The interconnectedness among dimensions such as Spirituality Moral, Nationality Moral, and Humanity Moral might muddle the instrument's precision. The discriminant validity, represented by the low correlations with the Self-Esteem Scale, although viewed positively, can also be a limitation. Extremely low coefficients, might hint at the instrument's non-sensitivity or limited responsivity to other constructs (Soto & John, 2014).

There are also gaps in the provided data, which render a comprehensive assessment challenging. One is the absence of correlation results with Locus of Control, which Levenson (1981) finds crucial for a rounded view of discriminant validity. Moreover, the study appears to miss an essential step in psychometric validation: factor analysis. Without it, as noted by Aquino & Americus II (2002), we lose valuable insights into the BLMQ's inherent dimensions and their conceptual coherence.

4.5 Future Directions

The present study has shed significant light on the psychometric properties of the BLMQ, particularly as it pertains to Indonesian leadership morality. However, there remains a multitude of promising avenues for expanding this research. For instance, while the BLMQ has been validated within the Indonesian milieu, its potential applicability across other cultural landscapes begs exploration. This would necessitate further psychometric evaluations in various cultural settings to discern the instrument's universality. Furthermore, it's pertinent to delve deeper into the nuances that distinguish BLMQ from MCI. Though both scales touch upon moral competency, they may capture different facets of it, hence a thorough investigation into their distinctions is warranted.

Another intriguing correlation identified is between the BLMQ and the Having Others' Trust (HOT) construct, which has showcased a negative relationship. It would be invaluable to ascertain the reasons underlying this unexpected correlation. From an integration perspective, combining the BLMQ with other leadership metrics can furnish a more holistic comprehension of leadership morality and its tangible translations into leadership behaviors. On a more foundational level, it would be intriguing to probe how developmental factors, such as one's upbringing, educational trajectory, or early life episodes, could potentially mold BLMQ scores. Moreover, venturing into the realm of neuroscience could unravel the neurological underpinnings behind the moral reasoning metrics of the BLMQ. From a temporal viewpoint, longitudinal analysis might illuminate how the moral leadership ethos undergoes transformations across different life stages.

Turning to the practical domain, it would be worthwhile to ascertain whether tailored training programs or specific interventions could bolster the moral leadership qualities encapsulated by the BLMQ. Furthermore, understanding the sway of external societal levers, such as media, on BLMQ scores could provide insightful data on external influences. Finally, a comparative lens could be employed to discern potential disparities in BLMQ scores between leaders hailing from private versus public sectors or traversing different industrial terrains.

5. Conclusion

The study rigorously assesses the psychometric properties of Bafadal's Leadership Morality Questionnaire (BLMQ) within an Indonesian context, focusing on its convergent and discriminant validity. In terms of convergent validity, the BLMQ showed strong positive correlations with established moral measures such as the Moral Competency Inventory (MCI) and the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (MFQ), particularly in subdimensions like Spirituality Morals, Nationality Morals, and Humanity Morals. However, the overall correlation between BLMQ and MCI lacked statistical significance, pointing to the need for additional inquiry into whether the full scales are indeed capturing the same moral competencies. Additionally, some negative correlations emerged, notably with MCI's "Having Others' Trust" subdimension, suggesting areas for future research on divergent aspects. For discriminant validity, BLMQ was found to be largely uncorrelated with unrelated constructs like Self-Esteem and Locus of Control, reaffirming its focus on measuring leadership morality exclusively. Overall, the BLMQ seems to be a robust tool for gauging leadership morality, although certain nuances and ambiguities warrant further investigation.

References

- Alase, A. (2017). The Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Guide to a Good Qualitative Research Approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 5(2), 9. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.2p.9>
- Aquino, K., & Americus II, R. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423–1440. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423>
- Arifin, I. (2015). Kompetensi Kepribadian Kepala Sekolah Berbasis Moral Spiritual dalam Mengimplementasi Pendidikan Karakter. *Jurusan Administrasi Pendidikan FIP UM*, 374–385.
- Aristotles. (1984). *Nicomachean Ethics* (E. M. Albert, T. C. Denise, & S. P. Peterfreund, Eds.; 5th Ed). Wadsworth.
- Ayala, F. J. (2012). *The Big Questions. Evolution*. Quercus. <http://lccn.loc.gov/2013942147>
- Bafadal, I., Gunawan, I., & Nurabadi, A. (2020). School Performance Development: Measurement of Variables Affected by the Moral Debate Program. 501(Icet), 201–205.
- Bafadal, I., & Nurabadi, A. (2019). Efforts to Improve the Integrity of the Principal with the Moral Debate Model. 381(CoEMA), 1–4.
- Bafadal, I., Nurabadi, A., Gunawan, I., Juharyanto, Adha, M. A., Hung, M.-L., Pratiwi, F. D., & Akhbar, A. F. (2021). Moral as the basis of leadership practices in excellent schools. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET 2021)*, 601(Icet), 149–154.
- Bafadal, I., Nurabadi, A., Gunawan, I., Juharyanto, J., Syafira Ariyanti, N., Adha, M. A., Hung, M.-L., Syah, A., & Burham, I. (2021). Moral-based learning leadership process in excellent school. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Technology and Education (ICITE 2021)*, 609, 272–277.
- Beauchamp, G., Hulme, M., Clarke, L., Hamilton, L., & Harvey, J. A. (2021). 'People miss people': A study of school leadership and management in the four nations of the United Kingdom in the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 49(3), 375–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220987841>
- Black, J. E., & Reynolds, W. M. (2016). Development, reliability, and validity of the Moral Identity Questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 97, 120–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.041>
- Brewster, C., & Klump, J. (2005). Leadership Practices of Successful Principals. *Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)*, April, 1–57.
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Canetti, D., Waismel-Manor, I., Cohen, N., & Rapaport, C. (2014). What does national resilience mean in a democracy? Evidence from the United States and Israel. *Armed Forces and Society*, 40(3), 504–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X12466828>
- Caza, A., Zhang, G., Wang, L., & Bai, Y. (2015). How do you really feel? Effect of leaders' perceived emotional sincerity on followers' trust. *Leadership Quarterly*, 26(4), 518–531. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.05.008>

- Çelik, R., Koca, F., & Dadandi, İ. (2022). The Role of Self-Efficacy and Educational Beliefs in Democratic Values: The Case of Turkish Pre-Service Teachers. *Athens Journal of Education*, 9(4), 559–574. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.9-4-2>
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>
- Cuff, B. M. P., Brown, S. J., Taylor, L., & Howat, D. J. (2016). Empathy: A review of the concept. *Emotion Review*, 8(2), 144–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073914558466>
- Danopoulos, C. P. (2017). Civil liberties and rights, equality and the quality of democracy in Greece. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 19(3), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19448953.2017.1267364>
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employee proactive behavior? The role of autonomy and role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024903>
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage publications.
- Duckworth, A. L., & Kern, M. L. (2011). A Meta-Analysis of the Convergent Validity of Self-Control Measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 45(3), 259–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.02.004>
- Durgun Ozan, Y., Duman, M., Çiçek, Ö., & Boz, İ. (2020). The Turkish version of the Nursing Students' Perceptions of Instructor Caring Scale: An assessment of psychometric properties. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 56(1), 194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.12411>
- Falikowski, A. F. (1990). *Moral Philosophy: Theories, Skills, and Applications*. Prentice Hall.
- Flanagan, C. A., & Faison, N. (2001). Youth Civic Development: Implications of Research for Social Policy and Programs Youth Civic Development: Implications of Research for Social Policy and Programs. *Social Policy Report*, 15(1), 3–14.
- Ford, R. C., & Richardson, W. D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13(3), 205–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02074820>
- Freud, S. (1923). The Ego And The Id. *TACD Journal*, 17(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046171X.1989.12034344>
- Frey, B. (Ed.). (2018). *The Sage encyclopedia of educational research, measurement, and evaluation*. SAGE.
- Funder, D. C. (1995). On the accuracy of personality judgment: A realistic approach. *Psychological Review*, 102(4), 652–670. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.4.652>
- Graham, J., Meindl, P., Beall, E., Johnson, K. M., & Zhang, L. (2016). Cultural differences in moral judgment and behavior, across and within societies. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.007>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the Moral Domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(2), 366–385. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021847>
- Gumuruh, A. R., & Adinata, T. P. (2020). Implementation of Archipelago Insights in National Integration. *Santhet: Jurnal Sejarah, Pendidikan, Dan Humaniora*, 4(1), 35–35. <https://doi.org/10.36526/js.v3i2.e-ISSN>
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(4), 814–834. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.108.4.814>
- Hill, P. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2010). Propositions for the Study of Moral Personality Development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(6), 380–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410389168>
- Hofstede, G. H. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed). Sage Publications.
- Hundleby, J. D., & Nunnally, J. (1968). Psychometric Theory. *American Educational Research Journal*, 5(3), 431–431. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1161962>
- Junça-Silva, A., Mosteo, L., & Lopes, R. R. (2023). The role of mindfulness on the relationship between daily micro-events and daily gratitude: A within-person analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 200(March 2022), 11891–11891. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.11891>
- Kant, I. (1963). *Lectures on Ethics* (p. 118). Hackett Publishing.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (Fourth edition). The Guilford Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1963). The Development of Children's Orientations Toward a Moral Order. *Vita Humana*, 6(1), 11–33.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on moral development. In *Vol 2: The psychology of moral development*. Harper and Row.
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral Development: A Review of the Theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 16(2), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405847709542675>
- Krettenauer, T. (2021). Moral sciences and the role of education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 50(1), 77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2020.1784713>

- Levenson, H. (1981). *Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance* (H. M. B. T.-R. with the L. of C. C. Lefcourt, Ed.; pp. 15–63). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-443201-7.50006-3>
- Lin, X., Luan, Y., & Zhao, G. (2021). Personality influences on ethical, servant, and authentic leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 31(6), 588–594. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2021.2001944>
- Lind, G. (2019). Making Moral Competence Visible. In G. Lind (Ed.), *How to Teach Moral Competence*. Logos Verlag Berlin.
- Maisyaroh, Juharyanto, Bafadal, I., Wiyono, B. B., Adha, M. A., Saputra, B. R., Ariyanti, N. S., & Lesmana, I. (2023). Learning Management and Leadership Skills of Madrasah Principals in Implementing Freedom to Learn Policy. In B. B. Wiyono, A. Abusamra, Z. D. Kulitod, J. N. Bin Yunus, D. E. Kusumaningrum, & O. Kaosaiyaporn (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Educational Management and Technology (ICEMT 2022)* (pp. 418–426). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-95-4_50
- Martin, D. E., & Austin, B. (2010). Validation of the moral competency inventory measurement instrument: Content, construct, convergent and discriminant approaches. *Management Research Review*, 33(5), 437–451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0140917101041884>
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications*. (pp. 3–34). Basic Books.
- Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (Eighth Edition). SAGE Publications.
- Ohrn, E. (2001). Marginalization of democratic values: A gendered practice of schooling? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2–3), 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110010035834>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Oxford University Press.
- Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgment of the child. In *The moral judgment of the child*. (pp. ix, 418). Harcourt, Brace.
- Pijanowski, J. (2002). *Teaching Educational Leaders to Move from Moral Reasoning to Moral Action*. 18(1), 37–51.
- Pinker, S. (2009). *How the mind works: With a new foreword* (reissued). Norton.
- Plato. (1976). *The Republic* (p. 218). Penguin Books.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Rest, J. R. (1980). Development in moral judgment research. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 251–256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.16.4.251>
- Rest, J. R., & Narváez, Darcia. (1995). Moral Development in the Professions: Psychology and Applied Ethics. In *Choice Reviews Online* (Vol. 32, Issue 09, pp. 5012–32–5012). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.32-5012>
- Risnain, Muh., Fatahullah, F., Nurbani, E. S., & Rusnan, R. (2021). The Model Regulation of Wawasan Nusantara as Indonesian Maritime Development Strategy Towards World Maritime Axis. *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference on Education and Social Science (ACCESS 2020)*, 556(Access 2020), 216–218. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210525.078>
- Rodebaugh, T. L., Chambless, D. L., Terrill, D. R., Floyd, M., & Uhde, T. (2000). Convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity of the Social Phobia and Anxiety Inventory. *Depression and Anxiety*, 11(1), 10–14.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt183pjih>
- Runkle, G. (1982). *Ethics: An Examination of Contemporary Moral Problems* (p. 3). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed). Jossey-Bass.
- Schnitker, S. A., Currier, J. M., Abernethy, A. D., Witvliet, C. van O., Foster, J. D., Root Luna, L. M., VanHarn, K., & Carter, J. (2021). Gratitude and patience moderate meaning struggles and suicidal risk in a cross-sectional study of inpatients at a Christian psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Personality*, 89(6), 1191–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12644>
- Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Universalism Values and the Inclusiveness of Our Moral Universe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(6), 711–728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022107308992>
- Selvi, K. (2006). Developing a teacher trainees' democratic values scale: Validity and reliability analyses. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(9), 1171–1178. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2006.34.9.1171>
- Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect: The formation of character in an age of inequality*. Norton.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. Jossey-Bass.
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2014). Traits in Transition: The Structure of Parent-Reported Personality Traits from Early Childhood to Early Adulthood: Structure of Youths' Personality Traits. *Journal of Personality*, 82(3), 182–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12044>

- Su, C., Yang, L., Dong, L., & Zhang, W. (2022). The Psychological Well-Being of Older Chinese Immigrants in Canada amidst COVID-19: The Role of Loneliness, Social Support, and Acculturation. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(14), 8612. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148612>
- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The Evolution of Reciprocal Altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46(1), 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.1086/406755>
- Wormley, A. S., Scott, M., Grimm, K. J., & Cohen, A. B. (2023). Measuring Morality: An Examination of the Moral Foundation Questionnaire's Factor Structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672231191362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231191362>
- Xu, M., Briñol, P., Gretton, J. D., Tormala, Z. L., Rucker, D. D., & Petty, R. E. (2020). Individual Differences in Attitude Consistency Over Time: The Personal Attitude Stability Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(10), 1507–1519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220908995>
- Zhu, W., Zheng, X., He, H., Wang, G., & Zhang, X. (2019). Ethical Leadership with Both “Moral Person” and “Moral Manager” Aspects: Scale Development and Cross-Cultural Validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 158(2), 547–565. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3740-y>