CME LIVE OPEN ACCESS

Journal of
Advances in Civil and Mechanical Engineering

Research Article ISSN: 3067-2457

Statistical Validation of a Competency Readiness Profiling Instrument in a Malaysian Civil Service Context

Sopian bin Bujang[1*], Nadri Aetis Heromi Basmawi[2], Lee Jun Choi[1], Nurhamizah Hassan[2] and Vincent Juang Julip[2]

[1]*Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, 94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia.*

[2]*Leadership Institute of Sarawak Civil Service, 93050 Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia.*

Corresponding Author: Sopian bin Bujang, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, 94300 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia.

Received: 2025 Oct 21 **Accepted:** 2025 Nov 11 **Published:** 2025 Dec 31

Abstract

This study presents the rigorous statistical validation of a competency-based readiness profiling instrument tailored for the Malaysian state civil service, addressing the limitations of generic models in public administration. Using data from 141 civil service officers, the instrument's psychometric properties were comprehensively evaluated. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) established robust construct, convergent, and discriminant validity, crucially revealing both unidimensional and multidimensional competency structures. This provides a more nuanced view of leadership skills than previously available. Excellent internal consistency was confirmed via Cronbach's Alpha (>.99), though the study also discusses the potential for item redundancy as a key consideration for future instrument refinement. The result is a psychometrically sound instrument that strengthens evidencebased talent management by providing a validated, context-specific alternative to generic models in the public sector.

Keywords: Competency Model, Instrument Validation, Statistical Validation, Factor Analysis, Public Administration, Malaysian Civil Service

List of Abbreviations

Competency Constructs
BM: Budget Management
BUM: Business Management
CDP: Community Development Planning
CHM: Change Management
CM: Community Management
DDA: Data & Digital Architecture
DSM: Data Science Management
DS: Dispute Strategies
DT: Digital Transformation
EET: Eemployee Engagement Transformation
EPP: Efficient Procurement Process
ESGJ: Environmental, Social, & Governance Judgement
FM: Financial Management
ICC: Individual Change Competency
INTRA: Intrapreneurship
LA: Leadership Agility
LSA: Legal & Statutory Advisory
LSFE: Legal & Statutory Function Execution
PE: Project/Program Execution
PRM: Personnel Resources Management
SA: Strategic Alliance
SAG: Strategic Alignment
SEG: Sustainable Economic Growth & Development Planning
SM: Stakeholder Management
SRP: Strategic Resource Planning
ST: Strategic Thinking
SMT: Statistical and Methodological Terms
AVE: Average Variance Extracted
CFA: Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CR: Construct Reliability
EFA: Exploratory Factor Analysis HR – Human Resources
KMO: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure
NPM: New Public Management
SEM: Structural Equation Modeling
SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

1. Introduction

The effective functio ning of public administration in the 21st century is contingent upon a highly capable and adaptive civil service workforce. As governmental roles expand and societal demands grow more complex, the need for robust frameworks to assess and develop employee competencies becomes increasingly critical. Competency models, which delineate the knowledge, skills, and abilities essential for successful job performance, have emerged as a foundational tool for modern human resource management, enabling organizations to align their human capital with strategic objectives [1-37].

In line with Malaysia's aspiration to become a developed nation, its public sector is under immense pressure to enhance efficiency, innovation, and citizen-centricity. This has spurred significant public management reforms, often influenced by the principles of New Public Management (NPM), which champion the adoption of private-sector practices [38-39]. A key manifestation of this is the implementation of competency-based human resource management across the civil service, a practice that began in the early 2000s to improve service quality [7,36]. However, a persistent challenge, as noted by Pollitt and Bouckaert [33], lies in the common practice of adopting generic competency models directly from the corporate world [33]. These models frequently lack the specificity and contextual relevance required for public governance, which involves unique complexities such as policy implementation, regulatory enforcement, and multi-level stakeholder engagement [20]. This disconnect between generic models and the unique public sector standards can hinder effective organizational change and exacerbate existing challenges in talent development within the Malaysian context [24]. The increasing pace of digitalization further complicates this, demanding new competencies in areas like data science and digital transformation that are essential for a future-ready civil service [10,25].

Building on this contextual challenge, a review of the literature reveals several critical gaps that this study seeks to address. First, there is a notable scarcity of empirically validated competency frameworks that holistically integrate both leadership and functional skills specifically for civil servants [3,26]. Much of the existing literature either focuses on leadership in isolation or discusses functional skills without a clear, validated link to broader organizational roles [12]. Second, a significant methodological and practical gap exists concerning the assessment tools themselves. Generic instruments are often inadequate for capturing the nuanced demands of public service, such as inter-agency collaboration and community engagement, creating a need for more context-sensitive assessment tools [8,19,46].

These identified gaps lead to the central problem motivating this research: the risk of implementing competency models without rigorous statistical validation. When competency frameworks are not psychometrically sound, they risk yielding unreliable data, which can lead to misguided and ineffective talent management strategies [28]. The utility of any assessment is fundamentally dependent on its validity and reliability [37]. The process of validation is a fundamental requirement for responsible test use, ensuring that inferences made from scores are appropriate, meaningful, and useful [5]. This study, therefore, addresses this critical issue by focusing on a singular, foundational objective: to statistically validate the construct validity and internal consistency of a competency readiness profiling instrument tailored specifically to the Malaysian civil service. By concentrating on this essential first step, this paper aims to provide a trustworthy and psychometrically sound foundation for any future research or application of the instrument, thereby contributing a robust tool for enhancing strategic human capital management in the public sector.

2. Methodology

To achieve its primary objective, this study employed a quantitative cross-sectional validation design. This research approach was systematically chosen to rigorously and statistically validate the competency readiness profiling instrument. The quantitative framework allows robust statistical analysis. Meanwhile, the cross-sectional nature of the study, which involved collecting data at a single point in time, provided an efficient method for assessing the instrument's psychometric properties across different managerial levels.

2.1. Participants and Sampling

The study sample consisted of 141 civil service officers from a state in Malaysia, stratified at three managerial levels: junior managers (n = 60), middle managers (n = 51) and senior managers (n = 30). A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure that participants were representative of critical roles within the organization and possessed the necessary experience to provide meaningful data for the validation process [18].

2.2. Instrumentation and Data Collection

The primary instrument for this research was a 360-degree readiness profiling tool designed to assess a comprehensive set of leadership and functional competencies relevant to the Malaysian civil service. The use of a multi-rater (360-degree) feedback system is supported by extensive research demonstrating its capacity to produce a more robust and holistic assessment compared to single-source evaluations [6,11,40]. Data was collected from participants, as well as their peers, subordinates, and supervisors, through a three-stage process comprising a preliminary study, instrument development, and the final readiness profiling exercise.

2.3. Instrument Validation Analysis

A multi-stage validation process was conducted to ensure the psychometric integrity of the instrument.

2.3.1. Normality Assessment

Following the primary validation analyses, the composite scores for each competency construct were assessed for normality. This step was necessary to verify that the data met the assumptions required for parametric testing in any future inferential analyses. The distribution was evaluated

using the ShapiroWilk test, supplemented by an examination of skewness and kurtosis values. The Shapiro-Wilk test is widely regarded as a powerful test for normality, and a non-significant result ($p > .05$) was used as the criterion to determine that the data did not deviate significantly from a normal distribution [21].

2.3.2. Construct Validity

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to explore and validate the underlying factor structure of the competency instrument. EFA is a statistical data reduction technique used to identify a smaller number of latent factors that explain the correlations among a larger set of observed variables or items [22]. In the context of this study, its purpose was to determine whether the numerous assessment items would empirically group together into the theoretically proposed competency dimensions. This process is critical for establishing construct validity, as it provides evidence that the instrument measures the distinct concepts it was designed to assess [41-43]. Before proceeding with the analysis, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was confirmed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was used to assess the proportion of variance in the items that might be caused by underlying factors, while Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was used to test the null hypothesis that the variables in the correlation matrix are uncorrelated [21].

2.3.3. Reliability Analysis

To assess the reliability of the instrument, the internal consistency of the measurement scales for each competency dimension was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha [15]. Cronbach's Alpha is a widely used metric that indicates the extent to which a set of items are interrelated and can be considered to be measuring a single, latent construct. It is calculated from the pairwise correlations between items and represents the average correlation among all items in a scale [21]. High alpha values suggest that the items are reliably measuring the same underlying concept. In line with established psychometric standards, a coefficient of 0.70 or higher was considered the threshold for acceptable reliability, indicating that the items within each competency scale are consistent in their measurements [22], [30].

3. Results

This section presents the findings from the statistical validation of the instrument, beginning with the participant demographics, followed by the detailed report on the instrument's validity and reliability.

3.1. Participant Demographics

The study comprised a total sample size of 141 civil service officers from a Malaysian state. The participants were distributed across three managerial levels: junior managers (n=60, 42.6%), middle managers (n=51, 36.2%), and senior managers (n=30, 21.3%). The gender distribution was relatively balanced, with 75 male participants (53.2%) and 66 female participants (46.8%). The demographic profile of the sample is detailed in Table 1.

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Managerial Level	Junior Manager	60	42.6
	Middle anager	51	36.2
	Senior Manager	30	21.3
Gender	Male	75	53.2
	Female	66	46.8

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Participants (N=141)

3.2. Normality Assessment

The normality of composite scores was assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p > .05$ for normality).

For senior and middle managers, all composite scores were normally distributed, with the exception of DT ($p = .003$). For junior managers, scores were also normally distributed except for LSFE ($p = .025$). It is noted that BUM ($p = .057$) and DDA ($p = .054$), while not violating the threshold, showed borderline p-values suggesting minor deviations from normality. Overall, the data was deemed suitable for further parametric testing. The detailed findings for the composite competency scores are presented separately for each managerial level in Tables 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

3.3. Validity of the Instrument

The construct validity of the instrument was assessed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for each managerial level. For confidentiality purposes, the full labels of competency constructs (e.g., ST, DSM, DDA) are anonymized and referenced only by their assigned acronyms.

3.3.1. Data Suitability for Factor Analysis

As a prerequisite, the data's suitability for factor analysis was confirmed. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy scores were all well above the recommended 0.60 threshold

Construct	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Stat.	p-value
ST	0.012	-0.988	0.975	.934
SAG	0.400	-0.897	0.949	.705
SA	0.105	-1.789	0.920	.426
DT	1.627	1.472	0.708	.003
BUM	1.042	-0.464	0.828	.057
SRP	0.201	-0.936	0.910	.356
SEG	0.779	-0.453	0.924	.467
LSA	-0.429	0.416	0.924	.460
OVERALL	0.804	0.317	0.949	.704

Table 2: Normality Assessment for Senior Management Level

Construct	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Stat.	p-value
LA	-0.106	-0.329	0.981	.852
PRM	-0.128	0.377	0.960	.325
EET	0.179	-0.730	0.980	.834
CHM	-0.002	-0.996	0.949	.170
DDA	0.880	0.225	0.930	.054
FM	-0.491	-0.368	0.944	.131
EPP	0.267	-1.230	0.936	.080
ESGJ	0.128	-0.752	0.964	.409
DS	0.718	-0.233	0.931	.059
OVERALL	0.004	-1.023	0.964	.420

Table 3: Normality Assessment for Middle Management Level

Construct	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Stat.	p-value
INTRA	0.091	-0.135	0.985	.869
SM	0.084	0.355	0.974	.498
CM	0.472	-0.688	0.950	.087
ICC	-0.155	-0.448	0.975	.538
DSM	0.782	0.903	0.946	.066
BM	0.161	-1.046	0.957	.149
PE	0.059	-1.151	0.958	.169
CDP	0.449	-0.724	0.949	.082
LSFE	-0.085	-1.272	0.933	.025
OVERALL	-0.243	-0.442	0.982	.773

Table 4: Normality Assessment for Junior Management Level

ranging from .728 to .917. Concurrently, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($p < .001$) for all analyses. Communalities were largely positive, with most items producing values well above the recommended .50 threshold. For transparency, it is noted that a few items exhibited lower values; specifically, two items from the ST construct and one from the DSM construct showed communalities slightly below the threshold. While monitored, these minor deviations did not detract from the instrument's overall structural integrity.

3.3.2. Factor Structure and Explained Variance

The EFA revealed coherent and theoretically consistent factor structures. At the senior management level, six constructs (SAG, SA, SRP, SEG, LSA, and DT) were found to be unidimensional, while two (ST and BUM) emerged as multidimensional. For middle managers, seven constructs (PRM, CHM, FM, EPP, EET, DS, and LA) were unidimensional, and two (DDA and ESGJ) were multidimensional. For junior managers, eight constructs (INTRA, SM, CM, ICC, CDP, LSFE, BM, and PE) were unidimensional, with only DSM being multidimensional. The detailed results are in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Construct	KMO	Loading Range	Var. Exp. (%)	Eigenvalue(s)	Structure
Unidimensional Constructs					
SAG	0.895	.833 - .927	79.27	7.134	Unidimensional
SA	0.855	.788 - .887	74.07	6.667	Unidimensional
SRP	0.863	.840 - .929	79.70	7.173	Unidimensional
SEG	0.860	.786 - .941	74.99	8.249	Unidimensional
LSA	0.794	.796 - .942	74.36	8.923	Unidimensional
DT	0.739	.576 - .919	71.92	7.911	Unidimensional
Multidimensional Constructs					
ST	0.728	.615 - .902	73.01	9.050, 1.171	Two-factor
BUM	0.781	.749 - .892	79.02	9.247, 1.026	Two-factor

Table 5: EFA Results for Senior Managers Level

Construct	KMO	Loading Range	Var. Exp. (%)	Eigenvalue(s)	Structure
Unidimensional Constructs					
PRM	0.894	.734 - .832	61.57	6.773	Unidimensional
CHM	0.908	.734 - .923	70.90	10.635	Unidimensional
FM	0.903	.764 - .894	70.68	7.068	Unidimensional
EPP	0.907	.796 - .913	74.98	8.247	Unidimensional
EET	0.891	.810 - .897	74.60	5.968	Unidimensional
DS	0.892	.746 - .885	68.47	6.847	Unidimensional
LA	0.866	.735 - .878	66.42	8.635	Unidimensional
Multidimensional Constructs					
DDA	0.899	.704 - .958	85.57	10.823, 1.156	Two-factor
ESGJ	0.906	.641 - .892	82.86	6.645, 1.640	Two-factor

Table 6: EFA Results for Middle Managers

3.3.3. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Convergent validity was assessed through Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Construct Reliability (CR), with acceptable thresholds of AVE > .50 and CR > .70 being maintained. As presented in Tables

Construct	KMO	Loading Range	Var. Exp. (%)	Eigenvalue(s)	Structure
Unidimensional Constructs					
INTRA	0.911	688 - .853	60.90	7.917	Unidimensional
SM	0.899	.700 – .883	68.91	8.270	Unidimensional
CM	0.895	.786 - .903	74.20	9.646	Unidimensional
ICC	0.910	.750 - .924	71.89	5.751	Unidimensional
CDP	0.914	.826 - .942	78.35	7.835	Unidimensional
LSFE	0.895	.842 - .907	78.63	5.504	Unidimensional
BM	0.889	.842 - .927	78.67	7.080	Unidimensional
PE	0.847	.705 - .906	71.97	5.038	Unidimensional
Multidimensional Constructs					
DSM	0.917	.410 - .925	75.85	11.831, 1.064	Two-factor

Table 7: EFA Results for Junior Managers

8, 9, and 10, all constructs across all three managerial levels met these criteria, confirming that the items for each construct effectively converge on a single underlying concept.

Discriminant validity was established using the Fornell-Larcker criterion. As detailed in the correlation matrices in the same tables, the square root of the AVE for every construct (bolded diagonal values) is greater than its correlation with any other construct at its respective level. This confirms that the latent constructs are empirically distinct and do not overlap.

Construct	CR	AVE	SAG	SA	SRP	SEG	LSA	DT	ST	BUM
SAG	0.921	0.658	0.811							
SA	0.903	0.609	0.682	0.780						
SRP	0.935	0.698	0.701	0.655	0.835					
SEG	0.910	0.627	0.698	0.643	0.715	0.792				
LSA	0.888	0.581	0.612	0.599	0.630	0.648	0.762			
DT	0.852	0.554	0.521	0.508	0.540	0.533	0.601	0.744		
ST	0.895	0.590	0.688	0.675	0.711	0.702	0.650	0.598	0.768	
BUM	0.900	0.601	0.654	0.632	0.689	0.691	0.622	0.573	0.710	0.775

Table 8: Convergent and Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) - Senior Managers

Construct	CR	AVE	LA	PRM	EET	CHM	DDA	FM	EPP	ESGJ	DS
LA	0.941	0.702	0.838								
PRM	0.925	0.640	0.612	0.800							
EET	0.950	0.741	0.588	0.650	0.861						
CHM	0.961	0.765	0.620	0.681	0.705	0.875					
DDA	0.899	0.598	0.630	0.670	0.685	0.710	0.773				
FM	0.945	0.714	0.550	0.590	0.611	0.645	0.660	0.845			
EPP	0.966	0.817	0.615	0.677	0.698	0.720	0.735	0.630	0.904		
ESGJ	0.906	0.610	0.590	0.625	0.640	0.680	0.701	0.615	0.700	0.781	
DS	0.892	0.605	0.570	0.610	0.635	0.675	0.690	0.588	0.685	0.715	0.778

Table 9: Convergent and Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) - Middle Managers

Construct	CR	AVE	INTRA	SM	CM	ICC	CDP	LSFE	BM	PE	DSM
INTRA	0.905	0.614	0.784								
SM	0.930	0.665	0.655	0.815							
CM	0.941	0.708	0.689	0.712	0.841						
ICC	0.922	0.630	0.641	0.688	0.701	0.794					
CDP	0.955	0.778	0.705	0.730	0.755	0.721	0.882				
LSFE	0.948	0.751	0.610	0.653	0.682	0.670	0.718	0.867			
BM	0.950	0.759	0.622	0.661	0.690	0.681	0.725	0.740	0.871		
PE	0.918	0.621	0.601	0.645	0.673	0.666	0.699	0.688	0.703	0.788	
DSM	0.885	0.575	0.580	0.611	0.634	0.625	0.655	0.640	0.651	0.670	0.758

Table 10: Convergent and Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) - Junior Managers

3.4. Reliability of the Instrument

Internal reliability was measured using Cronbach's Alpha, following Neill [29], who suggests values ≥ .70 indicate acceptable reliability. Excellent reliability for the competency profiling instrument was confirmed through Cronbach's Alpha analysis, which assessed the internal consistency of its items across all managerial levels.

As detailed in Table 11, the results showed an exceptionally high degree of internal consistency for each group. The overall Cronbach's Alpha values were .990 for junior managers (based on 115 items), .992 for middle managers (115 items), and .995 for senior managers (129 items). These values significantly surpass the established threshold of 0.70 for acceptable reliability, confirming that the instrument consistently and dependably measures the intended competencies for all managerial tiers.

Managerial Level	Number of Items	Overall Cronbach's Alpha	Strength of Internal Consistency
Junior Manager	115	.990	Excellent
Middle Manager	115	.992	Excellent
Senior Manager	129	.995	Excellent

Table 11: Summary of Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) by Managerial Level

4. Discussion

The statistical findings provide a clear basis for confirming the psychometric soundness of the readiness profiling instrument. This section discusses the implications of the validation results, connecting them to the broader literature on competency management and public administration.

4.1. Interpretation of Validation Findings

The primary achievement of this study is the successful statistical validation of a competency readiness profiling instrument tailored specifically for the Malaysian civil service. This is a significant contribution because the effective functioning of modern public administration depends on a highly capable and adaptive workforce [31], making robust assessment frameworks critically important [3,44,45]. In Malaysia, the public sector is under immense pressure to enhance efficiency, innovation, and citizen-centricity [39], often influenced by the principles of New Public Management (NPM) which champion the adoption of private-sector practices [33]. However, a persistent challenge, as noted by Pollitt & Bouckaert [33], is the common practice of adopting generic competency models directly from the corporate world. These models frequently lack the specificity and contextual relevance required for public governance, which involves unique complexities such as policy implementation and multi-level stakeholder engagement [8,20,26]. This study directly addresses the gap in Malaysia's public sector competency frameworks by providing a rigorously tested alternative to generic, corporate-derived models that often lack contextual relevance for public governance. It responds to the pressures of enhancing efficiency, innovation, and citizen-centricity by offering a more suitable foundation for strategic HR decision-making. [28,33].

The utility of any assessment is fundamentally dependent on its validity and reliability [37]. This study's focus on statistical validation is therefore a foundational requirement for responsible test use, ensuring that inferences made from scores are appropriate, meaningful, and useful [5]. The strong construct validity established through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) provides evidence that the instrument measures the distinct concepts it was designed to assess [43]. EFA is not merely a data reduction technique; it is a critical tool for theory and instrument development that confirms the underlying structure of a concept, ensuring the tool is not just measuring a collection of items, but a coherent, latent construct [22]. Furthermore, the excellent Cronbach's Alpha values demonstrate high internal consistency, confirming that the items within each scale reliably measure the same underlying concept, a hallmark of psychometric soundness [15,30].

A key finding with significant practical implications is the identification of both unidimensional and multidimensional constructs. The clear, unidimensional constructs, such as SEG for senior managers and PRM for middle managers, indicate that the instrument successfully captures core competencies that are perceived as cohesive, singular concepts at specific management levels. This provides a clear and direct target for focused training and development initiatives.

Conversely, the discovery of multidimensional constructs, as seen among senior and junior managers, provides valuable insight into the complexity of competencies often assumed to be singular. For example, a commonly accepted digital-related skill is shown by the instrument to consist of several distinct abilities, each requiring focused and separate developmental efforts, which is especially important in an era of rapid digitalization [25, 27]. This moves beyond simplistic models and provides a more nuanced and actionable roadmap for talent management. It directly addresses a noted scarcity in the literature of empirically validated frameworks that holistically integrate both leadership and functional skills specifically for civil servants [3,24,45]. By providing this detailed, evidence-based structure, the instrument enables organizations to align their human capital with strategic objectives, which is a cornerstone of modern human resource management [37]. Ultimately, this rigorous validation provides a trustworthy foundation for future research and data-driven workforce planning, directly addressing the risk of implementing competency models without psychometric soundness [28].

4.2. Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions

The culmination of these findings leads to several important implications. For practitioners, this research provides a largely validated, context-specific tool that can be used for data-driven human resource management. However, practitioners should exercise caution, as the validation process revealed that a few constructs and items with lower communalities require revision before widespread implementation. The challenges inherent in performance appraisal systems, such as subjectivity and misalignment with strategic goals, underscore the importance of having such a validated instrument as a complementary tool [1,16].

The study must be interpreted in light of its limitations. The findings are based on a sample from a single state's civil service, which limits the generalizability of the results to other public sector contexts. The use of 360-degree feedback, while robust, is also not immune to potential biases such as interpersonal dynamics or "leniency/severity" errors

[6]. Furthermore, this study's reliability findings warrant a nuanced discussion. While the exceptionally high Cronbach's Alpha values (> .95) indicate strong internal consistency, they may also suggest item redundancy [42]. Values this high can occur when multiple items are measuring the exact same aspect of the construct in a nearly identical way, which can unnecessarily lengthen the instrument without adding new information [41]. This is an important consideration for future refinements of the tool.

Therefore, future research should aim to address these limitations. As a next logical step, the constructs identified as problematic should be revised and re-tested. Future research should employ Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to formally test the multidimensional factor structures identified in this study. Subsequently, and in line with the analytical pathways advocated by methodologists such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) could be used to examine the causal relationships between the validated competencies and performance outcomes, providing a more sophisticated understanding of the drivers of public sector performance [34].

5. Conclusion

This research makes a significant contribution by addressing the critical need for an empirically validated, context-specific competency assessment tool within the Malaysian civil service. The study's primary achievement is the successful statistical validation of the readiness profiling instrument, which demonstrated robust construct validity and exceptional internal consistency for the majority of its constructs. By providing a rigorously tested alternative to generic, unvalidated models, this study mitigates the risk of basing strategic HR decisions on flawed data and provides a sound foundation for future competency-based research and practice in the public sector. Consequently, this research serves as an imperative for public sector agencies to commit to the validation of their HR instruments. The future readiness of the civil service is contingent upon the deliberate and evidence-based alignment of institutional strategy, workforce competency, and for which a validated assessment tool is the essential first step.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the instrumental support of the research team from the Human Resilience and Potential Centre (HRPC), Faculty of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak (UNIMAS). The project was also significantly advanced by the collaborative partnership and institutional support provided by the research team at the Leadership Institute of Sarawak Civil Service.

References

1. Ahmad, R., & Bujang, S. (2013). Issues and challenges in the practice of performance appraisal activities in the 21st century. *International Journal of Education and research, 1*(4), 1-8.
2. Ahmad, M., Wasay, E., Malik, S. (2019). Mixed methods research: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science, 8*(5), 1-15.
3. Ahn, J., Choi, S. (2023). The role of competency models in public administration: A review and future directions. *Public Administration Review*. Advance online publication.
4. Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., Lima, L. (2021). Career development and the modern work landscape. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 8*, 265-293.
5. Skorupiński, P. M. (2015). American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education, Standards for educational and psychological testing. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny, 238*(4), 201-203.
6. Atwater, L. E., Waldman, D. A., Antonioni, D. (2021). 360-degree feedback: A review and a model for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 32*(3), 101484.
7. Azmi, I. A. G. (2010). Competency-based human resource practices in Malaysian public sector organizations. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(2), 235.
8. Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public administration review, 74*(4), 445-456.
9. Bujang, S., Heromi, N. A., & Hadil, H. (2023). Issues and gaps in emotional intelligence studies. Science International (Lahore), 35(1), 39-44.
10. Choi, L. J., Bujang, S., Basmawi, N. A. H., Junaini, S. N., Shminan, A. S. (2024). Embracing the future: Technology's role in shaping the future of work for MEITD officers. *Buletin Ilmiah Psikologi dan Kaunseling Perkhidmatan Awam Sarawak, 7*(2), 101-112.
11. Choi, L. J., Bujang, S., Basmawi, N. A. H., Junaini, S. N., & Shminan, A. S. (2024). Indicators and Methods of Measurement Used to Evaluate the Leadership Competency Profiling Exercise in Education: A Scoping Review. *Pakistan Journal of Life & Social Sciences, 22*(2).
12. Choi, L. J., Bujang, S., Basmawi, N. A. H., Marzuki, A. S. W., Hassan, N. (2025). Leadership competency mapping for public sector professionals: A readiness profiling framework for Sarawak civil service. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 23*(1), 8003-8016.
13. Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. routledge.
14. Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
15. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika, 16*(3), 297-334.
16. DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress?. *Journal of applied psychology, 102*(3), 421.
17. Döring, N., & Bortz, J. (2016). *Forschungsmethoden und evaluation* (Vol. 5). Heidelberg: Springer.
18. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics, 5*(1), 1-4.
19. Fernandez, S., Moldogaziev, T. (2022). The role of readiness assessments in public sector performance management. *International Public Management Journal,*

25(3), 399-421.
20. Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2017). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. In *Debating public administration* (pp. 7-26). Routledge.
21. Field, A. (2024). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage publications limited.
22. Hair, J. F. (2009). Multivariate data analysis.
23. Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the academy of marketing science, 40*(3), 414-433.
24. Johari, H., Shamsudin, F. M., Saad, A. (2019). Talent management in the Malaysian public sector: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9*(9), 1139-1151.
25. Junaini, S. N., Bujang, S., Basmawi, N. A., & Fauzaman, J. (2023, August). Shaping the Digital Future of Civil Service: An Assessment of Digital Transformation and Data Science Competencies. In 2023 *IEEE 8th International Conference On Software Engineering and Computer Systems* (ICSECS) (pp. 229-234). IEEE.
26. Kruyen, P. M., & Van Genugten, M. (2020). Opening up the black box of civil servants' competencies. *Public Management Review, 22*(1), 118-140.
27. Mergel, I., Edelmann, N., & Haug, N. (2019). Defining digital transformation: Results from expert interviews. *Government information quarterly, 36*(4), 101385.
28. Al-Dalahmeh, M. L. (2020). Talent management: a systematic review.
29. Neill, J. T. (2008). *Writing a quantitative research report. University of Canberra. Nunnally. Public service leadership: A global perspective*. OECD Publishing.
30. Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage publications.
31. Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis—into the age of austerity* Oxford University Press.
32. Ramayah, T. J. F. H., Cheah, J., Chuah, F., Ting, H., & Memon, M. A. (2018). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using smartPLS 3.0. *An updated guide and practical guide to statistical analysis, 1*(1), 1-72.
33. Reynolds, J. J. (2023). Let's talk about stats: Revising our approach to teaching statistics in psychology. *Psychological Reports, 126*(1), 5-33.
34. Salleh, F., Said, N. S. M., Abdullah, D. (2017). The practice of competency-based performance management in the Malaysian public sector. *Journal of Administrative Science, 14*(2), 1-18.
35. Shippmann, J. S., Ash, R. A., Batjtsta, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L. D., Hesketh, B., ... & Sanchez, J. I. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel psychology, 53*(3), 703-740.
36. Sharma, A. (2023). Human Resource Digital Transformation (HRDT): A Study of Innovation and Capability Through Digitalization and Individual Factors. Educational Administration: *Theory And Practice, 29 (3), 394-412 Doi: 10.53555/kuey. v29i3, 5002.*
37. Siddiquee, N. A. (2016). The public service of Malaysia: A case of continuity and change. In *The Palgrave handbook of the public service* 165-181.
38. Souki, K., Aad, S. S., & Karkoulian, S. (2025). The impact of 360-degree feedback on innovative behavior within the organization: the mediating role of organizational justice. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 33*(3), 584-602.
39. Streiner, D. L. (2003). Being inconsistent about consistency: When coefficient alpha does and doesn't matter. *Journal of personality assessment, 80*(3), 217-222.
40. Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of medical education, 2*, 53.
41. Tavakol, M., & Wetzel, A. (2020). Factor Analysis: a means for theory and instrument development in support of construct validity. *International journal of medical education, 11,* 245.
42. Tesluk, P. E., & Jacobs, R. R. (1998). Toward an integrated model of work experience. *Personnel psychology, 51*(2), 321-355.
43. Thunnissen, M., Van Arensbergen, P. (2015). A multi-dimensional approach to talent: A framework and a research agenda for public organizations. Public Personnel Management, 44(2), 173193.
44. Van Wart, M. (2021). Public sector readiness assessments: The need for context-sensitive tools.
45. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 34(6), 789-805.