

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20238079

CONTENT VALIDATION AND CONTENT VALIDITY INDEX CALCULATION FOR UNDERGRADUATES RETURNING TO THEIR HOMETOWNS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Wenjin Zhang¹, Sheerad Sahid¹ and Radin Siti Aishah Radin A Rahman¹

¹Faculty of Education, UNIVERSITI KEBANGSAAN MALAYSIA, MALAYSIA.
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4850-8323>

Received: 07/02/2026
Accepted: 08/04/2026

Corresponding Author: Sheerad Sahid
(sheerad@ukm.edu.my)

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyse students returning to their hometowns for entrepreneurship via a credible measure, the content validity index (CVI). Content validity is essential for confirming the accuracy of evaluation tools, like questionnaires, particularly in a research context. An expert panel of five people with specialised expertise in the relevant issue was used to determine content validity. As a result, the entrepreneurial behaviour of university students, including Intention, Ideation, and Behaviour, was examined and assessed using CVI. This research included five expert panels in entrepreneurship education in China, using a validated 4-point relevance assessment scale recognised for its high efficacy. There are two types of Content Validity Indexes: the Scale-level Content Validity Index (S-CVI) and the Item-level Content Validity Index (I-CVI). Items having an I-CVI score under 1.00 or an S-CVI score under 0.90 were not included. The research established that the facets of entrepreneurial behaviour, including Intention, Ideation, and conduct, demonstrated substantial content validity in assessing the level of entrepreneurial engagement among university students in China. After this phase, it is recommended to do further research on the evaluations of construct validity and reliability using the current scale. The results further confirm its suitability, indicating that this scale is pertinent for scholars examining the phenomena of university students returning to their hometowns for entrepreneurial pursuits.

KEYWORDS: Validation, Content Validity Index, Entrepreneurial Behavior, Instrument, University Students.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the alteration of China's urban-rural development model and the vigorous implementation of the rural revitalization strategy have led to university graduates returning to their hometowns to establish enterprises, becoming a vital force in the transformation and sustainable development of the rural economy (Cui, 2025). The government has carefully put in place a number of initiatives to help graduates return to their hometowns to start businesses. These include subsidies for new businesses, tax breaks, venue assistance, and training services. The goal of these activities is to help highly educated young people reinvest new resources and intellectual capital into rural regions. This will help local businesses grow and improve the job market (Romano et al., 2025). Even while the laws are becoming better, the overall success of college graduates who go back to their hometowns to start enterprises is still affected by a number of subjective and objective factors. These include individual entrepreneurial motivation, resource acquisition capabilities, local social capital, and the degree of entrepreneurial policy execution. (Hidalgo et al., 2024).

This research focuses on the empirical evaluation of psychological traits, behavioural goals, and actual performance of university students who return to their hometowns to establish businesses, a matter of collective interest for scholars and government alike. Developing a highly accurate and valid assessment instrument is crucial for understanding the factors that contribute to the success of rural return entrepreneurship, evaluating the efficacy of policies, and formulating targeted teaching and support strategies (Lu et al., 2023). Nonetheless, current quantitative research tools for rural return entrepreneurship remain insufficient. Certain studies use broad entrepreneurial intention scores without cultural and contextual modifications specific to the "return to hometown" setting (Li et al., 2024; Silva et al., 2025).

International research on the assessment of entrepreneurial intention and action often originates from Social Cognitive Theory and Behavioral Intent Theory (Belchior & Lyons, 2021). According to Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), which frames "attitude—subjective norm—perceived behavioural control" as predecessors of intention, the theory is commonly utilised to define and quantify entrepreneurial aspirations among university students and young adults. (Kesumahati, 2021). Entrepreneurial intention scales derived from the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) have been

developed, evaluated, and applied across various cultures, establishing them as a well-established construct and measurement framework (Adel et al., 2022). Liñán and Chen (2009).s Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire is among the pioneering studies in this domain). These studies often use Likert scales to evaluate intentions and their antecedents, systematically assessing the construct validity and reliability of the measures.

For this reason, it is of the utmost importance to create and assess a Hometown Entrepreneurship Scale that is specifically designed for university students within the setting of China. The content validity of the scale is the most crucial criterion that ensures the instrument is scientifically sound throughout the process of creating and validating the scale. It ensures that the items on the scale appropriately represent the theoretical content of the subject matter that is being investigated (Sireci, 1998). On the other hand, the Content Validity Index (CVI) provides professionals with a method to evaluate the degree to which each item accurately reflects the subject matter and is pertinent to the discussion (Madadzadeh & Bahariniya, 2023). Through the systematic review of content validity and the computation of the Content Validity Index (CVI), it is possible to significantly improve the structural soundness and measurement accuracy of the scale, so establishing a foundation for further assessments of construct validity and reliability.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Content validity refers to the extent to which a measurement effectively reflects the notion intended for assessment (Markus & Borsboom, 2024). According to Polit and Beck (2006), assessing content validity mostly depends on judgment and encompasses two distinct phases. The creator of the scale first aims to enhance content validity via domain investigation and meticulous conceptualization prior to item formulation. Subsequent to this phase, more endeavors are undertaken to assess the content validity of the scale by expert assessment. Consequently, entrepreneurial behavior, encompassing entrepreneurial activity, resilience in the face of failure, and proactive conduct, was examined and evaluated using CVI. This study's content validation approach consists of six phases, as outlined by Yusoff (2019). There are a number of steps that are involved, including the following: (a) developing the content validation form; (b) choosing a panel of experts for assessment; (c) carrying out content validation; (d) analysing items and domains; (e) assigning scores to items; and

(f) calculating the content validity index (CVI).

2.1. Composing the content validation form

Every expert reviewer is required to have a full understanding of the study, which includes definitions, the hypotheses that are going to be examined, and the key goals for using the instrument. There is a possibility that the evaluation of the instrument will be incorrect or inaccurate if the

experts who are reviewing it are not acquainted with the conceptual framework of the research by Davis (1992). This is the reason why the content validity form is required. For the purpose of determining whether or not the material inside the research was legitimate, the relevance rating scale that Davis (1992) developed was used. As can be seen in Figure 1, the researcher created a validation form for the expert reviewers. This form included the study purpose, definitions, and scale measurements.

Assessment Guide of Content Validation	
This inventory consists of entrepreneurial behavior with three dimensions, entrepreneurial activities, overcoming failure, and proactive behavior among vocational college students in China. The items of the instrument will be provided on a 7-Likert Scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree the respondents after this process. Kindly offer an expert evaluation of the relevance of each item to the specified domains being measured. The evaluation should rely on the definitions and pertinent terminology outlined in the text. Please aim for objectivity and constructive comments in your review, utilizing the provided relevance rating scale.	
Degree of relevance:	
1 =	The item does not pertain to the measured domain
2 =	The item is moderately related to the measured domain
3 =	The item is highly relevant to the measured domain
4 =	The item is extremely relevant to the measured domain

Figure 1: Content Validation Evaluation.

The title of this form mainly assists specialists in evaluating the content validity of the scale. The scale content relates to entrepreneurial behavior among vocational college students, including three dimensions: entrepreneurial activity, resilience in the face of failure, and proactive conduct. Researchers need specialists to assess the pertinence of each item to its corresponding dimension based on the supplied definitions and terminology in an objective and unbiased manner. The scale items were initially supposed to be assessed using a 7-point Likert scale (from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree"); however, this phase of content validity evaluation only examines the correspondence between items and their designated measurement domains.

The table below presents a four-tier scoring system for evaluating relevance: 1 signifies "item is unrelated to the measurement domain," 2 signifies "item has moderate relevance to the measurement

domain," 3 signifies "item has high relevance to the measurement domain," and 4 signifies "item has extremely high relevance to the measurement domain." This scoring method allows specialists to provide professional evaluations on scale items, providing a scientific foundation for further Content Validity Index (CVI) computations and scale enhancement.

Beyond the evaluation criteria, this study focuses on the hometown-based entrepreneurial behavior of Chinese college students, encompassing three dimensions: intention, ideation, and behavior. The measurement tool for students' hometown-based entrepreneurial behavior was adapted from Mathews (2017); Meng et al. (2023) and Qi et al. (2023). All items are detailed in Figure 2, which includes 5 items from Qi et al. (2023) (EB1–EB5), six items from Mathews (2017) (EB6–EB11), and five items from Meng et al. (2023) (EB12–EB16).

	Original Items	Relevancy			
Intention					
EX1	I am extremely interested in returning to my hometown to start a business.	1	2	3	4
EX 2	I plan to return to my hometown to start a business in the future.	1	2	3	4
EX 3	I will take the initiative to pay attention to relevant policies and training courses.	1	2	3	4
EX 4	I will save money to start a business in my hometown after graduation.	1	2	3	4
EX 5	I am willing to take the time to understand and learn about information related to starting a business in my hometown.	1	2	3	4
Ideation					
EX 6	I should do some pre-judgment of my ideas before telling them to others.	1	2	3	4
EX 7	I feel that people at work ought to be encouraged to share all their ideas, because you never know when a crazy-sounding one might turn out to be the best.	1	2	3	4
EX 8	I feel that all ideas should be given equal time and listened to with an open mind regardless of how zany they seem to be.	1	2	3	4
EX 9	The best way to generate new ideas is to listen to others then tailgate or add on.	1	2	3	4
EX 10	Quality is a lot more important than quantity in generating ideas.	1	2	3	4
EX 11	I think everyone should say whatever pops into their head whenever possible.	1	2	3	4
Behavior					
EX 12	I can identify valuable market opportunities very well	1	2	3	4
EX 13	I can help everyone to start a business.	1	2	3	4
EX 14	When starting a business, I can actively seek new resources to make up for the lack of existing resources	1	2	3	4
EX 15	I pay much attention to establishing a good relationship with the technical service team and technical experts.	1	2	3	4
EX 16	I tend to learn from the management experience and system of successful entrepreneurs.	1	2	3	4

Figure 2: Form for content verification that represents the measured constructs.

2.2. Choosing a panel of experts for review

This research used Chinese university students as respondents, and four experts from distinct Chinese universities, together with one accomplished entrepreneur with entrepreneurial expertise, were chosen. Expert selection criteria included appropriate job experience in the same area (Quatrini Carvalho Passos Guimarães et al., 2016). Certain requirements were imposed on experts, including the possession of a master's degree, the designation of associate professor, and strong knowledge in entrepreneurship education or a minimum of five years of relevant work experience. Experts were required to complete these requirements. In order to evaluate each component of the scale and offer ratings based on its relevance and representativeness within the topic area, the expert panel was given the responsibility of evaluating each component (Davis, 1992). Panel experts evaluated the clarity and relevance of scale items at the fundamental conceptual level on a 4-point ordinal scale, based on the definitions of the concepts and their dimensions. Table 2 provides the expert knowledge for judging student entrepreneurial activity.

The basic information of five domain experts who were interviewed is included in Table 2, which is titled "Relevance of Teaching Objectives in University Subjects." This information includes the subject matter experts' professional titles, linked institutions, and years of experience. The expert group is made up of teachers and business people from several universities, and their expertise spans both academic and practical domains. Among them, two associate professors with doctoral degrees are from Shandong Vocational College of Commerce and Qingdao University, boasting 20 and 13 years of teaching experience respectively; One PhD holds a position at Malang State University with 12 years of professional experience; One associate professor serves at Heilongjiang Dongfang University with 16 years of experience; The other expert is an entrepreneur from Weifang Haoxin Agricultural Preparation Co., Ltd., possessing 7 years of industry expertise. In general, these specialists have a wealth of knowledge in both academic research and industry practice, which enables them to provide multifaceted professional assistance for the investigation of the relevance of instructional objectives.

Table 2: Relevance of Objectives of Teaching Subjects at the University.

No	Domain expert	Organization	Experience
1	Doctor and Associate Professor	Shandong Institute of Commerce and Technology	20 years
2	Doctor and Associate Professor	Qingdao University	13 years
3	Doctor	Universitas Negeri Malang,	12 years
4	Associate Professor	East University of Heilongjiang,	16 years
5	Entrepreneur	Weifang Haoxin Agricultural preparation Co., Ltd.	7 years

2.3. Performing content validation

The study utilized Chinese university students as participants, selecting four experts from various

Chinese universities, along with one successful entrepreneur possessing entrepreneurial expertise. The criteria for choosing experts included having the right kind of work experience in the same field (Rubio et al., 2003). Experts were required to meet specific criteria: possessing a master's degree, holding the title of associate professor, and having significant expertise in entrepreneurship education or at least five years of pertinent professional experience. The expert panel was tasked with evaluating each component of the scale and assigning scores according to its relevance and representativeness within the domain (Davis, 1992). An ordinal scale with four points was used by the panel experts to evaluate the clarity and relevance of the scale items at the basic conceptual level. The evaluation was based on the definitions of the concepts and the dimensions of those ideas. A look at what the professionals know about how to evaluate students' entrepreneurial potential is shown in Table 2.

2.4. Examining items and domain

According to Johnson et al. (2008) before assigning scores to each item, experts should be entrusted with conducting a comprehensive evaluation of both the items and the content of the items. They are strongly urged to offer comments, either verbally or in writing, in order to improve the relevance of the issues to the area that has been chosen. As we work to improve the domain and the components that make it up, we give careful consideration to any and all feedback that we receive. The researcher made sure to provide both phone numbers and email addresses on the assessment form in order to reduce the possibility of any misunderstandings occurring.

Experts play a crucial role in this process by ensuring that each item precisely aligns with the conceptual and practical specifications of the construct being assessed. Patrick et al. (2011) and Vogt, King, and King (2004) contend that content validation should include the assessment of item relevance, clarity, representativeness, and appropriateness within the cultural and contextual frameworks of the target group. Evaluators should assess if the language, structure, and purpose of each statement align with the corresponding theoretical area. To enhance the content and provide comprehensive coverage of essential topics, it is crucial to get constructive input, including recommendations for rephrasing, consolidating, or eliminating elements.

Moreover, effective communication between researchers and assessors is crucial for minimizing

misunderstandings throughout the review process (Gingerich et al., 2014). Experts may handle any inquiries and get further information as needed by providing direct contact details such as phone numbers and email addresses (Ehrlich et al., 2007). This collaborative methodology enhances the reliability of expert assessments, facilitates consensus on item relevance, and ultimately increases the validity and credibility of the generated instrument.

2.5. Assigning scores to items

It was decided to contact five specialists in order to get their subjective assessments of the tools, which were then sent to the researcher. Following that, the researcher handed out the questionnaires and feedback forms to the panel of experts in preparation for the subsequent meeting. All of the members of the expert panel were tasked with the duty of evaluating the relevance and clarity of the indicators that were used in the research instrument by using the scoring system that is shown in Figure 1. Additionally, they were required to provide open comments in the manner that is stated in Table 1. According to Davis (1992), a score of one or two on the relevance scale may be reported as zero, but a result of three or four can be categorised as something else entirely. A rating of three to four is considered to be the appropriate item.

2.6. Calculating the CVI

According to Lynn, (1986), a number of researchers calculate two different kinds of Content Validity Indices (CVIs) in order to assess the objectives of the study. According to Polit & Beck (2006), the first statistic is the I-CVI, which is calculated by dividing the total number of experts by the percentage of experts that offer ratings of three or four. The second kind is the S-CVI, which indicates the percentage of items in an instrument that get ratings of either three or four from the total number of content experts (Polit et al., 2007). This type takes into account the entire number of content experts. Regarding the allowable I-CVI in respect to the number of experts, Polit et al. (2007) offered suggestions that are widely recognised as being appropriate. It is recommended that the I-CVI threshold be set at 1.00 when the panel consists of three to five experts. This implies a unanimity among all experts about the authenticity of the item's content. Because five experts were involved in this study, it was important to leave out any items from the questionnaire that had an I-CVI score of less than 1.00. Figure 4, which is available online, shows the requirements for the right cutoff value.

Number of experts	Acceptable CVI	References
3 to 5 experts	Should be 1	Polit et al. (2007)
At least 6 experts	A minimum of 0.83	Polit et al. (2007)
6 to 8 experts	A minimum of 0.83	Lynn (1986)
More than 8 experts	A minimum of 0.78	Lynn (1986)

Figure 4: Comparison between total exports and the cutoff value.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Intention, Ideation, and Behaviour are the three aspects of local entrepreneurial behaviour that are investigated in this study: the efficacy of each of these three dimensions among Chinese college students. In order to get a consensus among the experts for a certain item, the assessment ratings that were offered by all of the experts for that particular item were compiled and analysed. It is possible to calculate the I-CVI by using the formula I-CVI, which is obtained by dividing the total number of items that have been agreed upon by the total number of experts (Polit & Beck, 2006). According to Polit et al., (2007), the S-CVI

is a representation of the cumulative I-CVI score. Two different approaches are available for calculating the S-CVI: the S-CVI/UA (universal agreement), which calls for a minimum acceptable value of .80 (Davis, 1992), and the S-CVI/Ave, which demands a minimum acceptable value of .90 or higher (Polit et al., 2007). Both of these approaches are referred to as various techniques. It was stated by Polit and Beck (2006) that the S-CVI/Ave approach is preferable because of the excessively stringent nature of universal agreement. This is especially true in situations when a significant number of professional experts make up the validation panel. Tables 4, 5, and 6 include the specifics of the evaluations made by the specialists.

Table 4: The relevance rating on the scale of the item for Intention.

Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert in Agreement	I-CVI	UA
EB1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB2	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB3	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB4	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB5	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
Proportion	1 relevance: Average	1 proportion	1 of items judged	1 as relevant across the	1 five experts	S-CVI/Ave S-CVI/UA 1	1	1

Note(s): I-CVI = agreed-upon/number of experts; UA = universal agreement; S-CVI = the sum of the I-CVI

Table 1: The relevance rating on the scale of the item for Ideation.

Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert in Agreement	I-CVI	UA
EB6	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB7	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB8	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB9	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB10	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB11	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
Proportion	1 relevance: Average	1 proportion	1 of items judged	1 as relevant across the	1 five experts	S-CVI/Ave S-CVI/UA 1	1	1

Note(s): I-CVI = agreed-upon/number of experts; UA = universal agreement; S-CVI = the sum of the I-CVI

Table 2: The relevance rating on the scale of the item for Behavior

Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Expert in Agreement	I-CVI	UA
EB12	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB13	1	0	1	1	1	4	0.8	0
EB14	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB15	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
EB16	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1
Proportion	1 relevance: Average	0.8 proportion	1 of items judged	1 as relevant across the	1 five experts	S CVI/ Ave S-CVI/UA 0.96	0.96	0.8

Note(s): I-CVI = agreed-upon/number of experts; UA = universal agreement; S-CVI = the sum of the I-CVI

As can be seen in Tables 4, 5, and 6, the entrepreneurial activity of students was assessed based on three distinct aspects: behaviour, ideation, and intention. These factors were used to evaluate entrepreneurs. Based on the results of the assessment, it was concluded that the S-CVI/Ave and S-CVI/UA scores that were more than 0.90 satisfied the requirements of the criteria. As a result, the scale achieved the needed degree of content validity acquired by the scale. Due to the fact that its I-CVI score is lower than the requirement of 1.00, just one item (EB8) has to be eliminated from consideration totally. Following the removal of this item, the I-CVI was able to attain a level that was suitable for the circumstances. In light of this, it is possible to draw the conclusion that the constructs of entrepreneurial behaviour, which include proactive conduct, resilience in the face of failure, and entrepreneurial activity, exhibited significant content validity when it came to determining the extent to which university students in China engage in entrepreneurial behaviour.

It is very vital to make sure that an assessment is completely valid, and content validity is a big part of this. The objective of this study was to provide a systematic and evidence-based methodology for conducting comprehensive content validation. To compute the Content Validity Index (CVI) using this instrument, empirical data derived from expert evaluations of entrepreneurial behaviour among Chinese university students have been established as the basis. This establishes a foundation for further research endeavours. After this step of expert assessment is done, other research should employ EFA to look at how reliable and valid the tool that was used in this study is.

Despite the fact that this work has a great deal of potential, it is necessary to acknowledge that it has certain limitations. Initially, establishing a business in one's hometown is a dynamic activity that requires continuous adjustments to research tools. This is

because the industry is always evolving. Intention, ideation, and action were the only three dimensions of entrepreneurial activity that were the subject of this study. During further research, more facets could be addressed. In terms of geography, this research only included specialists from three different locations, which restricts its capacity to be generalized. people from universities and vocational institutions might be included in future research, and the scope of the study could be expanded to include people from a variety of places. In addition, the only dependence on online self-administered surveys may lead to bias; in the future, research should make use of a hybrid survey approach that incorporates both online and offline methodologies in order to give more comprehensive insights. This study only looked at university students from one country; in the future, researchers should broaden their scope to include university students from other nations and take into account the cultural differences that exist across communities.

4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research aims to validate a measuring scale designed to assess the entrepreneurial activities of college students returning to their hometowns to establish firms. The research demonstrates, via extensive testing, that most questions on the scale properly represent entrepreneurial behavior across three primary dimensions: entrepreneurial intention, entrepreneurial conception, and entrepreneurial activity. The computation of the Content Validity Index (CVI) indicates that the scale is very trustworthy and valid, allowing for confident use in future empirical investigations. The findings demonstrate that the instrument is theoretically valid and statistically accurate for assessing the intricate entrepreneurial activities of returning students.

This study contributes to the literature on local entrepreneurship by addressing a vacuum in previous research that has mostly focused on policy,

motivation, and obstacles, while seldom investigating the measurable entrepreneurial activities of Chinese university students. The study provides a validated and dependable instrument, allowing future researchers to obtain high-quality and consistent data, thus enabling more detailed analyses of the effectiveness of entrepreneurship

education, governmental support, and regional development policies. The study enhances theoretical understanding and creates a practical framework for developing targeted interventions and policy measures to foster and maintain college students' entrepreneurial activities in their local communities..

REFERENCES

- Adel, A. M., Dai, X., & Roshdy, R. S. (2022). Investigating consumers' behavioral intentions toward suboptimal produce: An extended theory of planned behavior—a cross-cultural study. *British Food Journal*, 124(1), 99–139.
- Belchior, R. F., & Lyons, R. (2021). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions, nascent entrepreneurial behavior and new business creation with social cognitive career theory – a 5-year longitudinal analysis. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 17(4), 1945–1972. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-021-00745-7>
- Cui, M. (2025). 16: Rural and remote education for rural revitalization in China. <https://www.elgaronline.com/edcollchap/book/9781035307722/chapter16.xml>
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5(4), 194–197.
- Ehrlich, K., Lin, C.-Y., & Griffiths-Fisher, V. (2007). Searching for experts in the enterprise: Combining text and social network analysis. *Proceedings of the 2007 International ACM Conference on Conference on Supporting Group Work - GROUP '07*, 117. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1316624.1316642>
- Gingerich, A., Kogan, J., Yeates, P., Govaerts, M., & Holmboe, E. (2014). Seeing the 'black box' differently: Assessor cognition from three research perspectives. *Medical Education*, 48(11), 1055–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12546>
- Hidalgo, G., Monticelli, J. M., & Vargas Bortolaso, I. (2024). Social Capital as a Driver of Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 15(1), 182–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2021.1951819>
- Johnson, R. L., Penny, J. A., & Gordon, B. (2008). *Assessing performance: Designing, scoring, and validating performance tasks*. Guilford Press. https://books.google.com/books?hl=zh-CN&lr=&id=KuxdzkjyKUC&oi=fnd&pg=PR1&dq=specialists+must+be+tasked+with+thoroughly+evaluating+both+the+items+and+their+topic+prior+to+scoring+each+item.&ots=3vq2QnkWY_&sig=kskyoiN035tkh83tW9np_g0FFdY
- Kesumahati, E. (2021). *Social entrepreneurship intention during covid-19 crisis among university students: A case study from Indonesia* [PhD Thesis, Udayana University]. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Erilia-Kesumahati-2/publication/356541016_Social_Entrepreneurship_Intention_During_Covid-19_Crisis_Among_University_Students_A_Case_Study_From_Indonesia/links/619fc7aed7d1af224b2421d8/Social-Entrepreneurship-Intention-During-Covid-19-Crisis-Among-University-Students-A-Case-Study-From-Indonesia.pdf
- Li, M., Zhang, L., Huang, J., & Lu, Y. (2024). A Quantitative Evaluation Study on Return-to-Hometown Entrepreneurship Policies in 16 Provinces (Municipalities) and Autonomous Regions in China Under the Rural Revitalization Strategy. *Sustainability* (2071-1050), 16(23). <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=20711050&AN=181653574&h=DEjZ6uEE%2F9aQfMWV74yp2XWVOJA1DW6ujEiR76vCHWqDepjiqHyfwDoVCrd09xkWOcbWrSVM5YZE0kIPwhH5g%3D%3D&crl=c>
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593–617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x>
- Lu, Y., Zhou, Y., & Liu, P. (2023). Improving the entrepreneurial ability of rural migrant workers returning home in China: Study based on 5,675 questionnaires. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1–10.
- Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and Quantification Of Content Validity. *Nursing Research*, 35(6), 382.
- Madadzadeh, F., & Bahariniya, S. (2023). Tutorial on how to calculating content validity of scales in medical

- research. *Perioperative Care and Operating Room Management*, 31, 100315.
- Markus, K. A., & Borsboom, D. (2024). *Frontiers of test validity theory: Measurement, causation, and meaning*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781003398219/frontiers-test-validity-theory-keith-markus-denny-borsboom>
- Mathews, R. D. (2017). *Entrepreneurship Education: Effect of a Treatment in Undergraduate College Courses on Entrepreneurial Intent and Ideation* [Ed.D.]. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1977404196/abstract/38A124B1432E4BCEPQ/1>
- Meng, D., Shang, Y., Zhang, X., & Li, Y. (2023). Does Entrepreneurship Policy Encourage College Graduates' Entrepreneurship Behavior: The Intermediary Role Based on Entrepreneurship Willingness. *Sustainability*, 15(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15129492>
- Patrick, D. L., Burke, L. B., Gwaltney, C. J., Leidy, N. K., Martin, M. L., Molsen, E., & Ring, L. (2011). Content validity—establishing and reporting the evidence in newly developed patient-reported outcomes (PRO) instruments for medical product evaluation: ISPOR PRO Good Research Practices Task Force report: part 2—assessing respondent understanding. *Value in Health*, 14(8), 978–988.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489–497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20147>
- Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 30(4), 459–467. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20199>
- Qi, R., Wang, D., Yang, Y., & Wu, F. (2023). How does environmental perception affect the willingness of university students to return home to start a business? *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2288720>
- Quatrini Carvalho Passos Guimarães, H. C., Pena, S. B., Lopes, J. D. L., Lopes, C. T., & Bottura Leite De Barros, A. L. (2016). Experts for Validation Studies in Nursing: New Proposal and Selection Criteria. *International Journal of Nursing Knowledge*, 27(3), 130–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2047-3095.12089>
- Romano, M., Cunningham, J. A., Cuttone, G., Munnia, A., & Nicotra, M. (2025). Intellectual capital-based research impact management: A strategic approach to increase regional intellectual capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 26(7), 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-04-2024-0115>
- Rubio, D. M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research*, 27(2), 94–104.
- Silva, B. G., Andriese, N. C., & Combs, J. G. (2025). Return Migrant Entrepreneurship: A Systematic Review and Future Research Agenda. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 10422587251322402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10422587251322402>
- Sireci, S. G. (1998). The Construct of Content Validity. *Social Indicators Research*, 45(1–3), 83–117. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006985528729>
- Vogt, D. S., King, D. W., & King, L. A. (2004). Focus groups in psychological assessment: Enhancing content validity by consulting members of the target population. *Psychological Assessment*, 16(3), 231.