Construct Blueprint and Blind Review: Internal Service Quality

Instrument Development, stages 1 and 2. Sample deliverable on a synthetic construct, prepared by Dr Milos Kankaras, Center for Psychology, September 2026.

This is a demonstration. The construct is invented for it, every stem was written for it, and no client, no client data and no published instrument is involved. A client receives exactly these documents for their own construct: the approved blueprint, the candidate bank, the blind review sheet with every call, and the screen record.

1. The construct blueprint

Approved by the client before any item was written. Everything that follows is checked against it.

Field	Content
Construct	Internal Service Quality
Working definition	How employees experience the support they receive from an internal service function (IT, HR, finance, facilities) when they raise a request: how quickly and dependably the request is handled, and how they are treated while it is.
Population	Employees of the organisation who raise requests with an internal service function (adult, general reading level).
Response format	5-point Likert agreement (Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree)
Referent	"The support team" stands for the client's named function and is substituted at fielding.
Target length	Six items per facet in the final form; eighteen candidates drafted per facet.
Keying	At least 30 percent reverse-keyed per facet, written as opposite-pole statements.
Scoring intent	Two dimension scores; facets are content areas within them, to be tested in the pilot.

Dimensions and facets

Name	Code	Level	Definition
Delivery	DL	dimension	Whether the request gets done: speed of response and dependability of the outcome.
Responsiveness	RS	facet	How quickly the support team acknowledges and acts on a request, and how easy it is to reach.
Reliability	RL	facet	Whether the support team does what it said it would, correctly and by the time it promised.
Relationship	RE	dimension	How the person raising the request is treated while it is handled: kept informed, and owned by someone.
Communication	CM	facet	Whether the person is kept informed, in plain language, about what is happening with the request.

Name	Code	Level	Definition
Ownership	OW	facet	Whether one person takes responsibility for the request until it is resolved, rather than passing it on.

2. The candidate bank

Seventy-two stems, eighteen per facet, authored to the item-writing rule set: one idea per stem, plain register, no absolutes, no leading or socially desirable wording, reverse items written as genuine opposite-pole statements. A share of stems that break those rules was left in deliberately, because a bank in which nothing needs a decision teaches the client nothing about how the review works. The Ownership facet is shown in full; the other three facets are in the annex.

Ownership candidates (OW), as they went to review

Id	Key	Stem
OW1	+	One person takes charge of my request until it is resolved.
OW2	-	My request gets passed from person to person.
OW3	+	The person handling my request keeps it moving even when others are involved.
OW4	-	I have to re-explain my request each time someone new picks it up.
OW5	+	When something goes wrong, the support team takes responsibility rather than blaming others.
OW6	+	The support team treats my problem as its problem.
OW7	-	The support team tells me the issue is someone else's job.
OW8	+	If my request stalls, someone on the support team notices before I do.
OW9	+	I know who is responsible for my request.
OW10	-	Nobody on the support team seems to own my request.
OW11	+	The support team goes above and beyond to make sure I am completely satisfied.
OW12	+	The support team sees my request through to the end.
OW13	-	Requests are closed before the problem is actually fixed.
OW14	+	The support team follows up after a fix to check that it worked.
OW15	-	When I raise a problem, I end up coordinating the solution myself.
OW16	+	The support team takes ownership of my request.
OW17	+	The support team proactively escalates blockers to the appropriate stakeholders.
OW18	-	The support team doesn't take responsibility and doesn't follow up.

3. The blind review

The reviewer read every stem on a sheet that carried the items and nothing else: no screen output, no flag, no count. Each stem received a call (use, rework, drop) and, where useful, a note. The sheet was rendered at 2026-09-18 13:59:17 UTC and the calls were recorded at 2026-09-18 14:00:31 UTC;

the ordering is the evidence that the review was formed before the machine's proposals were visible.

Table 1. Blind calls per facet

Facet	Code	Use	Rework	Drop
Responsiveness	RS	11	3	4
Reliability	RL	15	1	2
Communication	CM	13	3	2
Ownership	OW	13	2	3
All facets		52	9	11

Ownership: the reviewer's calls and notes

Id	Call	Note
OW1	use	
OW2	use	
OW3	use	
OW4	use	
OW5	rework	'rather than blaming others' is a second idea; end the stem at 'takes responsibility'
OW6	use	
OW7	use	
OW8	use	
OW9	use	
OW10	use	
OW11	drop	socially desirable and absolute; 'above and beyond' is a slogan
OW12	use	
OW13	use	premature closure; content borders reliability, assigned here as an ownership failure
OW14	use	follow-up after a fix is rare in practice; expect a low mean
OW15	use	
OW16	rework	names the facet; abstract; reword to a visible behaviour
OW17	drop	jargon: proactively, escalates blockers, stakeholders
OW18	drop	double negative and two claims

4. The screen, and where it disagreed

After the calls were recorded, a rule-based screen read the same 72 stems for double-barrelling, negation, absolutes, reading level, social desirability, vague referents and near-duplication, and the

bank for keying balance and facet coverage. It proposed keep for 57, revise for 15 and cut for 0; it found the reverse share adequate in every facet (25 of 72 items overall) and one near-duplicate pair: RS1 and RS18 (overlap 0.92). The screen has no verdict weight. Its use is that it reads every stem the same way and leaves a record.

Set against the blind calls, the screen agreed on 53 of 72 stems (74 percent). Table 2 gives the agreement by facet and Table 3 every disagreement. The pattern is the one to expect from a surface reader: where it disagreed, the reviewer was usually stricter (drop where the screen said revise, because two ideas in a stem is a reason to discard, not to patch), and the screen missed exactly the defects that need a reader (the duplicate stem RS18, the policy-dependent RS14, the jargon of OW17). In the other direction it flagged three Ownership stems the reviewer kept, on reading level and on the word responsible, which is the kind of false alarm a rule set produces.

Table 2. Agreement between the blind review and the screen, by facet

Facet	Rated	Agree	Disagree	Agreement, %
Responsiveness	18	12	6	67
Reliability	18	15	3	83
Communication	18	15	3	83
Ownership	18	11	7	61
All	72	53	19	74

Table 3. The disagreements

Id	Reviewer	Screen	Screen flags	Reviewer's note
RS7	rework	keep	none	describes what channels exist, not how fast help arrives; likely weak, reword to reachability or hold in reserve
RS9	drop	revise	double barreled; absolute quantifier; reading level	two claims in one stem and an absolute
RS11	rework	keep	negation	wordy negation; RS3 covers the same ground more directly
RS14	drop	keep	negation	the answer depends on the function's opening policy, not on how well it serves
RS17	drop	revise	reading level	jargon: leverages, expedite, triage
RS18	drop	keep	none	duplicate of RS1
RL11	drop	revise	double barreled; negation; absolute quantifier	two absolutes, two claims
RL14	rework	keep	negation	contraction plus negation; reword to 'The support team remembers my request without reminders'
RL18	drop	revise	reading level	jargon and a vague quantifier
CM11	drop	revise	double barreled	two ideas: comprehensibility and timeliness
CM17	rework	keep	reading level	summary judgement with no behaviour in it; reword or hold in reserve
CM18	drop	revise	double barreled; reading level	management jargon in a triad
OW3	use	revise	reading level	

Id	Reviewer	Screen	Screen flags	Reviewer's note
OW9	use	revise	social desirability	
OW10	use	revise	negation; absolute quantifier	
OW11	drop	revise	double barreled; absolute quantifier	socially desirable and absolute; 'above and beyond' is a slogan
OW16	rework	keep	none	names the facet; abstract; reword to a visible behaviour
OW17	drop	keep	reading level	jargon: proactively, escalates blockers, stakeholders
OW18	drop	revise	double barreled; double negation; reading level	double negative and two claims

5. What went to the pilot

Eleven stems were dropped and nine reworked. Of the sixty-one that survived, forty went to the pilot form, ten per facet, chosen by the reviewer for content coverage across each facet definition and keying balance, with the rest held in reserve; forty items keep the pilot under ten minutes and leave enough surplus for the selection rule to work. One reworked stem was fielded (OW5, ending at "takes responsibility"). Three stems the reviewer had doubts about were fielded on purpose (RS16, RL13, OW14), because a pilot answers the question a reader can only raise; the technical note reports what happened to them.

Facet	n	Items fielded
Responsiveness	10	RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS6, RS8, RS12, RS15, RS16
Reliability	10	RL1, RL2, RL3, RL4, RL5, RL6, RL7, RL8, RL15, RL13
Communication	10	CM1, CM2, CM3, CM4, CM5, CM6, CM7, CM8, CM12, CM13
Ownership	10	OW1, OW2, OW3, OW4, OW5, OW6, OW7, OW9, OW12, OW14

Reviewer's note

The blueprint holds: four facets in two dimensions, each with a definition an item can be checked against. The bank that went to the pilot is balanced in keying, covers every facet definition, and carries no stem I would not defend. Whether the four facets earn separate scores is the pilot's question, not this document's, and the technical note answers it.

Dr Milos Kankaras, Founder and Director, Center for Psychology

Specimen: a client report carries the reviewer's dated signature here.

Dr Milos Kankaras, Founder and Director, Center for Psychology | milos@centerforpsychology.me | miloskankaras.com | centerforpsychology.me | ORCID | Google Scholar | LinkedIn

Annex. Candidate stems for the other three facets

Responsiveness (RS)

Id	Key	Stem	Call
RS1	+	When I raise a request, the support team acknowledges it the same day.	use
RS2	+	It is easy to reach someone on the support team when I need to.	use
RS3	-	My requests sit unanswered for days.	use
RS4	+	The support team starts work on my request soon after I send it.	use
RS5	-	I have to chase the support team to get any response.	use
RS6	+	Urgent requests are treated as urgent.	use
RS7	+	I can get hold of the support team through more than one channel.	rework
RS8	-	Reaching the right person on the support team takes several attempts.	use
RS9	+	The support team responds quickly and always solves the problem completely.	drop
RS10	+	The support team never keeps me waiting.	rework
RS11	-	When I contact the support team, I do not get an answer for a long time.	rework
RS12	+	The support team replies to my messages promptly.	use
RS13	+	I know how long I will wait before someone picks up my request.	use
RS14	-	Outside office hours there is no way to get help from the support team.	drop
RS15	+	The support team's response times are acceptable for the work I do.	use
RS16	-	Simple requests take as long as complicated ones.	use
RS17	+	The support team leverages its ticketing workflow to expedite triage of incoming requests.	drop
RS18	+	When I raise a request, the support team acknowledges it on the same day.	drop

Reliability (RL)

Id	Key	Stem	Call
RL1	+	When the support team says something will be done by a date, it is done by that date.	use
RL2	+	The support team gets my request right the first time.	use
RL3	-	I often have to go back to the support team because the fix did not work.	use
RL4	+	I can rely on the support team to follow through on what it agrees.	use
RL5	-	Promised deadlines slip without warning.	use
RL6	+	The support team's work is accurate.	use
RL7	-	I check the support team's work because errors are common.	use
RL8	+	Once the support team closes my request, the problem stays solved.	use
RL9	+	The support team is dependable.	use
RL10	-	What I receive from the support team is not what I asked for.	use
RL11	+	The support team is always right and never misses a deadline.	drop
RL12	+	The support team delivers the same quality from one request to the next.	use
RL13	-	The outcome of a request depends on who happens to handle it.	use
RL14	+	I don't have to worry that the support team will forget my request.	rework
RL15	+	The support team keeps its commitments.	use
RL16	-	The support team makes mistakes that cost me time.	use

Id	Key	Stem	Call
RL17	+	The support team does what it says it will do.	use
RL18	+	The service-level agreement is adhered to in the majority of instances.	drop

Communication (CM)

Id	Key	Stem	Call
CM1	+	The support team tells me what will happen next with my request.	use
CM2	+	I am told when my request has been passed to someone else.	use
CM3	-	I only find out about delays when I ask.	use
CM4	+	The support team explains things in language I understand.	use
CM5	-	Messages from the support team are full of technical terms I do not follow.	use
CM6	+	When my request is closed, I am told what was done.	use
CM7	+	I can see the status of my request at any time.	use
CM8	-	I am left guessing about where my request stands.	use
CM9	+	The support team asks the right questions to understand what I need.	use
CM10	+	The support team communicates clearly and treats me with respect.	rework
CM11	-	The support team's updates are hard to understand and arrive late.	drop
CM12	+	If my request cannot be done, the support team tells me why.	use
CM13	+	Updates from the support team arrive without my having to ask for them.	use
CM14	-	I never know what is happening with my request.	rework
CM15	+	The support team confirms what it has understood before starting work.	use
CM16	-	Explanations from the support team leave me with more questions than answers.	use
CM17	+	The support team is good at communicating.	rework
CM18	+	Communication from the support team is transparent, proactive and stakeholder-oriented.	drop