

TITLE: Estimate of the Validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory Scale for Self-Rating School Business Officials

RESEARCHER: Wayne A. Ruman, Jr.
School of Education
University of Akron
Doctoral Dissertation: December 2004

OBJECTIVE: This study was designed to estimate the validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory as a self-predicting tool for school business officials.

METHODOLOGY: The 41 subjects came from public school districts in the most populated counties in North-Central Ohio, and represent 76 percent of the target population. In addition to completing the LPI-Self, each respondent asked four colleagues (superior, direct reporting subordinate, coworker/peer, and other manager) to complete the LPI-Observer. Participation rate by observer category were all above 71 percent, although in only 40 percent of the cases did all five members of the school district return their surveys.

KEY FINDINGS: The LPI was not supported as a self-rating tool for business officials in North-central Ohio during 2003-2004 because the collected data was not the same between the self scores and those from the various constituents. Generally, there were no significant interactions between the LPI responses and demographic data (i.e., years of education, age, work experience or school size).

“This researcher believes that school business officials have not embraced a transformational leadership style but continue, generally, as transactional managers. This position is a result of a review of both the literature on transactional and transformational leadership characteristics and the job responsibilities of school business officials. A lack of agreement was also found related to transformational leadership behaviors between school business officials and their colleagues on the Leadership Practices Inventory” (p. 179-180). The lack of significance, the author asserts, may also have been the result of low sample size and/or power (p. 149).

A final note (from Barry Posner): Some confounding data is offered in this dissertation but not discussed. Consider the results from Table 5.6 (p. 173) of mean scores of the five practices by respondent category turned into *rank orderings*:

Respondent	CTP	ISV	EOA	MTW	ETH
Self	4	5	1	2	3
Superior	4	5	1	2	3

Direct Report	4	5	1	3	2
Co-worker/Peer	4	5	1	2	3
Other Manager	3	5	1	2	3

Looked at from this perspective the data reveals considerable agreement between all of the respondents about which leadership practices are used most to least frequently by school business officials..