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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The last quarter of the twentieth century documents major efforts to reform public school education to improve results in the critical area of student achievement. Concurrently, the importance of leadership in schools has been the focus of intensive research and theory. The current mandates of reform are different from previous efforts at school restructuring. Issues include decentralization of school districts toward school-based management, whole school reform programs that are research-based, requirements for the implementation of these programs, accountability plans, professional development, instructional technology and increased parent and community involvement. The need for effective principals is emphasized in the current body of research on school reform as evidence of the vastness and seriousness of this reform effort. At the same time, however, the mandate for decentralized governance or school-based management has created a critical change in the role of the principal, and is part of requirements of school reform.

Historically, the structure of school leadership has been a top-down approach, with the principal in each school as the primary decision-maker and policy interpreter in its local educational system. Lawrence Lezotte's description of the change in the principal's role typifies the new role and vision for leaders in many school reform models. "Principals, though essential leaders of change, cannot do it alone, and thus, teachers and others must be integral parts of the school improvement process." (Lezotte,
2000, p. 1). In describing the role of the principal in the Effective Schools Reform Program, Lezotte writes, "The principal will become a 'leader of leaders' rather than a leader of followers." Specifically, the principal will become a coach, partner, and cheerleader." (Lezotte, 2000, p. 2). Similarly, Wohlsetter and Mohrman note that the principal's role changes toward one of facilitator and manager of change. As they stated, "Principals at actively restructuring schools work to broaden and sustain the school's commitment to reform by getting various stakeholders involved in decision-making teams." (Wohlsetter, & Mohrman, 1999a, p.2).

Effective leadership is an issue supported by a large body of research (Blasé & Blasé, 1999, p.347). Blasé and Blasé (1999) identify nine primary tasks for an effective principal: (a) direct assistance to teachers, (b) group development, (c) staff development, (d) curriculum development, (e) action research, (f) planning, (g) organizing, (h) facilitating change, (i) motivating staff. (Blasé & Blasé, 1999, p. 348). Effective principals empower the members of the school to institutionalize the commitment to reform. (Wohlsetter & Mohrman, 1996b, p. 2).

District offices no longer are in the business of telling schools what to do; instead, they are moving to help schools accomplish what schools, themselves, decide to do. Roles within schools for principals and teachers change under School-Based Management, as decision-making becomes a participative activity shared among various school constituents. ...Whereas principals are accustomed to being the primary decision-maker at the school site, this is likely to change under SBM, with teachers, parents and community members empowered to make decisions formerly in the principal's exclusive domain. (Wohlsetter & Mohrman, 1996b,
Decentralized governance that signifies a change in the role of the principal consists of efforts in site-based management or school-based management under required school reform. Control is decentralized from central office parameters. This process provides support to the constituents in individual schools, as increased control over day-to-day school activities becomes part of staff as well as administrative responsibilities. The implementation of decentralized governance, or school-based management in school districts, systemically changes the role of the principal within those districts. The process may assist in the redesign of the organization of the school, based on its educational vision. For others, however, issues such as the principal’s veto power, membership of the management council, and even who has access to the school’s copy machines impede the process of site-based management. (Wohlseter & Mohrman, 1996b, p. 1). The University of California at Los Angeles conducted a major three-year study of schools in the United States, Canada, and Australia in 1996 to discover what made school-based management work. The study involved 40 schools in 13 school districts, with more than 400 people including school board members, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents and students in local schools. In brief, the researchers found that:

School-based management requires a redesign of the whole school organization that goes far beyond a change in school governance. For school-based management to work, people at the school site must have ‘real’ authority over budget, personnel and curriculum. Equally important, that authority must be used to introduce changes in school functioning that actually affects teaching and learning. (Wohlseter & Mohrman, 1996a. p. 1).
School-based management requires that principals and teachers, who are trained and empowered to make decisions related to management and performance, have the information necessary to make appropriate informed decisions and be rewarded for their accomplishments.

Another important body of research has focused on leadership traits and their impact on principal behavior. Carl Jung first developed personality typing in 1922. "The essence of the theory is that much seemingly random variation in behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to basic differences in the ways individuals prefer to use their perception and judgment." (Myers. McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer, 1998, p. 3). Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers developed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in the 1950's. Myers and Briggs added a fourth scale to Jungian personality typing, simplified its description, and developed a psychometric called the MBTI or Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for measuring their personality typing.

David Kiersey's temperament classifications added to the body of psychological-type theory. "It is a curious and interesting observation that personality typing is not used nor studied much within the research academic psychological and psychiatric communities, at least compared to other model metrics, nor is it universally accepted." (Kiersey, 1996, p. 2). One of the unique contributions of Keirsey's interpretation, however, is the link that it attempts to make between trait theories and leadership behavior, although not in the context of school reform.

The implementation of mandated approved whole school reform is the primary focus of the present educational initiatives of the State of New Jersey for 30 of the poorest performing school districts, through implementation of the State Supreme Court's
Abbott decision. The 1999 interpretation of this 1998 Supreme Court mandate is thorough as to the issue of school-based management. It includes specific legal citations describing the composition of school management teams, as well as their duties and responsibilities. (Abbott v. Burke m. 1336-98, 2000). However, the role of the principal receives little if any focus in the specificity of the Abbott Legislation. Only two of the seven state-approved models of whole school reform address the issue of the principal's role in decentralized governance, within their models of whole school reform.

Four of these models of school reform are approved for implementation at the elementary level, but only two of these provide specific leadership training for principals. Of the four approved elementary models, Modern Red Schoolhouse has a school-based training program that includes a module for leadership development for principals. "An annual administrator's conference provides administrators new to the design with opportunities to acquaint themselves with their role and responsibilities, the stages of planning and implementation, and with organizational issues associated with implementing the design." (Kilgore, 1997, p. 48). The focus of this training is on the implementation of the school reform model, but does not address the leadership issue as it relates to all other parts of the principal's responsibility in the school.

The principal of an Accelerated School participates on the cadres (or school-based focus groups), on the steering committee, and in school-as-a-whole meetings, raises other questions and concerns that affect the entire school, and acts on the decisions and recommendations of these bodies and puts them into practice. (Hopfenberg, Levin, & Associates, 1993, p. 268). Principals of Accelerated Schools participate as members of the school's coaching team, and provide turnkey training to the school staff in all
precepts of the implementation process.

The only area in which *Success for All/Roots and Wings* makes a direct reference to the role of the principal is in its description of the Advisory Committee:

An advisory committee composed of the building principal, program facilitator, teacher representatives, parent representatives, and family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program and to identify and solve any problems that arise. In most schools, existing site-based management teams are adapted to fulfill this function. In addition, grade level teams and the Family Support Team meet regularly to discuss common problems and solutions and to make decisions in their areas of responsibility. (Slavin, 1999, p. 8).

The principal of a *Success for All* School participates in all training provided for the school. The role of the principal in this model is as part of the team, but has no specific focus in terms of leadership as a critical element in the school or the model.

**The School Development Program (Comer)** has a Principals’ Academy as part of its implementation processes in years one and two. “Studies of the implementation process (of Comer) reveal that the principal’s attitude and leadership…. greatly affect implementation.” (Reform Handbook, The School Development Program, 1999, p. 5). This model is the only model that addresses the role of the principal in implementing the program in a specific, focused manner that targets the importance of the leadership of the school.

The implementation of mandated whole school reform programs has” change” as its inherent modality. “What seems to be important is now what the change is, but how do you change; . . . not leadership that blocks poorly conceived and potentially harmful
change, but leadership that "turns things around." (Sergiovanni, 2000, p. 28). The issue of effective leadership leading to improved student achievement has been supported by research for over 30 years. Neither the reform models nor the Abbott legislation address the issue of effective leadership in a meaningful manner, with one exception. The Modern Red Schoolhouse whole school reform model is the only reform model approved in New Jersey that directly addresses the issue of change, both from the perspective of the principal and from that of the staff of the school.

Statement of the Problem

The history of educational reform has been long and complex. Despite rigorous efforts at improving student achievement through systematic school restructuring efforts, significant and lasting results of sustained, incremental improvement of student achievement are not part of the current research. "Most aspects of this complex phenomenon have not been adequately studied." (Blase & Blase, 1999, p. 354). Although the literature has many studies and much information on the effective principal, the relationship or role of the principal to issues of state-mandated reform and required decentralized governance have not been examined to any great degree. The only study to address the current issues of mandated reform in New Jersey was completed by Rutgers University during the 1998-1999 school year. (Erlichson, Goertz, & Turnbull, 1999). This study addresses the school management or decentralized governance issue thoroughly, but shows no evidence regarding investigation of the role of the principal in school reform efforts.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was an important variable used in analyzing the
relationship between personality type of principals and leadership behavior. The focus research was on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was on the relationship between leadership effectiveness and personality type, using a variety of other instruments to which to investigate potential correlative results. Although the results from the studies of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were somewhat varied, two recommendations made by the researchers predominate the body of research. First, further study of the manner in which principals, teachers and students with various personality styles function in school settings was recommended, and, second, to verify the possibility that high scores in certain areas of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator may be related to leadership effectiveness. (McGrattan, 1997; Campbell, 1991; & Lueder, 1983). Yet, none of these studies provides any evidence regarding the relationship between leadership effectiveness in any type of decentralized governance structure or under any mandated reform initiative.

This study has three central purposes. First, to measure the perceptions of the impact of decentralization on the role of the principal as a visionary, a manager, and a leader. Second, to determine the extent to which this impact is related to the type of whole school reform model that has been selected or implemented. Finally, to examine the relationship of the principal's prior demonstrable leadership traits with the perception of impact of decentralization on his/her role as principal.

Research Questions

1. How has working under mandated decentralized governance impacted on the principal's role as a visionary, a manager, and an instructional leader?
2. What is the extent to which the selection of one of the four whole school reform models affected the role of the principal?

3. How has the role of the principal under decentralized governance been affected by the principal's leadership traits as interpreted through the Keirsey interpretation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator?

Significance of the Study

Much of the previous research on school reform, particularly as it relates to decentralized governance structures, focused on the structure and role of school management teams in school restructuring efforts. The research is based on teacher perceptions of shared management, not from the perspective of the principal. The history of educational reform has been long and complex. Despite rigorous efforts at improving student achievement through systematic school restructuring efforts, significant and lasting results of sustained, incremental improvement of student achievement are not part of the current research. Although the literature has many studies and much information on the effective principal, the relationship or role of the principal to issues of state-mandated reform and required decentralized governance have not been examined to any great degree. The only two studies to address the current issues of mandated reform in the New Jersey were conducted by Rutgers University during the 1998-1999 school year, clearly addresses the school management or decentralized governance issue, and again in the 1999-2000 school year. Neither of the studies presents evidence or information on the role of the principal in these reform efforts.

The culmination of 27 years of debate on the issue of thorough and efficient
education in the State of New Jersey has resulted in the mandate of school reform. This wave of reform, different from previous efforts, is systematic and prescribed, with a central theme of decentralization of school authority. The legislation describes only that a school should have an effective principal. This lack of focus on the role of the principal in a decentralized governance structure under mandated school reform provided the impetus for this study.

By studying the role of the principal in these efforts and examining the leadership styles of principals, this study adds to the knowledge base in the field. Furthermore, it adds to the work of numerous researchers in the field, especially as it relates to the role that principals play in decentralized governance and mandated whole school reform implementation and trait theory. (Anderson & Forsyth, 1998; Blasé & Blasé, 1994; Blasé & Blasé, 1999; David, 1995; Doud & Keller, 1998; Evans, 1995; Everston, Murphy & Radnofsky, 1991; Fullan, 1997; Hampel, 1993; Hallinger, & Heck, 1998; Hatch, 1998; Herman, 1997; Hopfenberg & Levin, 1993; Kilgore, 1997; Lambert, 1998; Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1998; Osterman & Sullivan, 1996; Oswald, 1995; Palacios & Associates, 1999; Peterson & Warren, 1995, Selbymillsmith, 1999; Slavin, Dolan, Madden & Wasik, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1996d, 1996e; Wang, 1998; Yukl, 1998). Conducting this study within the State of New Jersey, and with the advent of mandated whole school reform, adds both a new geographical as well as conceptual perspective to the current available research. The secondary focus of the intended study was to examine styles of principal leadership in relation to both mandated whole school reform program implementation and required decentralized governance in schools. The historical perspective of the principal has been toward conservatism. (Fullan, 1997, p. 3).
“Principals as dynamic change agents seem to be still in the minority despite at least twenty years of effort.” (Fullan, 1997, p. 4). The advent of mandated school reform in New Jersey has identified the role of principal as a manager of change in its Abbott schools. Historically reforms or initiatives have started and then been replaced with others before sufficient time was provided to document results of any type. The issue of mandated reform participation with required decentralized governance of schools in New Jersey addresses this fragmentation of initiatives. The legislation requires a three-year initial commitment from each school to change through the implementation of approved reform programs. It provides for an additional three-year period for implementation that is intended to result in institutionalized change in schools in all 30 Abbott districts. It appears that the responsibility for implementing these changes is on the role of the principal. Yet the only direct reference to this role is found in the section of the current legislation entitled, “ Establishment of School Management Teams.” (N.J.A.C. 6.19A-1-4), where the principal is listed as a member of the team. No other information is provided that addresses the role of the principal in the reform effort. The current study design provided information from the perspective of the cohorts, from the principals, and from the traits of the principals in the study as they related to the whole school reform models selected for their respective schools. The study sample (N=8) was comprise of a random sample of principals from the first and second cohorts of Whole School Reform implementation under the Abbott Legislation (1998) in the State of New Jersey. Four models of Whole School Reform were selected: two prescriptive models of reform: Success for All and Modern Red Schoolhouse, and two governance models of reform: Accelerated Schools and Comer. Four principals in their first year of reform
implementation and four principals in their second year of implementation, two in each of
the four selected models, participated in this study. The principals were administered an
interview protocol that addressed the questions of the impact for principals working
under mandated decentralized governance and the impact of the selection of a whole
school reform model on their role as principal. In addition, the principals were
administered the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory to determine their leadership traits. This
information was used to analyze how the role of the principal under decentralized
governance had been affected by the principals' prior leadership traits. This information
was interpreted using David Keirsey's Temperaments in the World of Work.

This study was timely as the mandate of reform and decentralized governance is
new to principals in the State of New Jersey. This study is significant because it
examined the role of the principal in decentralized governance under mandated reform. It
investigated the impact that the principals' leadership traits brought to the success or
failure of their reform efforts, and added to the body of research in leadership and trait
theory.

Definition of Terms

_Cohort:_ Schools that were either 1<sup>st</sup> _Cohort_ Schools (Second Year of Whole
School Reform), or a 2<sup>nd</sup> _Cohort_ School (First Year of Whole School Reform).

_Myers-Briggs Type Indicator:_ The "Myers-Briggs Type Indicator" consists of 126
forced choice items that encourage individuals to describe themselves under four main
scale headings that correspond to Carl Jung's theory of types.

_Whole School Reform:_ Comprehensive school reform focuses on reorganizing
and revitalizing the entire school rather than on isolated, piecemeal reforms with full implementation of a design.

Limitations

The weaknesses demonstrated by the results of the studies reviewed supports the lack of data directly addressing the principal's role as instructional leader in mandated decentralization of authority. There is a wealth of literature supported by qualitative data on what constitutes an effective instructional leader. However, few studies address the role of the principal as it relates to mandated whole school reform under state-required decentralized governance, the focus of this study. In addition, there are few, if any, empirical studies conducted on leadership styles of school principals. Mandated reform and decentralized governance have been part of legislative requirements in New Jersey for only two years, an issue that has an impact on principals' perceptions of their roles in these endeavors. The small sample size of the intended study may not have provided answers to all issues presented. The conclusions obtained from the information provided by the participants in this small study may be tentative at best, but may provided the basis for continued study in the field. The study relied on interview material gathered from principals as they described themselves. This, at times, led to information that was, "how it should be" rather than "what is." The questions used in the interview process needed careful validation. An independent examiner for the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was used, and sufficient time was provided between the interview and the survey administration of the study to resolve these concerns.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

"In the late 1970's and throughout the 1980's, school critics issued a steady stream of reports claiming that the schools were in decline and recommending sweeping reform." (Stedman, 1993, p. 215). Most of these of reform efforts were curricular. Reformers created new subject areas including social studies, special education, and vocational education. Curriculum reforms had their least impact at the school level. "The history of school reform indicates that agendas pushed down from above telling schools what to do eventually get set aside unless the teachers understand and endorse the ideas." (Hampel, 1993, p.44).

The impetus for educational reform can be traced to several sources: concerns about the achievement of even the most advantaged American students relative to that of students from other countries; calls from the business community to better equip students for a changing job marker; questions about the quality of the teaching force; criticisms of an overly bureaucratic education system; and recent cognitive research on the actual process of learning. (Lessons from a National Study, 1995, p. 2)

Most efforts at school reform over the last quarter century have come from the courts of the United States. New Jersey was not alone in this endeavor. "Most of the school reform action since the early 1980's has taken place at the state level. " (Wolk, 1999, p. 6). State governments spent billions of dollars to have governors and legislatures enact laws and regulations for public schools. Local school districts spent
time adhering to mandates and policies rather than focusing on the reasons for the mandates and policies, the students. The Consortium on Renewing Education, completing a two-year study on reform, said:

If public education is to fulfill its most important goal, states and localities must reorganize their focus intensively and consistently on student performance. The litmus test for every education policy and every education program should be whether and to what degree it contributes to more-effective student learning and higher student achievement. . . What has been lacking is a coherent, coordinated strategy that addresses the entire system in all of its complexity. (Wolk, 1999, p. 6)

National Reform

The publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 was the impetus for serious educational reform in America’s public schools. The outcome of the first wave of educational reform was standardization of assessment, more strenuous graduation requirements, some merit pay programs as well as changing standards, accountability, governance, and curriculum. (Slavin, 1996, pp. 2-3). Research suggests that this did little to improve student learning and comprehension in sustained, incremental increases in student achievement. (Carvin, 1999, p. 1). Reform had to address the bureaucracy of the administrative structure of a school as well as curricular planning, assessment and teacher empowerment. This realization resulted in the development of programs of comprehensive (whole) school reform that focused on the school and classroom practice.

Successful examples of school-based reform share a core set of characteristics. They must have a clear focus on creating more challenging learning experiences for all
students, a school culture in which teachers work collaboratively, have a voice in
decisions that directly affect their ability to improve classroom practice, and opportunities
for teachers and administrators to gain knowledge and build their professional capacity.
(Quelmalz, Edys; & Others, 1995, Abstract). In addition, effective models have:

(1) research-based methods and strategies; (2) comprehensive
designs with aligned components; (3) professional development; (4) measurable
goals and benchmarks; (5) support within the school; (6) parental and community
involvement; (7) external technical support and assistance; (8) evaluation
strategies; and (9) coordination of resources. (Northwest Regional Educational

Schools participating in successful school-based reforms have three key features:
challenging learning experiences for all children, a school culture that nurture staff
collaboration and participation in decision-making, and meaningful opportunities for
professional growth. (National Study, 1995, p. 1). "Comprehensive reform focuses on
reorganizing and revitalizing entire schools, rather than on isolated, piecemeal reforms.
Schools engaged in comprehensive school have challenging academic standards, strong
teachers, and meaningful parent and community support." (Success for All/Roots and
Wings, 1998, p. 1). They have high expectations for student success, employ effective
classroom-management practices; offer frequent feedback to children, hire teachers who
use powerful strategies that tailor instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of each
student; provide a professional climate, and foster students' ability to take responsibility
for their learning and behavior. Strong leadership appears in virtually every list of
Effective reform leaders cultivate a broad definition of community and consider the contribution that every member can make to help children meet challenging standards. They are dependable and committed 'keepers of the dream', adopting essential values. The dream must be student centered and focused on ambitious academic goals and must be continuously evolving. Relevant information bases are developed. Effective leaders cultivate human resources to minimize failure while encouraging risk-taking, all carefully calculated. They know how the system works and they can take a lot of dissension. They put to good use an array of personal qualities. Effective reform leaders use self-assessment to demonstrate their accountability to their own values as well as to the appropriate expectations of their professional communities. (Kilgore, 1997).

New Jersey Reform

The history of educational reform in New Jersey focuses on the difficulties of providing a "Thorough and Efficient" education for all students. The state courts wrestled with this concept for almost 27 years. The outcome of the political maneuvering was comprehensive reform focused on schools and students with clearly defined academic standards targeting improved student achievement. The outcome of the debate was mandated school reform for 28 school districts in the state.

Funding of Public Education in the United States occurs through a combination of federal, state, and local revenues. Over the last three decades, reformers have sought and received federally guaranteed access to educational facilities and teaching resources for a variety of student groups. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, equity advocates attempted to sever the link between per-pupil property, wealth and per-pupil educational spending
through litigation. A number of cases were filed. Advocates representing children in property-poor districts argued that tying education spending to neighborhood property values violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution guaranteeing that no state shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the law. (Orland & Tan, 1995, p. 2).

The State of New Jersey has a 27-year history of litigation challenging the constitutionality of the system of financing its public schools. The first of these court decisions was Robinson, et. al. v. Cahill, et. al. (1973). Residents, taxpayers and various municipal officials brought action challenging the constitutionality of the system of finance of public education. The Superior Court of New Jersey declared the system of financing public schools to be unconstitutional. The decision was appealed, brought to the New Jersey Supreme Court on behalf of Kenneth Robinson, an infant, by his parent and guardian, Ernestine Robinson. The Court held that the New Jersey system of financing public education that relies heavily on local taxation to furnish approximately 67% of public school costs, which leads to great disparity in dollar input per pupil, and which has no apparent relation to mandate for equal educational opportunity is violational of the constitutional provision, which imposes upon the State the obligation to furnish thorough and efficient system of public schooling. Judgment modified, and as modified, affirmed. (Robinson, et al. v. Cahill, et al., 1973)

The case was re-heard and decided May 25, 1975, (Robinson v. Cahill, 1975), due to a failure to implement the 1973 decision. The Court granted a provisional remedy for relief from the unconstitutional system for financing New Jersey public schools, but only for the school year 1976-1977. Constitutional law dictates that where the constitutional
right of children to a thorough and efficient system of education has been violated, the court must afford an appropriate remedy to redress the violation of the right. (Robinson v. Cahill, 1975). In its decision, the Court wrote:

Where three years had passed since system of financing public schooling principally through local taxation had been declared unconstitutional but Legislature had failed to enact legislation granting relief from unconstitutional system, court would grant provisional remedy for school year 1976-77 whereby minimum support aid and save-harmless funds would not be distributed as provided under existing statutes but would be distributed in accordance with incentive equalization aid formula of 1970 act so as to realize goal of equality of educational opportunity. (N.J.S.A. 18A: 58-4, 5, subds, a, b, 6.3, 18.1).

The result of the 1975 decision was the Thorough and Efficient Education Funding Law in the State of New Jersey. Before the decision became effective, the State Legislature enacted the Public School Education Act of 1975, deemed constitutional, if fully funded, by the Court.

Abbott v. Burke was decided July 23, 1985. The premise of the case was that under the 1975 Act, and for more than 10 years, the State had not contributed more than 40% of all school operating costs, and that the majority of all public school expenditures were derived from local property taxes with no State contributors. They alleged that the absence of financial resources in districts with no property base deprived them from obtaining a thorough and efficient education and denied them equal protection under the law. The court, however, determined that the case did not merit a decision on constitutional grounds, but by an Administrative Law Judge under the auspices of the
Commissioner of Education. The case was returned to the Commissioner for judgment. The Administrative Law Judge heard the case, but the Commissioner declined to accept the recommendations and found that the statutory system was constitutional. (Abbott v. Burke, 1990). The students appealed the Commissioner's decision. The Supreme Court held that:

the Public School Education Act was unconstitutional as applied to poorer urban school district and had to be amended to assure funding of education in poorer districts a the level of property-rich districts, that funding could not be allowed to depend on the ability of local school districts to tax, but had to be guaranteed and mandated by the state, and that the level of funding had to also be adequate to provide for the special educational needs of the poor urban districts in order to redress heir extreme disadvantages. (Abbott v. Burke, 1985, p. 284)


The Court describes program disparities between affluent suburban and poor urban districts and requires that such disparities are eliminated. Under the QEA, additional funding shall be used to reduce class size, to expand curriculum, to expand support services, to enhance inservice training, and for other purposes which the Commissioner may approve. (Education Law Center, 1990, p. 6). The Supreme Court required parity in its 1990 decision, and the QEA did not
provide a method to achieve it. The QEA did not provide for the real costs of funding at-risk students although the Court mandated adequate funding for this purpose in its decision. The QEA provided a new monitoring bill as well as ethics legislation for administrators and school board members. (Education Law Center, 1990, p. 17). 1994 marked the State Supreme Court's decision on Abbott by Abbott v. Burke. The decision upheld the tenets of the 1990 Abbott decision while abrogating the Quality Education Act implemented by the Legislature. The Court reaffirmed the responsibility of the State Education Department to provide adequate funding for the 30 at-risk districts.

The Comprehensive Plan for Educational Improvement and Financing became law on December 20, 1996. The New Jersey State Department of Education developed a comprehensive educational reform strategy known as CEIFA: Comprehensive Educational Improvement Act based on this comprehensive funding plan. It established the budget process for the thirty at-risk districts for the 1997-98 school year to provide parity in funding. It included the parity funding formulas and the areas of eligibility for additional funding based on poverty statistics. This was the first time that the State of New Jersey proposed an equitable educational funding system based on the expected attainment of high academic standards for every child in the state while providing a 'though and efficient' education. (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1996a, p. 1). The initiative focused on six overarching areas: curriculum standards, fiscal responsibility, state aid, local flexibility, assessment, and accountability. A Comprehensive Implementation Plan was submitted to the Department of Education for the first year of the program that described how the additional funding supported activities in the six areas.
Abbott v. Burke was brought again to the New Jersey Supreme Court in April 1996. The motion filed contended that there was less than a reasonable likelihood that the State would address the continued disparity in per-pupil expenditures between poor and wealthy suburban districts. (Rutgers School of Law, Docket No. M-622-96). The motion was renewed on January 6, 1997 contending that CEIFA failed to remedy the constitutional deprivations existing in special needs districts. The Supreme Court upheld the petition, ordered, as interim relief, that the Commissioner of Education assure that all funding be spent effectively, efficiently and to further the achievement of the core curriculum content standards. (Rutgers School of Law, Docket No. M-622-96).

The case was remanded to Superior Court in 1997. The Court ordered the Commissioner of Education to develop a plan that addressed all the requirements of Abbott v. Burke, 1997. The Commissioner and the Abbott plaintiffs submitted reports and recommendations to Superior Court Judge Michael Patrick King. Judge King referred the matter to the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner requested the assistance of Dr. Alan Odden of New America Schools. Dr. Odden's report was reviewed by Judge King, who subsequently issued his report on January 22, 1998. On May 21, 1998, the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey addressed the recommended reforms and other proposed remedial measures in Abbott v. Burke 1998. This became known as Abbott V, the predominant reform legislation in place for Abbott schools at the current time.

HELD: The Commissioner of Education shall: 1) implement whole-school reform and full-day kindergarten and half-day pre-school programs for three- and four-year-olds as expeditiously as possible; 2) implement technology programs
on the request of a school or district, or as he shall otherwise direct; 4) authorize accountability programs, as may be deemed necessary and appropriate, and to coordinate them with whole-school reform; 5) implement alternative schools or comparable educational programs; 6) implement school-to-work and college-transition programs in secondary Abbott schools at the request of individual schools or districts or as the Commissioner shall otherwise direct; 7) prescribe procedures and standards to enable individual schools to adopt additional or extended supplemental programs and to seek and obtain the funds necessary to implement these programs, but only when the school has demonstrated a particularized need; 8) secure funds to cover the complete cost of remediating identified life cycle and infrastructure deficiencies in Abbott school buildings, including making available necessary temporary facilities; and 9) initiate promptly effective managerial responsibility over school construction, including necessary funding measures and fiscal reforms as may be achieved through amendments to the Educational Facilities Act. (Raymond Abbott, et al. v. Fred G. Burke, 1997)

The Court directed the Commissioner of Education to develop regulations to guide the Department of Education's plan for reforming various aspects of education for the students in the twenty-eight Abbott School Districts. (Klagholz, 1998, p. 1). The regulations included implementation of an approved Whole School Reform program in each elementary school and an approved Whole School Reform program or required supplemental program/s in each middle and secondary school. (Klagholz, 1998, p. 2). Abbott v. Burke (M-1336-98) was argued October 13, 1999 and decided May 7, 2000.
"The court made certain assumptions concerning the proposals that were before it in respect of school reform."

HELD: Any discrepancies in the implementation of the Court’s judgement in Abbott V are the result of misunderstandings in executing the Court’s mandate and not demonstrations of bad faith on the part of the Commissioner of Education. The requirement to establish quality preschool programs for three- and four-year-old children is not met by the use of community care providers staffed by uncertified teachers and governed by daycare standards. The State’s regulations need to be improved and clarified in respect of the substantive standards for preschool education and the certification of preschool teachers. As represented in Abbott V, the teacher-student ratio for preschools must be one teacher for every fifteen students. The Department of Education must give the districts more guidance and act more quickly on supplemental funding requests. (Portiz, 2000, p. 1).

The Abbott regulations are vast and encompassing. The focus of the decision is with the individual school, its staff, students, principal and greater school community. The reform is mandated, but only for the most economically disadvantaged districts in the state, now known as Abbott districts. Other districts in New Jersey are required to demonstrate high student achievement with the core curriculum content standards as their mandate. They are not required to implement a model of reform. Abbott schools must, and within three years of the legislation, implement an approved model of school reform. The reforms, ranging from mandated whole school reform model implementation to accountability plans aligned from the district level to the school level, force a
commitment from educators for high student achievement. The New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards are the instructional guides for all New Jersey students. The most important outcome of Abbott v. Burke 1998 is the specificity of the decision in the focus on the students and provisions for equitable opportunity for their academic achievement.

Models of Reform Permitted by New Jersey Law

The New Jersey Department of Education approved five nationally known models of school-based reform for Abbott elementary schools: Success for All/Roots and Wings, Modern Red Schoolhouse, Corner, Community for Learning (ALEM), and Accelerated Schools, as well as a Kindergarten through Grade Twelve Model, Co-NEXT, and a Grade Six through Twelve model, the Coalition of Essential Schools. (New Jersey Department of Education, Website). The decision to approve these models was based on the record of research available for the models that supported the developers' claims that implementation of their models would result in higher student achievement, fulfill the nine-step criteria requirement, and be replicable. The list included several models for secondary schools, but none was viable due to lack of available, long-term research validating their claims. Supplemental program plans that targeted higher student achievement were required of secondary schools. Individual schools in Abbott districts have three years to implement a model of reform but must agree to maintain the implementation for at least three years beyond the first three to assure accurate replication of the model as intended. The legislation was specific in the matter of Whole School Reform implementation:
Each elementary school shall adopt a whole school reform (WSR) model by the 2000-2001 school year. The presumptive model shall Success for All/Roots and Wings-Roots and Wings (SFA/R&W); however, permission to use other models may be granted by the Department where the choice of such model is justified. If any school shall fail to select a model by the commencement of the 2000-2001 school year, the Commissioner shall direct the school to implement a Department-approved WSR model. (Abbott v. Burke, 1998).

The intent of whole school reform is to redesign a failing school through the implementation of a research-based program with a successful outcome record of increased student achievement. The programs focus on changes in student achievement and work within the structure of existing schools. "By designing an educational reform framework around the factors that work to promote resilience, individual students, whole schools, and entire communities can thrive." (Wang, 1998, p.52). The programs are of two types. Curriculum-based reform demonstrates predictable and immediate impact on student learning. They depend on individual teachers' skills and proficient management. These include Success for All/Roots and Wings, Community for Learning, and to a somewhat lesser degree, Modern Red Schoolhouse and Co-NECT. Comer, Accelerated Schools and the Coalition of Essential Schools are examples of governance-based reforms. These reform models are long-range, with constantly changing goals that rely on sustained leadership and strong teacher commitment.

School reform in New Jersey mandates that the Whole School Reform Models adopted by Abbott schools have nine required elements. (Abbott v. Burke, 6-19A-3.el). The first element is improved student performance. (Abbott v. Burke, 6-19A-3.1el1).
The State of New Jersey developed and implemented a comprehensive set of Core Curriculum Content Standards in May 1996. They address seven major academic content areas as well as five cross-content workplace standards. "Core curriculum content standards are an attempt to define the meaning of 'Thorough' in the context of the 1875 State constitutional guarantee that students would be educated within a Thorough and Efficient system of free public schools. They describe what all students should know and be able to do upon completion of a thirteen-year public education." (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1966b, p. i). In addition, the state developed standard assessments at three benchmark grades, four, eight and eleven.

The second element requires each school to implement a research-based program of curriculum and instruction supported by and integrated with an appropriate array of research-proven supplemental strategies. (Abbott v. Burke, 6-19A-3.1e 2). Curriculum frameworks were developed by the New Jersey State Department of Education supporting the seven academic strands of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. These frameworks work with the curriculums of the schools and provide a wealth of research-proven instructional strategies. The frameworks contain information targeted at specific grade levels. They provide the necessary link between the standards and instruction in individual classrooms. (New Jersey Department of Education, 1996, p. i)

The third is school-based leadership and decision-making. Individual Abbott schools must have a school management team led by a strong, effective principal, who is mandated to involve parents and teaching staff members in setting annual student achievement targets. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-3.1(e) 3)). The core of site-based management is participatory decision-making focused on improved student achievement.
New Jersey requires Abbott districts to develop written guidelines for the establishment and training of school management teams. The legislation defines the powers vested in school management teams:

- Oversee faculty selection of the WSR model chosen by the school; develop curriculum and instruction designed to ensure achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards; design a program of professional staff development to assist implementation of all aspects of WSR; prepare a school-based budget; make recommendations for the appointment, transfer or removal of teaching staff members and instructional aides; make recommendations for the appointment of a building principal; develop a school-level technology plan; provide for programs to address the Cross-Content Workplace Readiness standards; develop a plan for accountability. (*Abbott v. Burke*, 6:19A-1.4 (3) c 1-9).

"School staff and members of the community must be committed to working together in a comprehensive, concerted effort to ensure that each child achieves immediate success and maintains his or her self-confidence and enthusiasm for learning". (*Abbott v. Burke*, 6:19A-(e) 3). The principal is a participatory member of the school management team, assuring that the school makes an informed choice as to its whole school reform model.

The school must take a comprehensive approach to the implementation of the Whole School Reform model chosen. (*Abbott v. Burke*, 6:19A-(e) 4). Research shows that the results that come from comprehensive reform come from full implementation of a design. "Schools must latch on to a model wholeheartedly, then have time and support to make it work." (*Anderson*, 1998, p.52). Comprehensive school reform focuses on
reorganizing and revitalizing the entire school rather than on isolated, piecemeal reforms. (Anderson, 1998). The school must have an effective and compatible program of curriculum and instruction, supported systematically by a well-planned school budget. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A- (e) 4).

All school efforts must target student achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. Reform models address all core academic subject areas, instruction, and school organization. (Anderson, 1998). New Jersey required all approved models of reform to have fully-aligned instructional programs or strategies to the Core Curriculum Content Standards. These standards are the benchmarks targeting student academic success at grades four (the Elementary School Proficiency Assessment), grade eight (the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment), and grade eleven (the High School Proficiency Assessment). Students in New Jersey are unable to receive a diploma at the end of grade twelve without attaining a Level 1 score on the HSPA. "The core curriculum content standards describe what students should know and be able to do in specific academic areas and across disciplines. Content standards are concerned with the knowledge students should acquire and the skills they should develop in the course of their K-12 experience." (New Jersey Department of Education, 1996b, p. ii).

Educational technology focused on the Core Content Standards must be an integral part of the curriculum and instruction in a school. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-(e) 5). Both the district and individual schools are required to have technology plans reflecting appropriate instruction focused on the acquisition of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content standards. It includes the acquisition and maintenance of necessary equipment and infrastructure, professional development activities, and appropriate staff.
The staff of a school must participate in an organized, continuous program of staff training. The training is focused on the faithful replication and implementation of the Whole School Reform model chosen and on the skills necessary to improve student in achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-(e) 6).

An effective Whole School Reform model provides high-quality professional development for teachers and administrators connected to the central focus of the school and tied directly to improving student achievement. (Anderson, 1998).

A Safe School Environment that supports learning is mandated. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-(e) 7). Each elementary school must have a Family Support Team that encourages parent involvement in the school. Each middle and secondary school must provide health and social services to students and parents. Finally, each school must establish an accountability system based on a district accountability plan that includes both sanctions and rewards. (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-3.1(e) 8-9).

Dr. Leo Klagholz, the Commissioner of Education for the State of New Jersey during the initial period of Abbott legislation implementation, chose Success for All/Roots and Wings/ as the presumptive model of reform for all Abbott elementary schools. This has been reiterated by the current Commissioner, David Hespe, who has developed a more comprehensive version of the Abbott legislation that took effect July 1, 1999. As previously stated, other approved models of reform may be considered through the application approval process, an alternative to the requirement to choose a Whole School Reform model from the approved state list. The process for approval of an alternative program is rigorous and lengthy with additional requirements beyond those for the implementation of a program on the state-approved list. The state-approved
programs are required to meet the nine rigorous elements required in the legislation. The implementation of all approved models must to lead to improved student achievement based on demonstrated competence on the Core Content Standards at the required benchmark grades of four, eight and eleven. All seven approved models document a research-based program of curriculum and instruction, the first of the nine required tenets of Whole School Reform under the New Jersey legislative mandate.

A comprehensive school reform program) has a design for effective school functioning, including instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement, and school management, that aligns the school's curriculum, technology, and professional development into a school-wide reform plan designed to enable all students—including children from low-income families, children with limited English proficiency, and children with disabilities— to meet challenging State content and performance standards and addresses needs identified through a school needs assessment. (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1998, p.1)

Under the legislation, schools must have a planning structure and decision-making structure; a committee composed of a fair representation of all stakeholders at the school, and a commitment to work toward improved student achievement. Each of the approved models, with the exception of Co-NECT, has advisory councils, site-based teams, cadres, or task forces that fulfill this requirement. However, specific language in the current version of the Abbott legislation includes this requirement as part of the law rather than as just a tenet of reform:

The school shall maintain its own planning and decision-making structure,
including establishment of an SMT pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6:19A-2 et seg, and shall be led by a strong, effective principal. The principal shall involve parents and teaching staff members in setting annual student achievement targets. School staff and teaching staff members of the community shall be committed to working together in a comprehensive, concerted effort to ensure that each child achieves immediate success and maintains his or her self-confidence and enthusiasm for learning. (N.J.A.C. 6:19A-4.1 (d) 3).

The implementation of reform in Abbott schools must be comprehensive. Success for All/Roots and Wings, Comer, Modern Red Schoolhouse and Co-NECT require an 80% initial commitment for implementation from stakeholders in a school to proceed. Accelerated Schools and Coalition of Essential Schools require a 90% commitment to participate. These are conducted through a secret ballot process. The Community for Learning Program has no such requirement, but implemented an 80% level to demonstrate compliance to state mandates in this area. The staff "buy-in" is a critical factor affecting a school's ability to replicate the program accurately and experience improved student achievement.

The reform model chosen by an Abbott school must have educational technology as an integral part of curriculum and instruction provided by the model. Co-NECT is a technology-based program, through a program of on-site and online professional development and is the only technology-based model. Roots and Wings makes use of available technology resources including publishing, analyses, projections, displays and simulations. Modern Red Schoolhouse has a technology component: Phase I includes acquiring word processing support for all teachers and developing a school technology plan. Phase 2 uses computers for individual educational capstones and curriculum
analysis. Phase 3 implements technology for student reports. (Kilgore, 1997, p. 52). No other state-approved whole school reform models have viable integrated technology components as part of their reform initiatives. Abbott districts are required to have technology plans both at the district level and in individual schools as part of the required legislative paradigm.

Professional development for Success for All/Roots and Wings requires three days for all teachers before the program begins. Consultants return to the school for three two-day visits during the school year to work with principal, facilitators, and teachers to build a strong implementation model. Facilitators from Success for All/Roots and Wings are available for telephone consultation during the year. Building facilitators follow up on initial training with classroom visits, coaching, and team meetings. (Slavin, Dolan, Madden, & Wasik, 1996, pp. 7-8).

The training model developed by Success for All/Roots and Wings supports the need for the engagement of all school staff in training that supports the full implementation of the reform model. Co-NECT is a professional-development based Whole School Reform model, as is Modern Red Schoolhouse. They each use staff training to result in institutionalized changes resulting in improved student achievement over time. “The data-based staff development program of Community for Learning provides ongoing professional development and technical assistance tailored to specific implementation needs.” (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1998, p.3). The coaching team of each Accelerated Schools participates in on-going, monthly, professional development. The program is designed to ‘teach’ the components of the process in small steps, so that the team can return to the school and “turnkey” train other
staff member. The **Comer model** has a national training program for the Parent Team, the School Planning and Management Team, and Student and Staff Support Teams. In addition, workshops are designed and developed for teachers and parents and are held as needed. (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1998, p. 4).

The **Coalition of Essential Schools** has a process that includes exploring, committing, and developing a plan of action. When the criteria have been documented, a school may apply for membership to the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES). CES staff facilitate the process, but places the responsibility for its implementation on the school. The school works with other CES schools to determine how it is progressing, and to develop changes as necessary. No formal professional development component is available for this model.

"The school climate must be safe and conducive to learning." (Abbott v. Burke, 6:19A-(e) 7). Each Abbott district developed a comprehensive security plan that addressed all areas of school security. Schools developed Safe School Management Plans with the support of the district security offices. District security plans included strategies for the maintenance of safe and secure schools.

The legislation requires a Family Support Team. (Urban Education Reform in Abbott Districts, 19A-4.1(d) 8, 1999, p.13). **Success for All/Roots and Wings** requires a Family Support Team. "A family support team works in each school, serving to make families feel respected and welcome in the school." (Slavin et al, 1996a, p. 47). The Family Support Team identifies community resources to assist students with poor attendance or health problems. The Team encourages and trains parents as volunteers in the school as well as tutors for students having reading difficulties. **Comer** has both a
Parent Team and the Student and Staff Support Team, which includes a Mental Health Team, that work together to create and develop a comprehensive school plan while meeting the needs on all levels of all constituents. The Accelerated Schools Model does not have a specific family support team as part of its design. However, specific schools, through a comprehensive needs-assessment process, determine the necessity of this type of 'cadre.' "Community for Learning (ALEM) has a family-community involvement component designed to mobilize and utilize the resources and expertise of families and the community to achieve student learning success." (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1999, p.2). The design of Co-NECT's small learning communities is to strengthen relationships among students, teachers and families. Modern Red Schoolhouse has no formalized family support team element in its design.

Each Abbott district school must establish a reward system, consistent with each district's an accountability plan. The plans focused on the achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards as goals for the program. They provide rewards to teachers, parents, and administrators who contribute to students attaining competence on the Core Content Standards of the state. None of the approved models has specific reward plans, although all have implementation issues that are paramount to their goal of improving student achievement.

"Efforts that lead to the implementation of innovative school programs to significantly improve instruction and learning require major rethinking and restructuring." (Laboratory for Student Success, Handbook, 1996, p. 2). Thirty school districts in New Jersey must implement school reform following the specific guidelines of the 1998 Abbott decision, and its 1999 revised version. The impact of this mandate is
intended to result in changes in the operating structure of schools: the ways teachers deliver instruction to students, the perceptions of parents and community about the effectiveness of the schools in their districts, in short, in all facets of daily school life.

The Role of the Principal in Approved Whole School Reform Models

Modern Red Schoolhouse has a school-based training program that includes a module for leadership development for principals. “An annual administrator’s conference provides administrators new to the design with opportunities to acquaint themselves with their role and responsibilities, the stages of planning and implementation, and with organizational issues associated with implementing the design.” (Kilgore, 1997, p. 48). Its Implementation Model Development module includes principal coaching that is an on-going process in which a consultant works with a principal to create a personal improvement plan and to provide coaching in the articulated areas of that plan. The principal of an Accelerated School participates on the cadres, on the steering committee, and in school-as-a-whole meetings, raises other questions and concerns that affect the entire school, and acts on the decisions and recommendations of these bodies and puts them into practice. (Hopfenberg Levin, & Associates, 1993, p. 268). The only area in which Success for All/Roots and Wings makes a direct reference to the role of the principal is in its description of the Advisory Committee:

An advisory committee composed of the building principal, program facilitator, teacher representatives, parent representatives, and family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program and to identify and solve any problems that arise. In most schools, existing site-based management teams are adapted to fulfill this function.
In addition, grade level teams and the Family Support Team meet regularly to discuss common problems and solutions and to make decisions in their areas of responsibility. (Slavin & Madden, 1999a, p. 8).

The School Development Program (Comer) has a Principals’ Academy as part of its implementation processes in years one and two. “Studies of the implementation process (of Comer) reveal that the principal’s attitude and leadership….greatly affect implementation.” (Reform Handbook, The School Development Program, 1999, p. 5). Co-NECT has no specific program targeted at effective principal leadership, although the presence of the principal as part of the implementation design is described. The Community of Learners (ALEM) describes a school-wide organizational structure that supports a school team involving coordination and collaboration and shared responsibility for student learning with no specific references to principal leadership, as is the case with the Coalition of Essential Schools program.

The Role of the Principal in School-Based Management

Kent D. Peterson and Vowel D. Warren’s 1995 study entitled, “Principals’ Skills and Knowledge for Shared Decision-Making,” described work they conducted with 24 schools that employ school based management. Three essential skills for principals emerged. “First, principals must be able to help their schools develop a clear, shared, educational vision….Second, principals must develop effective structures and processes to support shared decision-making….Third, principals must build strong and cohesive teams.” (Peterson & Warren, 1995). An important limitation was described, that of, “the availability of sufficient time for administrators and teachers to engage in

“Current efforts in the United States to restructure schools involve new types of governance and teacher empowerment. Rather than hold power over teachers, educational leaders are being asked to share power with them.” (Blasé & Blasé, 1994, p. 2). This is consistent with the Abbott legislative requirement of school management teams with effective principals as educational practitioners focused on improving school achievement. Most of the available research on principal effectiveness relates the issue to student achievement. The Blasé and Blasé study described several actions by principals that have been shown to enhance teachers’ perceptions of empowerment:

1. Modeling, building, and persistently supporting an environment of trust among teachers, whom they consider professionals and experts.

2. Systematically structuring the school to encourage authentic collaboration by establishing readiness and common goals and by responding to the unique characteristics of the school. Supporting shared governance efforts by providing professional development and basic resources.

3. Supporting teacher experimentation and innovation, granting professional autonomy, and viewing failure as an opportunity to learn.

4. Modeling professional behavior, especially by exhibiting caring, optimism, honesty, friendliness, and enthusiasm.

5. Encouraging risk taking and minimizing threat (or constraints on teacher freedom and growth).

6. Praising teachers and using other symbolic rewards (e.g., valuing and respecting teachers).
7. Setting the stage for discussing and solving the metaproblems of a school through effective communication, openness and trust, use of action research, group participation in decision-making, and the use of effective procedural methods for solving problems. (Blasé & Blasé, 1994, p. 127).

"Principals as main conduits to the outside are a dead model. The reason that the role of the principal has taken on such inflated importance is related to the limited leadership of the everyday teacher." (Fullan, 1993, p. 81). One of the new tasks of the principal is to broaden the leadership capacity of the school. Fullan continues, "Teacher leadership - mentors, peer coaches, staff developers at the school level, curricular resource teachers, divisional and department heads, site-based planning members--thus extends leadership beyond the principal." (Fullan, 1993, p. 127).

A study conducted as part of the doctoral dissertation of Linda A. Howell in 1999 explored the power relationships between a principal and teachers as they implemented school change. (Howell, 1998, abstract). Three schools from three different districts were studied, using the Cambridge strategic planning model. Data was collected from a principal and two teachers from each of the three schools over a period of one and one half years. The results suggest that, "a principal's understanding and use of power is a significant element of the implementation stage. The ways in which principals enact their belief in teacher empowerment does impact the outcome of implementation efforts. The sense making of the participants was also shaped by the culture of the school." (Howell, 1998, abstract).

Principals, says the research, have the obligation to help improve and escalate the Learning opportunities for all teachers in their schools. (Fullan, 1993, p. 98).
research examines the role of the principal from many perspectives: from the viewpoints of teachers, from self-survey vantage points, in a variety of school settings. Each provides recommendations for principals to assist their efforts in leading rather than managing schools. Issues of collaboration, authentic leadership, vision setting, and shared decision-making are reported in the reviewed research. The results appear to support the Abbott legislative mandates regarding required schools to have school management teams with effective principals as their leaders. In 1991, Kushner and Kruse conducted a study of the evaluation of the process and product of site-based management using a school and university collaboration design. Fourteen building leadership teams from three high schools, three middle schools, and eight elementary schools participated in the action-research training. Among their findings was information on the role of the principal in the team-building process.

Principals appeared unable themselves to move the groups to detailed action plans. They sited on-going problems with the "uneven" ability of varied group members. Furthermore, they noted that while it is often the younger faculty that is eager to participate in such teams, they also "lack the skills" necessary to create thoughtful research projects . . . Also, the principals themselves reported a reluctance to ask teachers to do much "extra work" including outside reading that would help to educate teachers on the problems they sought to address. (Kushner & Kruse, 1991, p.9).

Three themes relevant to the role of the principal in a decentralized governance model emerged from the study. Considerable time is required in the process of what the study called "intellectual leadership." Trust and respect are endemic to the ability of a staff to
engage in meaningful discussions about school change or improvement. Finally, the study concluded that, "time must be allotted for teachers and administrators to be freed from those immediate concerns to attend to issues of improvement and change." (Kusher & Krause, 1991, p. 10).

"At the building level, the principal is usually the key figure in fostering shared governance within the school. Principals not only have increased responsibility and authority in school program, curriculum, and personnel decisions, but also increased accountability for student and program success. Principals must be excellent team leaders and delegators." (Oswald, 1995, p. 5). Etheridge and her colleagues (1990) surveyed several site councils in Tennessee. "...the ideal principal had a democratic style in relating to other council members, and a well defined view of what needed to be done to improve the school." (Peterson-Del Mar, 1994, p. 3).

The change in the role of the principal in schools engaged in systematic restructuring was investigated by Kent Peterson and Valli Warren in 1993 in a report entitled, "Changes in School Governance and Principals' Roles: Changing Jurisdiction, New Power Dynamics and Conflict in Restructured Schools." (Peterson & Valli, 1993, ERIC abstract). The study, involving six schools with decentralized decision-making structures. The data was collected through observation, surveys of teachers and students, interviews with teachers and administrators, and document analysis. The researchers found that principals, in their new roles, face uncertainty and spend a greater amount of time in formal and informal meetings addressing a number of critical issues. "Although changes in school governance have often increased teachers' sense of empowerment, it has substantially change the principal's role, transforming it into a complex role centered
within the micro-political environment of the school." (Peterson & Valli, 1993, ERIC abstract). Current research on the role of the principal in decentralized governance schools emphasizes the importance of good communication about the process of change and the clear understanding of school culture. Three important challenges face principals as they implement shared decision-making: having a clear, shared educational vision, developing an effective shared-governance process, and establishing well functioning school management teams.

"Decentralization has far-reaching implications for the leadership and management capacities of principals. In decentralized districts, schools become mini-school districts. In order to be successful, principals need to be strong instructional leaders, astute community organizers, sharp managers, skillful facilitators, and visionary shapers of positive school cultures. (Stinnette, 1992, p.6).

Principal Leadership Styles

"Research in business and education demonstrates that leadership is essential to substantive and enduring progress. Yet the literature reveals a lack of strategic leadership that focuses on improving instruction...Principals rarely apply systematic approaches to solving school problems." (Schmoker, 1999, p. 72). The models of reform that are requirements for New Jersey’s Abbott districts reflect a focus on shared decision-making. The issue of principal leadership as a component to the success or potential failure reform implementation and institutionalization is reflected in the majority of the approved models for reform as shared management.
A study in 1996 conducted by Charles S. Hausman and Ellen B. Goldring examined the differences in teacher ratings of effective principal leadership in magnet and non-magnet schools in Cincinnati, Ohio's system of school choice. It included the influence of school demographics, student achievement, teacher professionalism and workplace conditions. The sample included ten magnet schools and ten non-magnet schools, with a 66% response rate on 628 surveys conducted. The results showed non-magnet principals rated higher than magnet principals did. The strongest predictors of effective principal leadership were the indicators of teacher professionalism, with no correlation between teacher ratings of effective principal leadership and student outcomes. (Hausman & Goldring, 1996, ERIC).

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium adopted standards for school leaders on November 2, 1996.

Formal leadership in schools and school districts is a complex, multi-faceted task.... Effective school leaders are strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement. They are moral agents and social advocates for the children and the communities they serve. Finally, they make strong connections with other people, valuing and caring for others as individuals and as members of the educational community. (Standards for School Leaders, 1996, p. 2).

The standards adopted reflect the issues raised in all of the examined research in the area of principal leadership and school reform. Each standard is accompanied by clarification under the labels of knowledge, disposition, and performances. (Standards, 1996, pp. 1-8).
1. Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

2. Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning at staff professional growth.

3. Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 1996, pp. 1-8).

Research conducted on the principal’s contribution to school effectiveness found that, "principals exercise a measurable, though indirect effect on school
effectiveness and student achievement ... although relatively small, it is statistically significant and meaningful." (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 186). The 1990's are replete with issues that support the assertions of many researchers relative to the importance of adaptive leadership skills for principals: globalization, increasing stress on the environment, increasing speed and dissemination of information technology, and scientific and social change. These issues translate into critical implications for leadership.

Karen Osterman and Susan Sullivan conducted a study that began with the assumption that, “principals with different leadership paradigms might function very differently in the urban bureaucracy.” (Osterman & Sullivan, 1996, p. 663). Twelve principals with a range of experience, ethnicity, and grade-level assignments were given a questionnaire with an open-ended response design focused on their visions and leadership beliefs. They report that the findings, “support those from previous studies, particularly regarding the manifestation and development of a sense of efficacy, or the belief that one has the power and capability to produce positive change.” (Osterman & Sullivan, 1996, p. 683).

“Strong leadership, particularly from the principal, is essential if change is to occur at the school level.” (Osterman & Sullivan, 1996, p. 661). This statement is found in most research regarding the role of the principal and student achievement. “Principals who were trained to be managers are now expected to be leaders in the context of school reform and district decentralization.” (Neufeld, 1997, p. 490). Neufeld conducted twenty-three open-ended interviews with principals in a study conducted in 1997 focusing on what principals needed to know as they participated in middle school reform.
The results support the importance of creating and sustaining visions for schools. There was no evidence of any process for effecting the kinds of changes required. This resulted in responses from the principals requesting such assistance as part of the study's conclusions. (Neufeld, 1997, pp. 490-509).

The emerging new roles of principals were defined by research conducted with support of the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement in October 1996 by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. An in-depth study was conducted of 25 elementary and middle schools in 11 school districts in the United States, Canada and Australia. (School Based Management, October 1996, p. 1). Their focus was in four areas: power, knowledge and skills training, information, and rewards. This study found evidence of new roles for principals:

1. Designer/Champion of Involvement Structures: Principals helped to develop decision-making teams that involved various stakeholders to provide them with opportunities for conversations around school-specific issues. Principals invested the teams with real authority by carving our discrete areas of justification.

2. Motivator/Coach to Create a Supportive Environment. Principals worked to communicate trust, encourage risk-taking, communicate information and facilitate participation in SBM.

3. Facilitator/Manager of Change: Principals encouraged staff development as an ongoing, school-wide activity. Principals provided tangible resources (money, equipment and materials) and intangible resources (time, opportunities) to staff to assist in the school improvement process.

4. Liaison to the Outside World: Principals brought into the school new ideas
and research for thinking about teaching and learning. Principals solicited
donations of funds and materials, and encouraged grant writing among staff to
boost school resources. Principals also ran interference for teachers by filtering
out unnecessary distractions that freed up teachers to focus on teaching and
learning. (School-Based Management, October 1996, pp. 1-5).

The Myers-Briggs as an Indicator of Leadership Styles

"Considerable progress has been made in identifying traits and skills relevant for
managerial effectiveness and advancement.....The most useful studies attempt to explain
why a person is effective in a particular managerial position, or, why the person is
promoted to a higher position." (Yukl, 1998, pp. 237, 257). McClelland and his
237). The results of this assessment technique support the position that, "the optimal
pattern of needs for managerial effectiveness in large organizations includes a strong
socialized power orientation, a moderately high need for achievement, and a relatively

Research over the last thirty years has identified eight traits useful in predicting
leadership effectiveness: (1) high energy level and stress tolerance; (2) self-confidence;
(3) internal locus of control orientation; (4) emotional maturity; (5) personal integrity;
(6) socialized power motivation; (7) moderately high achievement orientation; and (8)
low need for affiliation. The first of these, high energy level and stress tolerance has
been found to have a strong association with managerial effectiveness. (Yukl, 1998, p.
244). Kouzes and Posner found that, "leaders who have high expectations for themselves
are likely to have high expectations for their subordinates.” (Yukl, 1998, p. 244). An important trait is internal locus of control, in which individuals believe their own actions determine what they do rather than forces outside of themselves. Individuals demonstrating this trait are more future-oriented. They tend to plan in a proactive manner in terms of accomplishing objectives.

The trait of emotional maturity denotes individuals who have a more accurate awareness of their strengths and weaknesses. They tend to be less self-centered, less impulsive, and not prone to mood swings. (Yukl, 1998, p. 246). "Integrity means that a person's behavior is consistent with espoused values, and the person is honest, ethical, and trustworthy. Integrity is a primary determinant of whether people will perceive a leader to be trustworthy." (Yukl, 1998, p. 247). Power motivation is reflected in the authority for making decisions from two perspectives, personalized power and socialized power. The former uses rewards and punishments as a way to control subordinates, while the latter use influence to build up the organization. "Achievement orientation includes a set of related attitudes, values and needs: need for achievement, desire to excel, drive to succeed, willingness to assume responsibility, and concern for task objectives. (Yukl, 1998, p. 249). Managers with a strong need for affiliation as documented by Litwin and Stringer in 1966 and McClelland in 1975, are concerned about relationships rather than the task required, and will not allow the work to interfere with positive relationships. Therefore, the need for affiliation should be moderately low rather than high or low. (Yukl, 1998, p. 251).

"The trait approach has important implications for improving managerial effectiveness." (Yukl, 1998, p. 260). The research findings relating to managerial skills
and effectiveness focus in three areas: (1) technical skills, including knowledge about methods, processes, and procedures, (2) interpersonal skills, and (3) conceptual skills that include analytical ability, logical thinking, concept formation, inductive and deductive reasoning. Isolation of individual traits, however, does not provide the researcher with information that can be useful in studying leadership styles. The concept of psychological type, developed by the Swiss psychiatrist Carl G. Jung (1875-1961) has as its basic premise that human behavior is not random, but follows identifiable patterns that develop from the structure of the human mind. No psychological type information exists in isolation. Rather, combinations of perceptions, judgements, and attitudes comprise his theory. Two different ways identify how people perceive, or take in information, and judge, how individuals organize and prioritize information to arrive at decisions. Jung identified two opposite attitudes and orientations that individuals have toward the world: extraversion and introversion. Individuals develop psychological types as their energies are directed toward one of each of the pairs of opposites: Sensing or Intuition, Thinking or Feeling, Extraversion or Introversion.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was developed to make the theory of psychological types described by Carl G. Jung understandable and useful in people's lives. The MBTI is based on Jung's ideas about perception and judgement, and the attitudes in which these are used in different types of people. The aim of MBTI is to identify the basic preferences of people in regard to perception and judgment, so that the effects of each preference, singly and in combination, can be established by research. (CC&S. Management Consultants, p. 1).
The information provided by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator helps to understand individual behaviors in organizations. It provides organizations assistance in communicating more effectively, solving organizations problems, optimizing the human resources in the organization, assisting in professional development for members of the organization improving teamwork, and understanding and adapting to differences in management style.

"Effective principals set the tone and climate of their schools, outline high expectations for students and faculty members, establish discipline standards, engage faculty members in explicating goals and instructional processes, and provide leadership for all aspects of education in their buildings." (Wendel, Kilgore, & Spurzman, 1991, p. 14). The earliest studies of educators indicated that principals were the most homogeneous and were most frequently ENTJ, i.e., Extraversion, either Intuition or Sensation, thinking, and Judging types. In 1962, Isabelle Myers conducted a study. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to a heterogeneous group of 88 individuals who were working toward administrative certification. The group membership demonstrated a homogeneous set of personality preferences. ESTJ (19 %), ENTJ (15 %), and ENFP (12 %) were the primary patterns, and accounted for 46 percent of total responses. "According to Myers, persons with any of these personality types make good administrators." (Wendel, Kilgore, & Spurzem, 1991, p. 18).

Although many studies exist that report using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as an investigative tool in education, very few have focused on school administrators. Three preeminent studies are part of the informational base for the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator for educational administration: Von Fange in 1961, Wright in 1966, and
Morrison in 1980. Von Fange studied 66 superintendents and found the majority to be ESTJ types. (Myers, Hammer, McCaulley, & Quenk, 1998). The personality of 39 elementary school principals were assessed by Wright in 1966 and were found to be of the extraversion, thinking, judging types, results congruent with information from the 1962 Myers study discussed previously. Until 1983, "no research had been located that had investigated the relationship of school principals' personality types to principals' perceptions of their roles or their behavior." (Leuder, 1983, p. 8). 86 Elementary school principals participated in a study conducted by Donald C. Leuder in 1983. Each was administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Principal Problem Strategy Questionnaire.

The results of this study clearly support the hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the perceived problem-solving strategies of principals with differing psychological types. The principals in this study overwhelmingly perceived and made judgments about a problem situation according to their psychological type characteristics. Not only do these results have broad implications for understanding of leadership behavior, but also the data provide considerable evidence to the construct validity of Jungian typology. (Leuder, 1983, p. 14).

Robert John McGrattan's 1997 study of "The Relationships between Personality Traits and Transformational leadership Among North Carolina Elementary Public School Principals," examined the relationship between personality traits as identified by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and transformational leadership as measured by The Nature of School Leadership. (McGrattan, 199, Abstract). 74 elementary principals were
participants in this study. The thinking/feeling trait was found a significant factor in transformational leadership. This supports the results of an earlier study in 1991 in which principals from a large, urban school district were administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The study's findings included the fact that "the Thinking-Feeling dimension of the MBTI seems to be a strong discriminator of information preference." (Campbell, 1991, Abstract).

The work of David Keirsey has added an important addition to psychological type theory. He developed four temperament groupings combining the MBTI's four sets of preferences: SJ or Traditionalist/Stabilizers, SP, Troubleshooter/Negotiators, NT, Visionaries, and NF or Catalysts. Four MBTI preferences are encumbered under each of Kiersey's four temperament groupings:

- **SJ (Traditionalist/Stabilizers):** ESTJ, ISTJ, ESFJ, and ISFJ;
- **SP (Troubleshooter/Negotiators):** ESTP, ISTP, ESFP, and ISFP;
- **NT (Visionaries):** ENTJ, INTJ, ENTP, and INTP; and
- **NF (Catalysts):** ENFJ, INFJ, ENFP, and INFP.

The four temperament groups identify important behavioral patterns and belief structures. Leading and managing involves getting things done through others. To be effective at that task requires understanding of self and others, knowing how to match the right person with the right assignment, and helping people to work together to accomplish organizational goals. Knowledge of temperament helps leaders and managers do these things. (Brownsword, 1999, p. 97).

Summary of Leadership
The 27-year legislative process that led to the present status of mandated reform in New Jersey was parallel to reform issues in education in the United States during the same period. "For more than 30 years, the primary goal of U.S. federal education policy has been to ensure equality of educational opportunity....Now federal education policies must attach the highest priority to strategies that boost student performance for all groups." (Ravitch, 1999, p. 139). The decision in Abbott v. Burke, 1998 redirected educational policy from a top-down focus to a bottom-up perspective. The question therefore becomes how individual schools implement reform that is mandated (top-down) with the decision-making and implementation requirements bottom-up. The political maneuvering has left more than 580 districts with no implementation mandate and a top-down policy structure in place.

The courts turned to the New Jersey Department of Education and its Commissioner to find solutions to issues of increased student achievement. The Commissioner relied on New American Schools and Dr. Alan Odden to develop the criteria that would serve the Abbott districts in terms of mandated school reform and student achievement. This was beyond the original issues of equity and parity funding of school districts. All students in New Jersey must demonstrate achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards at specific benchmark achievement levels for students: the end of grades four, eight, and eleven. The standards do not provide specific instructional information for students not at these grade levels. The content of the curriculum frameworks developed by the state provides grade level instructional information. The state standards are the minimum of what students should know before leaving the public educational system. An examination of research supports the importance of principal
effectiveness in the process of implementing change. The legislation describes school-based management and shared decision making in detail. An effective principal is required, but no details are provided as to what that specifically means in terms of the development of a decentralized system of school governance as required under law.

There is some agreement as to the common set of characteristics of the structure of a reform program, including the focus on strong, effective principal leadership and the traits necessary for such leadership to occur. The present scope of school reform makes use of historical context to bring the focus on reform to the school level. The result is a precarious balance between the top-down reform design of the past with the bottom-up implementation model of reform, top-down, managerial, autocratic leadership as opposed to the shared, collaborative, collegial, adaptive model of school leadership. The responsibility for reform rests with individual schools. "The quality of leadership exhibited by the principal does indeed influence how the school will function." (Lezotte, 2000, p. 2).

School-based management is an integral part of the current version of Abbott legislation in New Jersey for thirty school districts. Law mandates shared authority. The body of research of principal effectiveness is clear as to the importance of shared decision-making at the school level. Research states that, "Principals need to be aware of the conditions that foster self-governance because teachers may be unprepared to participate in decision making. Depending on their career experiences and stage of adult development, they may have varying levels of engagement and commitment to team efforts and governance issues." (Blasé & Blasé, 1994, p. 127). Preliminary research supports the notion that restructured schools may support greater academic achievement
than non-restructured schools. There are a lack of quantitative studies on the
effectiveness of reform implementation and its effect on principal leadership. The
question of management or leadership becomes critical to the success of schools,
particularly those participating in the mandated reform initiative in New Jersey's Abbott
schools.

Leadership is not trait theory; leadership and leader are not the same. Leadership
can mean the reciprocal learning processes that enable participants to construct and
negotiate meanings leading to a shared purpose of schooling. (The operative definition of
leadership to be used throughout this study.)

1. Leadership is about learning that leads to constructive change. Learning is
among participants and therefore occurs collectively. Learning has direction
toward a shared purpose.

2. Everyone has the potential and right to work as a leader. Leading is skilled
and complicated work that every member of the school community can learn.

3. Democracy clearly defines the rights of individuals to actively participate in
the decisions that affect their lives.

4. Leading is a shared endeavor, the foundation for the democratization of
schools. School change is a collective endeavor; therefore, people do this
most effectively in the presence of others. The learning journey must be
shared, otherwise, shared purpose and action are never achieved.

5. Leadership requires the redistribution of power and authority. Shared
learning, purpose, action, and responsibility demand the realignment of power
There is a wealth of information on the importance of effective leadership in schools. There are research studies whose results establish and verify the behaviors that effective school leaders demonstrate. "The past decade has been marked by a nearly continuous effort to find ways in which to make schools more productive and effective, including the decentralization of decision making and the empowerment of teachers and parents." (Doud & Keller, 1998, p.4).

Leaders are uniquely positioned to ensure that amid the busyness and bombardment that all organizations endure, the dream remains central. Leaders nourish the dream by keeping each person fully aware of an organization's purpose and goals. Individuals also need to know that, without a doubt their efforts contribute meaningfully to the purpose and goals. By providing brief but regular occasions to observe, recognize, celebrate, and reward meaningful accomplishments, leaders can create a field of dreams where progress and appreciation prevail. (Schmoker, 1999, p. 115).

The culmination of 27 years of debate on the issue of thorough and efficient education in the State of New Jersey has resulted in the mandate of school reform. This wave of reform, different from previous efforts, is systematic and prescribed, with a central theme of decentralization of school authority. The processes of school-based management and school management teams are thoroughly and clearly defined in the guiding documents. The literature validates the importance of the principal in school reform. In contrast, the legislation describes only that a school should have an 'effective principal.' This lack of focus on the role of the principal in a decentralized governance structure under mandated school reform provides the impetus for this intended study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of the impact of decentralized governance on the role of the principal as a visionary, a manager, and an instructional leader. Further, this study sought to determine the extent to which this impact was related to the type of whole school reform model selected or implemented by the principal and his/her school. This study also analyzed the relationship of the principal's prior demonstrable leadership traits with his/her perceptions of the impact of decentralized governance under mandated whole school reform.

The intent of this chapter is to present the research design used for this study. This study was designed to provide in-depth information regarding the role of the principal in state-mandated decentralized governance within whole school reform participation in New Jersey. Additionally, the study provided information about leadership styles and trait theory in relation to the impact on the principal's role in mandated decentralized governance issues in whole school reform.

This chapter begins with a description of the subjects who will participate in the study, as well as descriptions of the school districts in which the study was conducted. A description of the design of the study, the protocols and instruments used to gather data are presented. Attention was given to the reliability and validity of the instruments. This is followed by an explanation of the data collection procedures. This chapter ends with an explanation of data analysis as used in this study.
Sample Description

A two-staged sampling design was used. In the first level of sampling, four school districts were selected from a matrix that contained the following information about the thirty Abbott Districts in the State of New Jersey: names of districts, names of elementary schools in each district, number of elementary schools in each district, names of Whole School Reform Models implemented or selected in each school, number of students in each school, and number of staff and administrators in each school. Purposive sampling was used to select the districts and schools that provided information regarding the current focus of the investigation of the role of the principal in mandated whole school reform initiatives. (Krathwohl, 1998, p. 172).

In the second sampling stage, eight sample schools were selected from Abbott districts that demonstrated similar information as validated by the data in the sampling matrix. Additionally, schools that were either 1st Cohort schools (Second Year of Whole School Reform), or a 2nd Cohort schools (First Year of Whole School Reform) were identified. Using the information received from sampling stage one, principals from a Cohort 1 school and a Cohort 2 school who selected or implemented the same Whole School Reform model were asked to participate in the intended study. The design of the final sample included four Abbott districts and eight participating principals. Three schools in each of two districts, one school in the third district and one school in the fourth district constituted the sample for this study. The principals who participated in this study reflected a broad base of experience and ethnicity: four women and four men were included, four African-Americans, two Hispanic individuals, and two Caucasian
individuals. Levels of experience included one principal with more than twenty years of administrative experience, two with five to six years experience, four with two-three years in the principalship, and one in the first year of school administration. Four of the principals in the study were male and four were female. Myers-Briggs’ identities included three ESTJ’s, two were ENFP, with two INFJ’s and one ENFJ.

Instruments

The following instruments were selected for use for data collection: an interview protocol and the Keirsey temperament interpretation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The interview protocol was developed based on a preliminary focus group of principals currently participating in school reform. “Questions to Ask Developers of Whole School Reform (WSR) Models,” prepared by the National Education Association and New Jersey Education Association, provided additional information for the protocol. The purpose of this protocol was to obtain specific information pertaining to a principal’s role in decentralized governance under mandated school reform. A review of the literature led to the development of the issues in the interview protocol that were addressed by the principals, and that were associated with their roles in decentralized governance under mandated reform.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator consists of 126 forced choice items that encourage individuals to describe themselves under four main scale headings that correspond to Carl Jung’s theory of types. This is a, “questionnaire that was developed to assess the Jungian theory of type. The basis of this theory is that the processes of perception decision making are descriptive of much of people’s individual behaviors.”
(Selbymillsmith, 1999, p. 1). The reliability and validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator include split half correlations, internal consistency correlations, and test/re-test correlations that all reach satisfactory levels.

There are no single numbers that summarize the reliability or validity of the MBTI. Reliability refers to the consistency with which a test measures what it attempts to measure. Validity refers to how well a test measures what it was intended to measure, and whether it produces information that will be useful to its users. On Forms F and G of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, there are three primary kinds of reliability reported for the MBTI: correlations of logical split-half for internal consistency, correlations of test-retest reliability, and percentage of agreement of direction of preference on test-retest studies. The internal consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients range from the mid 70s to low 90s, with periodic studies showing correlations that are lower. Percentages of agreement in test-retest studies range from 80% to 90% for the combination of all four type letters the same and for three of four the same. Correlational studies reported in the 1985 MBTI Manual show evidence for convergent validity with correlations in magnitude from 30 to 70. (Correlations higher than 70 would only be found when correlating the MBTI to another scale that purports to measure type as well, e.g., the Gray-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey.)

There are sixteen possible combinations of each of the four preference pairs: extroversion and introversion, sensing and intuition, thinking and feeling, and judging and perceiving. This is an untimed test, although typical times are either 25 minutes with paper and pencil, and 20 minutes with the computer administered version.

The four groupings in the Keirsey temperament interpretation each include four of
the sixteen Myers-Briggs Types: SJ (Traditionalist/Stabilizers) includes ESTJ, ISTJ, ESFJ, and ISFJ; SP (Troubleshooters/Negotiators) include ESTP, ISTP, ESFP, and ISFP; NT (Visionaries) include ENTJ, INTJ, ENTP, and INTP; and NF (Catalysts), ENFJ, INFJ, ENFP, and INFP. The questions used by David Keirsey to validate these temperament categories align directly with the questions in the proposed interview protocol. "(1) What do you see as your strengths as managers? (2) What do you have to do in your role that you find frustrating and difficult? and, (3) What do you see as your contribution when working in a management team? " (Brownsword, 1999, p. 97).

Procedure

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from each district Superintendents from the four participating Abbott districts. Each district Superintendent was contacted by letter requesting their cooperation in assisting in the data collection for the study.

Each Superintendent provided a brief letter of advocacy that was sent to the principals in their district, encouraging their assistance with the project. The selection of the participating principals in the study was based on four criteria: type of whole school reform model either implemented or selected, year of implementation or selection, first or second, number of students, grade levels serviced, and number of staff. The researcher conducted the selection process. Confidentiality of identity was maintained throughout the data collection and data analysis processes. Principals in the study were identified two different ways: as members of either Cohort 1 (second year of reform implementation), or Cohort 2 (first year of reform implementation), or as Principal 1 or Principal 2 in each of the four whole school reform models included in the study. The
Myers-Briggs administration and the Keirsey temperament interpretation identified individual principals in the same manner maintaining the confidentiality of their identities as required by study protocol.

A letter and an informed consent form were sent to each principal requesting his or her participation in the study. Structured interviews were conducted with the selected principals at a time and place mutually agreed upon. Each interview took approximately one to two hours to complete. All interviews took place in the school offices of the principals. All principals agreed to the tenets of the informed consent document provided. All interviews were tape-recorded with the permission of the principals. Transcripts of the interviews were made available to each of the participating principals. Follow-up, for clarification purposes only, was conducted by telephone if so requested by the participating principal.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to the participating principals approximately two weeks after the interview was conducted. An independent consultant, qualified and certificated in Myers-Briggs Type Indicator interpretation, administered the Indicator to each of the eight principals who participated in the study at each principal’s school. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator took each principal approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. Results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were made available to each principal upon request. No names of individuals, schools, or districts were used in this process at any time. The study reported these results in terms of personality trait, as traditionalist/stabilizer or catalyst, as well as the specific Keirsey “type” that the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator produced.
Data Analysis

The study used an a priori pattern coding protocol in analysis of the interview data. The interview protocol was analyzed in terms of overarching themes that pertained to each question in the protocol. Three levels of pattern coding comprised the analysis. Level I analysis included information from the principals' interviews from the perspective of all cohort 1 principals and all cohort 2 principals. This analysis focused on the question of the impact of decentralized governance on their roles as visionaries, managers, leaders, facilitators, and time managers. Level II coding included matching themes discerned from information about each of the four models of whole school reform from two perspectives, that of first year program implementation and that of second year program implementation to the responses of the cohort 1 and cohort 2 principals.

The David Keirsey temperament preferences were used to analyze the results from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator administrations as the Level III categorical coding protocol. The Keirsey temperament preferences provided a relational base for discussion and interpretation of the role of the principal in decentralized governance under mandated school reform, integrating the principals' responses from Levels I and II. The data from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator administration was analyzed to determine the dominant function (the "boss" of the personality), the auxiliary function of the personality (the essential balance), as well as the third and the inferior functions for each principal. The Level III coding reflected the link between information about the whole school reform models (Level coding), information about the impact of decentralized governance and mandated reform on the role of the principal (Level II coding), and the leadership traits of
the principals and their relationship to Keirsey's temperaments in the world of work. (Level III coding) (Brownsword, 1999, p. 123).

In addition, the results of the Keirsey Temperament preferences aligned with the results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were used to link data for analysis as follows:

- principals who are members of Cohort 1,
- principals who are members of Cohort 2,
- principals who are participating in the same Whole School Reform Model (four cross-coding alignments),
- principals participating in governance reform models,
- principals participating in prescriptive reform models.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of principals currently implementing approved models of whole school reform in New Jersey and the impact of decentralized governance on their role as visionaries, managers, or instructional leaders. Furthermore, this study sought to determine the extent to which this impact was related to the type of whole school reform model selected and implemented by the principal and the school. Finally, this study also analyzed the relationship of the principals' leadership traits as interpreted through the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and David Keirsey's Temperaments in the World of Work with the perceptions of the principals of the impact of decentralized governance required under mandated implementation of whole school reform.

The State of New Jersey named 30 schools as those that were considered part of the Abbott legislation that was in place in the spring of 1998. Each school in each of the districts was required to select an approved model of whole school reform within a three-year timeline. The program was phased in over a three-year period. This resulted in what are now termed "cohorts." Schools in these districts that elected to participate in the first year of the program are termed members of Cohort 1. Schools that chose to implement a reform model in Year 2 of the program are termed members of Cohort 2. Schools that chose to wait until to third year of the program are now considered members of Cohort 3. For the purpose of this study, principals and schools in cohorts 1 and 2 are represented.
The first part of this chapter focuses on the issue of principals working under mandated decentralized governance and how this has impacted on the principal’s role as a visionary, a manager, and an instructional leader. It presents information from the principal’s interview protocol from the perspective of all cohort 1 principals and cohort 2 principals, regardless of whole school reform model that has been implemented. Five of the interview questions are discussed in terms of decentralized governance and school leadership.

This is followed by an analysis of matching themes discerned from information about each of the four models of whole school reform selected for this study from two perspectives: that of first year program implementation and second year implementation reflecting responses from both cohort 1 and cohort 2 principals from each of the four models that were selected for inclusion in this study: Success for All and Modern Red Schoolhouse (Prescriptive models), and Accelerated Schools and Comer (Governance Models). The models that are prescriptive in nature are those that actually either prescribe the curriculum, and then train teachers in well-scripted modules that reprogram staff to deliver instruction and address curriculum and other issues in a pre-planned manner.

The models that are governance in nature are those that support theoretical frameworks within which school staff and leaders operate. The program content is given to small training teams of staff and principals who turnkey-train the rest of the staff. The school staff then prioritizes issues to be addressed as well as the manner in which they will be addressed. This section of the analysis uses information from the remaining seven questions from the interview protocol.
Each of the four models has characteristics that distinguish one from the other. The main features of Success for All are (a) a research-based, prescribed curriculum in the area of reading, (b) a 90-minute reading period; grouping by reading level; one-to-one tutoring; a family support team; cooperative learning; on-site facilitator; and building advisory team. The role of the principal is one of facilitator and support provider. Modern Red Schoolhouse has (a) a challenging curriculum, (b) high standards for all students, (c) emphasis on character, (d) integral role of technology, and, (e) individual education compact for each child. Leadership is addressed through principal coaching, an on-going process in which a consultant works with a principal by administering and using the results of the Skill Scope to identify needs areas and create a personal improvement plan, and providing coaching/advice in these areas, and continues with working in the area of building instructional leadership (as knowledge and support).

Accelerated Schools, the first of the two governance models, is characterized by having the principal as the keeper of the dream, who must constantly shift from the traditional role of school policy enforcer to that of facilitator, coordinator, and listener. A coaching team is the training arm of the program. It includes the principal, an Accelerated Internal Coach, and two classroom teachers, who then turnkey train all other staff after professional development monthly sessions at Columbia University. Its main features include (a) gifted and talented instruction for all students through 'powerful learning', (b) a governance structure that empowers the whole school community to make key decisions using the Inquiry Process; and, (3) three guiding principles: unity of purpose, empowerment plus responsibility, and building on strengths.

The School Development model, or Comer model of whole school reform, is
composed of several school-based teams: the School Planning and Management Team, the Student and Staff Support Team that includes a Mental Health Team, and a Parent team. The principal is a member of all Comer teams. Studies of the implementation process reveal that the principal's attitude and leadership and the level or teacher support greatly affect implementation. The three teams, three operations including a comprehensive school plan, a staff development plan, monitoring, and assessment, characterize the program. It also has three guiding principles: no-fault, consensus, and collaboration.

Finally, the study utilized the David Keirsey temperament preferences to analyze the results from the Myers-Briggs type indicator for each of the participating principals. The study here focused on how the role of the principal under decentralized governance has been affected by the principals' leadership traits. The David Keirsey temperament preferences were used to analyze the results from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator administrations for the principals included in this study. The Keirsey temperament preferences provided a relational base for discussion and interpretation of the role of the principal in decentralized governance under mandated school reform, integrating the principals' responses from the interview protocol to understanding the traits of these principals and their affect on their participation in whole school reform and decentralized governance.

The first part of the present study investigated school management teams and their impact on principal leadership in mandated reform situations. School management teams have an impact on principal leadership through their composition, selection process conducted, and responsibilities assumed or given. They most often include teachers
(represented by a variety of selection designs), support staff, paraprofessionals, parents, and the principal or his/her designee.

The Impact of Decentralized Governance on the Role of the Principal

The principals whose schools were part of Cohort 1 were more consistent in their responses to questions about their school management teams and their impact on school management than were the principals from Cohort 2 schools. The composition of school management teams for both Cohort 1 and 2 schools included both the principal and teacher representatives. This was the only area of consistency for both cohorts in terms of team membership. The remaining members of the teams as well as how the members were selected varied, with first cohort schools demonstrating greater consistency in terms of team membership than their counterparts in cohort 2. Two first cohort schools used stakeholder group representation as their method of choice for membership. Three second-cohort schools used stakeholder-group representation. Two first-cohort schools had various teachers on their school management teams, while five second-cohort schools had a non-specific teacher membership group on their teams. Only one school in Cohort 1 had support staff representation, while three second-cohort schools had support staff membership. One first-cohort school had community individuals on the team, while two second-cohort schools demonstrated community membership. Paraprofessionals were part of teams in four first-cohort schools, while only part of one second-cohort school. Students were represented on only one second-cohort school, since the school was the only K-8 school in the present study.

As is readily evident, there is much disparity as to the membership of school
teams among the principals in this study. Although the State of New Jersey has set
guidelines for school management team membership, it appears that the majority of
schools in both cohorts have not followed these guidelines as they were intended.

(c) The membership of the SMT shall be broad-based and representative of the
student population and of the community's racial and ethnic composition.

(d) The SMT shall include the building principal, teacher, school-level support
staff, parents, and community members. No one group identified above may
constitute 50 percent or more of the SMT membership. Board members shall not
serve on the SMT. A school district employee shall not serve as either a parent or
a community member on an SMT in that district. (Urban Education Reform in the

School Management Team selection is another area that impacts on the role of the
principal in mandated decentralized governance. The statute provides an option of either
electing or selecting: that is, teachers select teachers, school level support staff selects
school level support staff, and parents choose parents. The only time a principal becomes
involved in the selection process is if the parents do not choose a sufficient number of
parents. The principal then has the authority, by law, to select the remaining parent

No principal in the current study participated in the selection of team members. The
election process was implemented by four of the first cohort schools, while used in only
one of the second cohort schools. The four remaining first cohort schools used the
process of selection by stakeholder groups, as is appropriate in the law, or by volunteer
process, which is not within the scope of the present legislation. Five of the second
cohort schools also utilized either the process of selection by stakeholder groups, but three of these used a volunteer process. This area suggests that both the leadership and facilitator roles played a part in the selection process for school team membership for the principals in both cohorts one and two.

The area of school management team responsibilities is one that has a direct impact on the leadership role of Abbott principals. The duties of teams are clearly delineated in the law:

1. Ensure that curriculum, instruction, and the instructional delivery system are aligned with the Core Content Standards;
2. Review the Statewide assessment results at school and grade levels to determine program and curriculum needs and to take appropriate action to improve and enhance student achievement;
3. Ensure that a program of professional development to assist staff in the implementation of all aspects of WSR is being utilized by the school;
4. Develop and submit, to the Department for approval, with a copy to the Chief School Administrator and the Board, a school-level technology plan:
5. Ensure that education programs, including co-curricular and extracurricular activities, are provided to address the Cross-Content Workplace Readiness Standards of the Core curriculum Content Standards;
6. Implement a school-based system of rewards;
7. Establish work groups as needed that include SMT members and non-SMT members to maximize participation by non-SMT members;
   1. Annually, each SMT of a WSR school shall be authorized to:
a. Approve a school-based budget;


The principals in the present study indicated that the primary responsibility of their school teams was the preparation of the school budget. Issues presented by the cohort one principals included scheduling, staff development, school discipline, and hiring of personnel. Second cohort principals included budget preparation, student achievement issues, a discipline policy, aligning the curriculum, student assessment and performance issues, staffing, and building safety and security issues. There was some consensus among the principals in both cohorts relating to the importance of the budget issue as being paramount to all other duties of the school management team. Only one first cohort principal indicated that the question of responsibilities was still unclear for the team at the school, although these responsibilities are clearly articulated in the current version of the Abbott legislation. It is clear from the responses that none of the schools in this study have their school teams addressing all of the issues that are required.

First cohort principals found school-based management to have a positive impact on their roles as instructional leaders. A first cohort principal stated that, “I find it invaluable, the impact, because I’m really meant to share leadership. I, like I said, I don’t mind when, you know, if the arrow’s coming, I’ll be the first person to say, “I’m it. I’m the leader.” Others found it a bit confusing in the beginning. “I guess in the beginning it was kind of confusing, not so much for me because I now what my responsibilities are
and I know that the bottom line is always going to be with me... it's a new role for many of us and we're all learning together."

The responses from the second cohort principals concerning the impact of school based management on their roles as instructional leaders were more insightful. One second cohort principal said, "I think from experience, that good schools are good schools, because of that shared decision-making, but it's tough because people are taking on new roles... I don't know where I fit in. Should I exert myself at a meeting, because, you know, does that stop other people just because I'm the principal, from wanting to participate and to have input, so when do I sit back, when do I step forward and say no? So I'm learning and the staff is learning their responsibilities." Another second cohort principal saw the issue this way: "The impact is great. It makes my job a lot easier, because there's many good qualified people here on the staff... I really treasure the fact that I have a School Management Team, because I don't want to be responsible for all the decisions." And, another second cohort principal found that, "It has impacted positively and somewhat negatively. The positive side is that we don't have to go it alone... The negative side of it is that sometimes you get bogged down in discussion when the most important thing is resolution... I feel that this type of procedure, this type of board, I think, enhances what the arduous take of an administrator is."

The second cohort principals had a full year to investigate their programs. The first cohort principals were required to establish teams, select programs and implement all in the same year. Second cohort schools had school management teams, but did not have the weight of the reform program at an implementation stage. It appears that this has given the second cohort principals a better understanding of school based
management, and has facilitated the changes that had to be made to include a team as part of the management design of the school.

Reporting issues are those that impact upon the principal’s available leadership time in a school. They are most often classified as management issues, an important part of the principal’s responsibilities, but only as they facilitate the day-to-day operation of the school. The greater the demand of reporting issues for a principal, the less that principal is able to exercise true leadership in his or her building.

Effective school leaders are strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement. They are moral agents and social advocates for the children and the communities they serve. Finally, they make strong connections with other people, valuing and caring for others as individuals and as members of the educational community. (Standards for School Leaders, November 1996, p. 1).

The Standards for School Leaders has only one reference to the managerial tasks for principals among the six standards for leadership. The majority of these standards address the role of the principal as instructional leader, emphasizing high student achievement. The principals in this study were in full consensus about the effect of mandated reform on reporting issues for their respective schools. “The paperwork is endless...you are constantly doing paperwork. You can attempt to get it done during the day, but oftentimes, I don’t.” Another first cohort principal reported that, “It just seems like you have to report to more people. Just the same information gets lost, well it gets lost to two people, now it gets lost to five people. So you’re just constantly making copies of the same old.” “It takes my time as a principal and certainly takes the time of
my staff that has to support me in getting that information that data gathering and all that
other stuff. So sometimes, I guess, we just don’t feel we have enough time to do what
we’re about and that’s just simply to run a good school.”

Principals in both cohorts agreed that the issue of mandated reform as it impacts
on reporting issues is a critical factor. All eight principals in the study concurred that
mandated reform has increased the amount of reporting that the schools are required to
do, and that, in point of fact, if done during the day, it takes staff and its leader away from
the primary duty of helping to increase student achievement. If it is done before or after
the school day, the principal often has the responsibility of completing the paperwork,
leading to long days that do not contribute to the betterment of building leadership skills
for principals.

The impact of decentralized governance on the role of the principals in this study
has been considerable. Both first and second cohort principals discussed their changing
roles in terms of what leadership was becoming in their particular schools. “My
leadership has now become more of a facilitator. And I think that you don’t lose your
leadership skills at all. Several first cohort principals in the study saw control as being
defined as something that is not autocratic in nature, but rather answers the question, “Is
it really working?” One first cohort principal stated, “I truly believe that my staff, and
my staff knows this, that I am the principal, that I am in charge, that I am going to do
whatever I can for the benefit of them and for the benefit of the children. I think it has to
do with mutual respect.”

The second cohort principals saw the maintenance of control while providing staff
with support as a question of the quality of staff in a building. “Well, I don’t see it’s a
problem because you have a staff that's working collectively to implement a program and
being a leader, you are in a position that you encourage but you also direct..... I really
believe that control comes from the total body in that when they feel that they are part of
that control, it's not a difficult process.” Another principal felt that a principal does not
have to have a controlling type of attitude. The importance of assuring that staff in a
school understands the process of whole school reform in another area of importance to
the second cohort principals in this study. “It’s difficult because when you have the type
of governance that has been created by way of a School Management Team, you have as
many members on the team as how wide and varied their understanding of their oath...I
try to maintain the leadership and acquiesce the governance to the School Management
Team, which has become something of a juggling match that’s very difficult.”

Whole School Reform Model Selection and Its Effect on the Role of the Principal

Accelerated Schools: A Governance Model of Reform

Principal 1 selected this model for the school. The principal provided a great
deal of information about Accelerated Schools, but did not provide the staff with
information about other models that they might have been considered. “Each elementary
school shall adopt a whole school reform (WSR) model “ (Urban Education Reform in
the Abbott Districts, 2000, 6A: 24-4.1(a), p. 27). The legislation clearly indicates that
the school is to make the decision about which model is to be implemented. The
principal has the responsibility to oversee the selection process, to assure that, once the
model has been selected, that the selection process approved by each whole school
reform developer has been followed. Finally, the principal has the responsibility, along
with the school management team, to assure that the model is implemented faithfully. The principal did not have the opportunity to make an informed decision that would have helped to assure the commitment of the staff to quality implementation.

Well, I spoke to them about the Accelerated Model and I did that at grade level meetings. I did that at staff development. I put all the Literature that I could regarding the models, you know, in the library. We looked at it in depth. And the way that I encouraged the staff to go into it, I remember telling them, this school does have a very professional staff, you have lots of strengths out there and it is my belief that we should look into a model where we build on our strengths. What I sold to the staff, the way that I encouraged them, was by looking at the philosophy of the Accelerated Schools.

Other first cohort principals who selected Accelerated Schools in other districts did so through either a broad-based selection process reviewing all models before final selection and using a percent buy-in procedure as required by the whole school reform developers. This process was in line with the requirements of the state regarding the process of model selection. Principal 2 used a broad-based selection process as well as percent buy-in as the process for whole school reform model selection. "We had a great deal of discussion around different models. We had the representatives to come to the school and to discuss the pros and cons."

Principal 1 assumed the role of "boss" in the selection process. The principal stated that, "Yes, it was a directive, but it was a directive that you could embrace with dignity. " Principal 2 was much clearer in defining the role of the principal in the selection process. "The major role that I played was to be the facilitator, to encourage
teachers to be involved, and get their feedback, and from the feedback I received, I, with my committee, came up with this process in terms of selection." This is the role that establishes the greatest potential for whole school reform implementation success.

The implementation process for whole school reform models is the major factor contributing to the success or failure of the program in a school. Each of the principals in the Accelerated Schools’ model stated that they were either facilitators or coaches during the implementation phase of the reform process. Principal 1 stated that, “I guess my role is one mostly of support, and encouragement and facilitating as much as I can,” while Principal 2 said, “My role is still as a facilitator. I attend all of the meetings at Columbia University with Accelerated Schools. I participate; I go to the same training as the teachers do . . . it’s very important, as I said, as a principal to be part of that process.”

Whole School Reform implementation often presents limitations to the principals. Principal 1 felt that the union was the limitation that inhibited full implementation of the Accelerated Schools’ model. This principal also felt that the budget process presented a limitation to the school’s progress. “It’s disarming to see that you work so hard on the budget and you know what the needs of your school are, only to get a return by the State, ‘no, this is not approved, that’s not approved.” The principal used after school compensation as well as school management team compensation to mitigate the limitations that were perceived. Principal 2 felt that the major concern limiting the success of the program was the time line. “There are so many programs. . . there is a time line in terms of reaching your goals as relates to vision and the first year’s planning. . . the biggest problem is time restraint because there is so much you want to meet.” The budget issue was one of concern for this principal, who allotted funds to pay the school
management team during budget preparation. It appears that most of the limitations involve time that requires financial remuneration as a relief measure to obviate the problem.

Time issues were also discussed from the perspective of their impact on the principals' abilities to 'lead' their respective schools. "I probably put in long hours into the budget, and when that happens, the implementation plan, when that happens, obviously you're not the instructional leader, you want to be in the classroom." "That's a time situation, because we are out of our building. We go to Columbia University, sometimes three days a month. You're out of your building. It does have an impact in terms of your program in the school itself, because you are away from your school a lot."

Principal 1 found that the local board of education provided valuable informational meetings for the principal and management team members, exhibiting a very supportive response to the school's needs. The New Jersey Department of Education, however, created confusion and made extensive demands on the principal's time away from the school. Principal 2 found many of the same issues as the first cohort principal. "As far as the district office is concerned, we have a lot of meetings that take place at central office plus we have these meetings at Columbia University, so it gives you limited time . . . you are away from your building more than I have ever been before." The principal also found that the State did not respond when help was requested, did not provide the technical assistance that was needed, and created a great deal of confusion for the school and the principal.

School Development Program (Comer): A Governance Model of Reform
The School Development Program, or Comer, was adopted at the first cohort school some years before the mandate, but only with a 51% majority staff vote. The program, however, was not implemented in earnest until the state mandate for first cohort membership was presented to the principal and the school. This was the only program that the first cohort school considered and ultimately implemented. Principal 2 was not involved in the actual selection of the model, but became principal after the first investigative year into whole school reform by the school. "It was my understanding, as with other schools, that there was a process where the developers would come in and do their presentations." Principal 1 indicated a belief in situational leadership, a philosophy supported by James Comer, the developer of the School Development Program. The principal clearly supported the initial plan to adopt Comer, and continued to encourage the staff in the school to maintain the adoption through the state mandate for reform. Principal 2 did not participate in the selection process. However, the administrator who was in charge was very involved in the process, particularly in the selection of the Comer model.

Principal 1 was intimately involved in the implementation process for the reform program. The principal attended regularly scheduled school management team meetings as well as meetings of the school climate committee, the curriculum committee, the staff development committee and the parent committee. The principal was both leader and facilitator during the implementation process for Comer, as was the second cohort Comer principal. However, staffing was a major issue for the second cohort principal in terms of school management team membership. "I think the whole idea of shared-decision making comes very hard for many people. They're used to principals really acting in a
top-down approach. Now this is not the case, where I sit as an equal member I now understand I have certain responsibilities that are solely mine, but we, as a group, are beginning to learn what our responsibilities are.”

The limitations to the accurate implementation of a reform program were varied between the first and second cohort Comer principals. Principal 1 saw the limitations coming, not from the school, but from the State Department and Central Office. The principal attempted to address this issue in writing. “One judges your implementation plan, another judges the budget. If those two minds aren’t alike, we have a problem. You would think that if the plan were approved, that the budget that supports the plan would be approved as well. . . So I did fault the State for that, and I did express that in writing.” Principal 2 found getting a sufficient number of personnel as a major limitation to implementation. The developers also created a problem for this school. “Sometimes the developers are not always there when you need them. We found that when we needed help, for example, with the budget last year, it just so happened that the individual who was dealing with us had other schools, other responsibilities.” The second cohort Comer principal had the support of the central office in terms of attempting to solve the problems at the school, and felt that the school was receiving a great deal of help. “Unfortunately, the solutions don’t seem to always come quickly enough.”

Time issues had an impact on both first and second cohort Comer principals. Principal 2 found that the budget preparation timeframe impeded the smooth functioning of the school. However, the principal also found this constraint helpful in terms of learning to organize time in a better manner so that the school remains focused on required tasks relative to reform implementation. Principal 2 found that the number of
workshops that principals are asked to attend make great demands on time. "You just can't attend them all, so it's hard to know which ones need my attention and those that don't." Both principals found their Boards of Education, their Central Office staffs, and the State of New Jersey responsive to the needs of their respective school. They also found these organizations to be supportive, non-intimative, and accessible to both staff and principal.

Success for All: A Prescriptive Model of Reform

The process of whole school reform model selection conducted by Principal 1 was initiated through a concern for the decrease in student achievement scores, particularly in the area of reading. The State of New Jersey's initiative entitled Demonstrably Effective Program Aid listed Success for All as one strategy that could be selected to help improve student test scores. The school conducted research into the program. An initial meeting with representatives from Johns Hopkins University (November 1998) provided the school with an overview of Success for All. The school used the Internet, read newspaper articles, and visited a school that had already implemented the model. The school's commitment was 80%, the acceptance level required by the developers of Success for All. Although the school did not participate in an extensive review of Whole School Reform models, the principal led the school through the process that would have been appropriate for any school investigating any of the approved whole school reform models.

Principal 2 utilized the school management team during the reform investigative process. The team attended several workshops regarding the available approved models.
The school used a process of elimination through discussion and visitation to schools implementing several different types of reform models. There was a great deal of controversy in the potential adoption of the state’s preemptive model of reform, Success for All. The principal provided information on many other models and continued discussion. The first vote taken was less than the required 80%. The school continued to discuss the issues, took another secret ballot, and certified an 83% acceptance rate for Success for All. In both cases, the SFA principals facilitated the selection of whole school reform model for their sites.

The Success for All principals facilitated the whole school reform selection process for their schools. They encouraged teachers to visit schools with various models, brought in speakers to discuss a variety of models, encouraged the stakeholders to “seek our and to search and to see what would best meet our needs.” Both schools had identified a need for a strong reading program, given the poor test scores in that area in both schools. “And being that we had low reading scores, it was understood that we need to look at a model that supposedly had been researched and that is supposed to improve student achievement as it relates to reading.” Principal 1 knew, “that as the principal, it was my responsibility to make sure that the teachers had every single available material that was necessary and also the in-service time that they needed.” The principal worked to assure that the model was being implemented as was required by the developers of Success for All, assuring that the prescription design was followed, that the school was faithful to the program through classroom observations, lesson plan review, and in grade level and faculty meetings.

The second cohort Success for All principal attended a new sites conference.
Success for All provided the principal with a principal facilitator's manual. "And my role is to give support to the teachers in trying to implement a program which is far different than any reading program we've had here. It's very prescriptive. It's a difficult program. It takes a lot of work. And it's my rule to help support, and give encouragement." This principal assumed the roles of coach and cheerleader to provide the support necessary for successful program implementation.

The issue of limitations for the Success for All principals was varied due to some district constraints. The first cohort Success for All principal discussed the lack of trained substitute teachers available to the school. The model is extremely prescriptive and required specific training for accurate implementation. A lack of appropriately trained substitutes creates a problem in providing the required daily ninety-minute instructional reading period. The other limitation for the first cohort school was space. Success for All requires that the students be assessed in reading, and then grouped accordingly. There is no limit to the number of groups. "The children are grouped according to their reading level and right now, unfortunately, I have children in the cafeteria, I have children in a corridor outside of the cafeteria, I have children in the library." The principal has worked with the Central Administration in the district to try to ameliorate these limitations, and has found that the school has to live with these concerns.

Principal 2 saw, "lack of support on the part of teachers who are unfortunately not as well into change to accept change, lack of real, what I consider in-depth training to support the program in its implementation." Lack of materials as well as an overwhelming amount of paper need for reproduction for program materials, and lack of time to complete assessments for regrouping are other limitations expressed by the
second cohort principal. The principal has taken steps to, “see what the concerns are, what the needs are, and try to fill those needs. The best step to be taken as an administrator is to give as much support as possible to the facilitator of Success for All at the school.”

Time issues had a major impact on both first and second cohort SFA principals. Materials often did not arrive in time to implement the program as required by the timeline of the developers. The principals often stayed beyond the school day to complete the tasks of the job after the daily implementation of Success for All at their schools.

I think that’s a mark of a good leader, you have to be flexible. You have to be flexible. You have to be able to adjust your time . . . you know you prioritize and you make sure that whatever is needed you get done. That’s your responsibility as the leader. You know you have to be able to problem-solve, that’s the mark of a good leader. So you do what is required of you.

Both Success for All principals have experienced positive changes in their relationships with their district Central offices, Boards of Education, and State Department of Education. Principal 1 discussed the improved relationship with the State Department personnel, seeing it as a shared relationship committed to the students. Principal 2’s district was structured somewhat differently, in that there are five School Leadership Teams, each with its own administrative body. The principal communicates directly with the School Leadership Team that is assigned to the school. Principal 2 saw an improved relationship with the State Education Department, which provided assistance to the school when it was requested.
Modern Red Schoolhouse: A Prescriptive Model of Reform

Principal 1 did not participate in the selection process. However, the former administration selected Modern Red Schoolhouse for the school without input from the school. This led to a diminished quality of program implementation for the school as a member of the first cohort. Principal 2 provided information about four different whole school reform models to the staff of the school, those in which the staff had shown some interest. The focus here was on the staff, rather than on the principal, which supports the intent of the Abbott legislation. In-service training on the models was provided, groups of teachers visited schools where the models had been implemented, and the developers from each of the four models presented at the school. The staff narrowed the choice to two models, and had a 94% vote for Modern Red Schoolhouse.

Principals 1 and 2 saw the role of the principal in the selection process as one of facilitator. Each saw the importance of not biasing the selection process, but rather providing several models from which to choose so that the ultimate decision would rest with the staff. Principal 1 was not part of the selection process, but did express similar views to the actual situation described by Principal 2 in terms of model selection. “I just made sure the whole process ran smoothly, and if anyone had any concerns and needed anything in order to make an informed decision that I was there to cooperate and provide that for them whatever I could.”

Principal 1 stated there had been very little training provided by Modern Red Schoolhouse in their methodology, which impeded the principal’s ability to assist in the implementation of the program in the school. In investigating this situation, it was determined that the principal did not take advantage of the opportunities offered by
Modern Red Schoolhouse personnel to help the principal gain the knowledge necessary to assist the staff during the implementation process. This led to this first cohort school being far behind where it should have been at the time this study was conducted. Principal 2’s role in the implementation process was one of facilitator. The second cohort school had thirty-three training days scheduled during the year of this study. Principal 2’s role was, “to do all of the scheduling, to make sure that all the trainings take place, that all the staffs’ classrooms are covered so they can receive the staff development and training that the model requires.”

There were differences between the limitations presented by Principal 1 and Principal 2 in terms of the implementation process for their schools. Principal 1 indicated that there was a lack of information and lack of appropriate training that prohibited this individual from becoming an effective leader. Again it must be noted that the Modern Red Schoolhouse developers offered training opportunities for Principal 1. Principal 1 did not take advantage of this. Modern Red Schoolhouse has a readiness phase:

The focus of the modules in this phase is to prepare schools/sites who might not be ready to begin implementation of the comprehensive design. Emphasis during this phase is in Making Visible Change—in the acceptance of a change environment, in the learning environment and climate, and in student achievement in two to three target areas. (Implementation Module Development Template, 2000, p. 1).

This phase of the implementation process includes principal coaching (Leadership Diagnostics), described as, “an ongoing process in which a consultant works with a principal by (a) Administering and using the results of the Skill Scope to identify needs areas and create a personal improvement plan, and (b) providing ‘coaching/advice’ in
these areas.” (Implementation Module Development Template, 2000, p. 2). Although this was offered to Principal 1, it was never completed, leaving the school without the level of leadership necessary for successful implementation of program. Principal 1 addressed this limitation through self-teaching of the program. “It’s another band-aid for something or another. I don’t know if this band-aid at least fits that wound because a lot of time you have bandages when you have gashes and you have a little band-aid, but maybe this band-aid fits this particular wound. I don’t know.” Principal 2 viewed the limitation as being the actual learning process of Modern Red Schoolhouse. “Sometimes it’s not easy for people, especially in this new process, to give your opinion and then have someone else maybe agree with that but then I’m going to add something to it or have a different idea… to accept everybody else’s opinion in a nice congenial way and to know that everyone’s opinion is valued.” Principal 2 used the professional development opportunities provided to the staff to address the limitations. The school has five or six task forces, and the principal attends each meeting of each task force so that effective monitoring of the implementation of the program can be effected. “They’re doing much better than they even know. So it’s my job to make sure they all know that and keep them on board and keep them motivated.”

There was a difference of response relating to the issue of time. Principal 1 found that there was insufficient time to complete all the mandates and requirements of both the program and the state. “You have nothing to do with the selection of the trainer and, as you investigate it, it seems that some of these trainers, it’s just that they could be independent free lancers.” Principal 2 found these demands challenging. “I consider myself kind of an organized person, so when it comes to time issues, I relish it… the
reform process has given us new timelines to follow and new state requirements to follow and strategic plans and all those sorts of things, and that's not real new to me."

The relationship between the Modern Red Schoolhouse principals and their respective Boards of Education, Central Offices, and State Department of Education seem to evidence improvement in all three venues. Principal 1 described better communication and more contact with individuals from each organization. Principal 2 sees the situation as a type of working together. "The support and the congeniality that's developed among all four areas has really heightened and it's been very good, so it's no more like they and they, you know, it's all we. We're all together."

The Effect of Principals' Leadership Traits on Mandated Decentralized Governance

"Leading and managing involves getting things done through others. To be effective at that task requires understanding of self and others, knowing how to match the right person with the right assignment, and helping people to work together to accomplish organizational goals. Knowledge of temperament helps leaders and managers do these things. " (Brownsworld, 1999, p. 97). "Type development adds another dimension to leadership development, offering rewards in personal understanding and development, as well as growth as a leader." (MBTI Manual, 1998, p. 357). The use of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory in the current study emphasized the importance of leadership trait study as it related to mandated decentralized governance issues. The alignment of preference issues and whole school reform models in this study presented a congruence between leadership traits demonstrated by study participants and the reform models in which they were participating.
Principals in the current study completed the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory in their offices under the auspices of a certified MBTI practitioner. The interview questions focused on the nature of the score that each presented on each indicator, particularly the key functions of: Intuition (N) versus Sensing (S), the information-gathering preferences, and Thinking (T) versus Feeling (F), the decision-gathering preferences.

Subjects were asked questions related to those functions, based on their role, activities, preferred management/leadership styles, etc. For example, in the case of one principal whose desk looked like a dumping ground, initial questions might touch (gently) on how the person handles administrative detail and the importance the person places on neatness and external order. The questions would initially probe how the leader prefers to deal with the external world (J or P), but really address the style of decision-making.

"Management personnel can be classified according to the 16 MBTI types. Each type has distinctive preferences that affect how management functions are carried out. These preferences affect decisions about the use of time and business priorities." (O’Roark, 1987, p. 29). There are four preference dimensions: (1) Extraversion or Introversion: Preference for interaction or reflection; (2) Sensing or Intuition: Preference in gathering information; (3) Thinking or Feeling: preference in coming to conclusions; and, (4) Judging or Perceiving: preference for dealing with the outer world. (O’Roark, 1987, p. 27).

"Extraversion (E) versus Introversion (I) and Judging (J) versus Perceiving (P), when applied to principals’ leadership styles, provide insights into the ways in which they are most likely to carry out the mandates of collaborative planning and decision-making".
The results of the administration of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) from the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 principals yielded a sample population of two ESTJ's (Extrovert, Sensing, Thinking, Judging), two ENFJ's (Extrovert, Intuitive, Feeling, Judging), one ISTJ (Introvert, Sensing, Thinking, Judging), one INFJ (Introvert, Intuitive, Feeling, Judging), and two ENFP's (Extrovert, Intuitive, Feeling, Perceiving).

The study sample overall type profile was an ENFJ, a type that differs significantly from the statistically most frequent type in administrative/managerial jobs—the ESTJ. This type is characterized by competence and knowledge as architects of change and organizational entrepreneurs. David Keirsey classifies the overall type study profile as NF. "When administrators of this type look at the world of work, they see possibilities, meanings and relationships. They judge their value to people and for people, and are effective in getting people to work effectively together to achieve organizational goals." (Brownsword, 1999, p. 123). This is congruent with requirements of shared decision-making as opposed to the traditional administrative type, who examine their consequences analytically and impersonally, as would the NT's, or visionaries, of whom none were randomly selected for participation in this study.

The temperaments of five of the eight principals in the current study were typified as catalysts (NF's). This is consistent with the characteristics described by David Keirsey for NF's: drawing out the best in people, working with and through people-participative leadership, good verbal and listening skills, being sensitive to the organizational climate, expressing empathy, being creative, getting people to work harmoniously together, and learning new things, particularly about self and others. (Brownsword, 1999, p. 127). The other three principals in the study were classified as
SJ's, or traditionalist/stabilizers, who are characterized as being realistic and practical, being decisive, paying attention to rules, policies, and regulations, bringing a planned, organized approach to work, being dependable, steady workers, good at following through, and being thorough, systematic, and precise, especially with details. (Brownsword, 1999, p. 127).

The overall type and temperament profile in the current study indicated that leadership and work styles varied greatly among the types. The Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Success for All Principals were both ENFP (NF). Both principals emphasized the importance of enlisting teachers and others in consensus decision-making around common aims and ways of working together. This supports the role of the principal as described by Success for All: the role of the principal is one of facilitator and support provider. This is consistent with the strengths in Keirsey’s world of work: drawing out the best in people and working with and through people-participative leadership. “They (the NF principals) unequivocally thought that order and stability-valuable goals-grew out of the collaborative effort around building a strong school community consensus around values and goals for all children and staff. Stability and order instead of chaos would follow accordingly.”

Both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Accelerated School principals were NF’s, although as MBTI types, the Cohort 1 principal was an ENFJ, while the Cohort 2 principal was an INFJ. They both focus their attention on long-range goals, and are comfortable with decentralized structure with no clear lines of authority or fixed rules, consistent with decentralized governance issues. The cohort 1 principal’s emphasis is in terms of decision-making: “deciding in terms of own priorities/loyalties and employee
needs/wants is the most important business; people focused; historical perspective.”
(Center for Application of Psychological Type Trainer's Manual, 1997, p. 31). INFJ’s are only one percent of the population, and differ from the ENFJ in two major respects: the principal tends to make provisional decisions while reflecting, reviewing, weighing additional implications and options that may improve the quality of a decision, and will preach the decision on behalf of the school community with enthusiasm and conviction.
(Center for Application of Psychological Type Trainer’s Manual, 1997, p. 31). An ENFJ seeks to make a decision, preferably collaborative, as quickly as possible, but will make a decision known throughout the school community in a less public manner, after a careful review of their possible effects on people. This supports the temperament theory in terms of the nature and quality of the decisions of these catalysts, since they occupy different places along the gamut of collaborative options. Accelerated Schools leaders must constantly shift from the traditional role of school policy enforcer to that of facilitator, coordinator, and listener. The Accelerated principal is also a model trainer on a school coaching team. The leadership piece of Accelerated Schools is congruent with the results of the temperament study for these two principals.

The temperaments of the two Modern Red Schoolhouse principals varied somewhat. The first cohort principal, an ESTJ, was the classic managerial type, the administrator who, when effective, manages everything within the power to manage, and relishes the job. This MBTI type makes decisions objectively around concrete data, and tends to be decisive, and outgoing in personality. The ESTJ is the person who seeks to manage by making objective, decisive judgments. The second cohort principal’s MBTI type was ISTJ. This type is the opposite of the types of the Success for All principals
(ENFP). The focus for this principal is on fact gathering, using deliberate actions, being extremely clear and strong in dealing with the external world, with all decisions based on the facts at hand. The assumption would be that these two principals, although traditionalist/stabilizer MBTI types and member of the group who are statistically the most frequent type, ESTJ, would both demonstrate leadership capacities that would be amenable to collaborative governance issues. However, the ESTJ principal was, "tired, worn out, and frustrated with lack of clear direction, support, and saddled with what a disproportionately large number of students (1200) and 150 teachers. The task of simply maintaining the school was predominant. The principal did not see the school progressing in any measurable way. The first cohort Modern Red Schoolhouse principal was unable to exercise the ESTJ strengths that were demonstrated in the assessment. Modern Red Schoolhouse stresses leadership that is addressed through principal coaching, and using the results of the Skill Scope to identify needs areas and create personal improvement plans. The developer provides coaching in these areas, and continues working in the area of building instructional leadership through knowledge and support initiatives. These strategies fit both the ESTJ and ISTJ principals in this study. Because their strengths are in fact gathering and logical decision-making, the choice of this program of reform by the schools of these two building administrators provided the support that they each needed to enhance their non-dominant areas of leadership expertise.

The Comer principals also demonstrated differences in MBTI temperaments. The first cohort Comer principal was an ENFJ, whose strength was in deciding issues in terms of own priorities and employee needs and wants. This principal is people-focused and
uses historical perspective to a great advantage. This profile is the overall profile of the study sample group, a type profile that differs significantly from the statistically most frequent type in administrative/managerial jobs-ESTJ. The first cohort Comer principal is a classic ENFJ. Characteristics included being charismatic, dramatic, outgoing, and the center of attention. This principal self-describes as a people person and sees the key to the school’s progress as process, meeting people’s needs and engaging staff. The second cohort Comer principal is an ESTJ, the classic administrator/manager, who is strong on hands-on control but often short on vision. This is consistent with the MBTI management implications of type: possible managerial weaknesses for this type include: “Miss possibilities by shortsighted focus on task at hand; fail to see or factor in people’s feelings; over concern with rules and regulations.” (Mitroff & Kilman, 1986, [Training handout]). This principal thinks “inside the box”, but uses the visionary superintendent as the source of innovative ideas, the thinking “outside the box” that balances the “S” function of the “N” function that this principal demonstrates. The School Development Model or Comer model of school reform has several school-based teams on which the principal is an active member. The issue of implementation of model is addressed here in that Comer believes that the principal’s attitude and leadership and the level of teacher support greatly affect the quality of the implementation of the program. These traditionalist/stabilizers have strengths that include: “Being realistic and practical; being decisive; paying attention to rules, policies and regulations; bringing a planned, organized approach to work; being dependable, steady workers, good at following through; being systematic and precise, especially with details. (Brownsword, 1999, p. 123). This is consistent with the first and second cohort Comer principals, and follows that their
school's choice of whole school reform model is appropriate for the type of leadership that is practiced by these principals.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restatement of the Problem

This history of school reform efforts based on perceived iniquities in levels of funding for urban versus suburban school districts has been a major part of the education panorama for more than twenty-five years in the State of New Jersey. It began in 1973 with Robinson, et. al. v. Cahill, et. al and culminated in 1998 with Abbott v. Burke. The 1998 court decision differed from all previous cases in that, for the first time, the State Supreme Court ordered the Commissioner of Education to develop a plan that addressed all the requirements of the court decision. The Commissioner and the plaintiffs submitted reports to the Superior Court justice, who enlisted the assistance of Dr. Alan Odden of New American Schools. The legislative document that resulted was replete with specifics addressing the mandated implementation of state-approved whole school reform programs, school management teams, early childhood programs, technology issues, and facility improvement issues. The importance of school leadership was not given the same emphasis as the decentralization of school governance. In 6A: 24-1.4(b) Responsibilities of Local District in the Proposed Readoption of N.J.A.C. 6:19A and Recodification to N.J.A.C. 6A: 24, adopted June 7, 2000, leadership is addressed by the following: “The Chief School Administrator shall ensure that each school is led by an effective principal. The Chief School Administrator shall be guided by the Standards for School Leaders, developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, or any successor document in assessing principal effectiveness.” (Urban Education Reform in Abbott
Districts, 2000, p. 16). The legislation contains a full section (6A-24-4) addressing school-based management with no reference to the role of the principal in the process. School-based management is proscribed in detail, including team composition and all team responsibilities in terms of whole school reform implementation.

The legislation clearly places the responsibility for effective school leadership with the Chief School Administrator. At the same time, the legislation makes it extremely clear that the school is the governing body responsible for the decisions that will impact upon student achievement. This puts the focus on the building principal and the leadership of the school by that individual. The mandate of decentralized governance puts an additional burden on the principal in terms of the change to shared leadership. Yet there is very little that speaks directly to the principal, except in the area of budget preparation. The lack of specifics in terms of the leadership issues in the current Abbott legislation, the importance of shared leadership issues articulated in the mandated reform language of the law, and the fact that schools and their principals would have no option other than participate in both mandated reform and mandated decentralized authority precipitated this study, which investigated the role of the principal under decentralized governance in four models of whole school reform in New Jersey. The research questions investigated (a) how has working under mandated decentralized governance impacted on the principal's role as a visionary, a manager, and an instructional leader; (b) what is the extent to which the selection of one of the four whole school reform models affected the role of the principal, and, (c) how has the role of the principal under decentralized governance been affected by the principal's leadership traits as interpreted through the Keirsey interpretation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator?
Discussion

The research design was primarily a qualitative study intended to investigate issues pertaining to the role of the principal in decentralized governance and how the impact of mandated whole school reform was affected by the principals’ prior traits. (or types, as referred to by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator). Much of the literature indicates that effective leadership is the predominant element in assessing the success or failure of implementing mandated school reform. However, the focus of most of this literature is from the perspective of the implementation of decentralized governance such as site councils or school management teams rather than from the vantage point of the school leader. (Blase & Blase, 1994, p. 2).

This study sought to investigate the role of the principal under decentralized governance in four models of whole school reform in New Jersey. The research model was based on the cohort structure established by the State of New Jersey for whole school reform implementation. Initially, 28 schools were identified as being in need of mandated school reform. Those schools, from the original 28, that agreed to participate in reform during the 1998-1999 school year were considered first-cohort schools. Those that implemented reform during the 1999-2000 school year became second-cohort schools. Two additional schools were identified as being in need of reform and were part those schools during the 2000-2001 school year that comprised the third and final cohort.

Four of the whole school reform models approved by the New Jersey Department of Education were selected to be part of this study based on specific structural components: two governance models and two prescriptive models. Accelerated Schools and Comer were the two governance models selected for inclusion in this study. Success
for All and Modern Red Schoolhouse were the two prescriptive models selected. This
provided opportunity to examine the role of the principal from the two perspectives of
reform model type that were available for selection by principals in the thirty Abbott
districts. The role of the principal varies somewhat from model to model. The
governance models see the principal’s role as facilitator, coordinator, and listener. The
prescriptive models of reform view the role of the principal as one of facilitator and
support provider, building leadership with knowledge and support.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator shows leadership through management
implications of type. “Leadership development, management training, coaching
executives-by whatever name, is one of the fastest growing areas in organizational
administration of the MBTI to the study participants was coordinated with the whole
school reform models selected by each participant in terms of the model’s perceptions of
leadership and the alignment of these preferences to those demonstrated by the study
has become a key resource in leadership development and is widely used in leadership

The question of the impact of decentralized governance on the role of the
principals as visionaries, managers, leaders, facilitators, and time managers was a focus
of the current research. In general, school management teams from all study participant
schools had principals, teachers, and parents as members. The Abbott legislation is clear
as to the required composition of school management teams:

1. The membership of the SMT shall be broad based and representative
2. Of the student population and of the community's racial and ethnic composition. The SMT shall include the building principal, teachers, school-level support staff, parents, and community members. The SMT may include students. No one group identified above may constitute 50 percent or more of the SMT membership. Board members shall not serve on the SMT.

3. A school district employee shall not serve as either a parent or a community member on an SMT in that district. (Urban Education Reform Regulations in the Abbott Districts, 30 June 2000, 6A: 24-2.1.)

None of the principals in this study had school management teams that were comprised of all the required memberships that were mandated by law. School Management Teams were either elected by staff members in all the first cohort schools or selected by representative stakeholders, but were selected by representative stakeholder groups in each school by only two of the second cohort schools. The stakeholder groups were not represented as required in the content of the legislation regarding team membership, while the remaining two second-cohort schools used a volunteer procedure to form team membership. No principals in either cohort in the study directly selected team members. These results are supported by the current research on New Jersey Whole School Reform conducted by Rutgers University in January of 2001.

The implementation of whole school reform changed a traditionally hierarchical governance structure to one where the school was placed at the center of a multitude of relationships. Placing the school site at the center has forced the school to filter inconsistent messages and to prioritize competing demands. Schools have done so with limited success. Added to these new relationships was a lack of effective communication
resulting in mixed messages, new tasks or responsibilities without adequate training or capacity building among principals and SMT members, and an environment charged with high-stakes accountability and a thirty-year history of litigation. (Erlichson & Goertz, 2001, p. x).

Both first and second cohort schools found that the preparation of the budget was the major responsibility of school management teams in their respective schools. They also saw programs as an important responsibility of the team in each school in the study. However, areas such as staffing, programs, curriculum and assessment were not evidenced in each school in the study, although required by Abbott legislation as part of the responsibilities of principals and school management teams. (Urban Education Reform in the Abbott Districts, 2000, p. 21). Second-cohort school management teams were given more responsibilities than were the first cohort school management teams. This may be due to the opportunity that second cohort schools had in having school management teams in place a full year prior to the implementation of their selected whole school reform programs. The Abbot legislation is clear in terms of what the responsibilities of the school teams are to: develop and implement a WSR plan for the school, ensure curriculum alignment to the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, review assessment results, provide professional development, implement the school technology plan, implement cross-content workplace standard education programs, develop school-based reward systems, maximize participation in decision-making for both team and non-team members, and prepare the annual budget and make recommendations for teaching and administrative staffing. (Urban Education Reform in the Abbott Districts, 2000, 6A:24-2.2).
The principals of both cohorts 1 and 2 felt that mandated decentralized governance presented an increased focus on the importance of leadership in their buildings. In addition, they stated that their role as facilitator was best served in their membership on their school management teams to foster greater collaboration and consensus decision-making. Seven of the eight the principals in the current study stated that their role was in the facilitative domain. One first cohort principal, however, was overwhelmed by staff, student numbers, and perceived lack of support. This principal was clearly functioning as a manager as opposed to facilitator, coach, or leader. This manifested itself in a diminished level of model implementation at the school, further validating the importance of the role of the principal in reform implementation.

There was full agreement that time was a critical factor in the principals’ abilities to lead their schools. They agreed that there was more paperwork, generated more from state initiatives than from the models themselves, and often duplicative in nature. The majority of the principals in this study indicated that their school day extended well beyond the student and staff day, so that the paperwork could be completed. These results support the Rutgers University Study. “Among the most frequently mentioned obstacle to model implementation was simply a lack of time.” (Erlichson & Goertz, January 2001, p. x).

The second-cohort principals appeared to have a better understanding of the issue of control as it relates to decentralized governance under mandated reform. These principals saw control as a broad issue including their roles as leaders, directors, facilitators, and coaches. They saw control as an issue of support and encouragement for their respective staffs so that the issues of collaboration and consensus were paramount to
their commitment to whole school reform implementation. The first-cohort schools evidenced the director, facilitator, coach perspectives, but did not see their roles in this area as leadership issues.

The first cohort principals had a very short time to select a whole school reform model, establish school-based management, and implement the selected model. The impact of Abbott V began in the fall of 1998. The first cohort principals were expected to have a reform model in place as well as a school management team to oversee its implementation. The current study validates the difficulties that these principals experienced in implementing complex change in a relatively short period of time. The second cohort principals, in contrast, had a complete year to explore the various reform models and to implement school-based management before they were required to implement the reform model. The study shows that these principals have a better understanding of the requirements of Abbott V and the required decentralized governance issues inherent in the legislation. The second cohort principals in the current study demonstrated a clearer understanding of the change process in terms of creating shared leadership in their schools. Both the first and second cohort principals demonstrated their understanding of the nature of sustaining the changes that are mandated by the Abbott legislation. Research indicates that it takes three to five years to institutionalize change in a school or organization. The principals in this study have committed to this time frame, as it is a requirement of the legislation under which they are mandated to operate. The role of the principal was clearly affected by the mandate of school reform.

Successful school change requires effective leadership.

In communities, leadership is not defined as the exercise of power over others.
Instead, it is the exercise of wit and will, principal and passion, time and talent, and purpose and power in a way that allows the group to increase the likelihood that shared goals will be accomplished. In communities, leadership as power over events and people is redefined to become leadership as power to accomplish shared goals. And, when this leadership is exercised by everyone on behalf of what is shared, the school becomes a community of leaders. (Sergiovanni, 1994, pp. 170, 180).

The second cohort principals in the current study demonstrated the need for communities of leaders through their discussions about their roles and decentralized governance issues. Both first and second cohort principals understood the importance of the school management teams and their roles on these teams. Both the first and second cohort principals recognized their need to change their roles and discussed their new roles and responsibilities as facilitators and coaches, but the second cohort principals demonstrated a greater sense of shared leadership of their respective schools, including the use of the word leader in their discussions about their school management teams. (Anderson, 1993, p.2).

The implementation of mandated reform programs as well as decentralized governance created a change climate that was prescribed. Within this structure, Abbott principals and school staffs had some degree of freedom in terms of model selection. All other elements of the legislation were a mandate. The complexity of the change process, according to Michael Fullan, is clear about mandates and the new paradigm of change: “You can’t mandate what matters. The more complex the change the less you can force it.” (Fullan, 1997, p. 21). The Abbott legislation mandates a complex change process for
schools in the current study. Both the first and second cohort principals understood the nature of control as it related to initiating and sustaining change in terms of reform and decentralized governance issues. The principals saw their roles less as power, top-down directors than as facilitators and coaches.

Two of the four first cohort principals, and all of the second cohort principals selected their whole school reform models using a broad-based approach with stakeholder group involvement. The first cohort Accelerated Schools' principal selected the model for the school, and the first cohort principal Modern Red Schoolhouse principal had the model mandated from the central office, which were actions in opposition to the intent of the legislative mandate, that the school, not specifically the principal, was to be the chief selection body for the mandated reform model. The first and second cohort Success for All Principals used both a broad-based selection process as well as the required percent buy-in procedure for model selection, and were coaches and encouragers during this process. The second cohort Modern Red Schoolhouse principal also used a broad-based selection process. The second cohort Accelerated Schools' principal provided a review of several models, and then used a broad-based selection process. The first and second cohort Comer principals used the broad-based selection process as well. All principals in the study presented a facilitator and coach approach to the whole school reform model selection process, evidencing a change in the predominant top-down administrative posture in many schools to a more collaborative presence in their respective schools. These results supported the research conducted by Peterson and Warren in their study entitled "Principals' Skills and Knowledge for Shared Decision Making" where they "described work they conducted with 24 schools that
employ school based management. Three essential skills for principals emerged. “First, principals must be able to help their schools develop a clear, shared, educational vision....Second, principals must develop effective structures and processes to support shared decision-making....Third, principals must build strong and cohesive teams.” (Peterson & Warren, 1993).

The principals of the two prescriptive models of reform, Success for All and Modern Red Schoolhouse, saw their roles in the implementation of their models as managers, assuring all materials in place, scheduling all professional development training sessions for staff, and adjusting schedules to provide time for training. The principals participating in the two governance models of reform, Accelerated Schools and Comer, however, saw their roles as facilitators for reform implementation. They guided their staffs through the process, supporting staff efforts during implementation. This suggests that the type of model may impact on the role that the principal plays in implementing whole school reform: The more prescriptive and regimented the model, the more it may appear that a management approach is needed to effectively implement the model, while the more “governance”-focused the model, the more the model lends itself to a facilitator/coach posture for the participating principal.

The limitations in implementing reform were varied. The Success for All principals found supplies and substitutes the major impediments to fully implementing reform. The Modern Red Schoolhouse principals saw lack of training and the actual learning process issues that required their additional attention as school leaders. The Accelerated Schools’ principals saw the impact on instructional time and inability to compensate staff after hours as inhibiting their reform efforts. The Comer principals
found problems emanating from lack of state support as well as being district driven rather than school driven as is the requirement in the legislation.

Six of the eight the principals in the study found that their relationship with the Education Department at the State of New Jersey improved following the implementation of mandated reform. Statements about improved accessibility to the state from the school and state staff availability to assist the school characterized this improvement. They indicated that, except for the budget approval process, their respective Boards of Education were supportive, but not directly involved with reform implementation issues. The central office staffs of the districts involved in the study were found to be supportive, positive toward school efforts, and readily accessible to principals in the study.

The question of principal type affecting working under mandated decentralized governance has had an impact on the role of the principal in this study. Although principal type, according to the MBTI, appears to be closely aligned to the whole school reform models in which the principals participate, the advent of mandated reform has provided a venue through which these principals are truly exercising their leadership traits in appropriate ways for their particular personalities. This supports Donald C. Leuder’s 1983 study of leadership and the MBTI. He found that, “Not only do these results have broad implications for understanding of leadership behavior, but also the data provide considerable evidence to the construct validity of Jungian typology.” (Leuder, 1983, p. 14).

The temperament preferences favored catalysts (5) over traditionalist/stabilizers (3). Considered as a group, the principals overall type would be ENFJ, a type that Differs significantly from the most frequent type in administrative/managerial jobs-ESTJ,
or the "commandant" type. The ENFJ style would be charismatically extraverted and
decisive, focusing on collaboration, harmonious decision-making involving all staff. It is
a model of facilitative, people-oriented leadership. These individuals, on the whole, see
possibilities, meanings and relationships in the world. They tend to judge their value to
people and for people, and are effective in getting people to work effectively together to
achieve organizational goals. The goal of whole school reform is to raise student
achievement through the collaborative efforts of the principals, school staffs, and
community members. It seems clear that each principal in this study is working in a
whole school reform model that is consistent with the traits that they have relative to
leadership and workplace skills. The Standards for School Leaders from the Interstate
School Leaders Licensure Consortium (1996), makes this clear in Standard 1: "A school
administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by
facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of
learning that is shared and supported by the school community." (Standards for School

Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Studies

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the principal under mandated
decentralized governance in four models of whole school reform in New Jersey. The
major limitation of this study was the small sample size (N=8). The small size of the
sample may impact on the tentativeness of the conclusions in this study. However, the
sample was representative of the four models of whole school reform as well as first and
second cohort membership. The sample size was too small to speculate on which
temperaments or types would most likely succeed in Abbott schools. Nevertheless, the types and temperaments represented in this group would probably fit the challenges of the Abbott legislation and reform models more easily than the other temperaments. It is recommended that future research should include a multiple number of principals in each cohort and model, to better ascertain the congruence between leadership traits and model, as well as perceived proactivity toward decentralized governance.

The findings of this study have begun to address the role of the principal in school reform with a focus on the impact of decentralized governance. There is a wealth of research on school-based management, but it is predominantly presented from the teachers’ perspectives. “School based management is a potentially valuable tool for engaging the talents and enthusiasm of far more of a school’s stakeholders than traditional, top-down governance systems.” (Wohlsetter & Mohrman, 1996b, p. 1). The results of the current study showed that the first cohort principals were more consistent in their responses to questions about their selection of whole school reform models. A majority of these principals were not able to use a broad-based selection process for reform implementation. Their central offices provided strong suggestions as to the models that the principals should promote to their respective staffs. The second-cohort schools appeared to have a clearer understanding of school-based management as pertained to the requirements of the Abbott legislation. The descriptions of their roles were predominantly as facilitator, supporter, and coach. The Standards for Leaders that are the main reference for Chief School Administrators in the current version of the Abbott legislation support the importance of shared decision-making and the role of strong instructional leaders in schools. (Urban Education Reform in the Abbott Districts,
2000, p. 16). The second-cohort principals had an investigative year prior to their first year of model implementation. They were, however, required to implement school-based management during that year. This gave those principal a full year with decentralized governance, but without model implementation, which appears to have given these principals a more comfortable role in terms of sharing leadership in their respective schools that that which the first-cohort principals experienced. And a better perspective on the issue of change as it impacted on their respective schools.

The Success for All principals demonstrated greater consistency of response than did any of the other principals in the study relative to their respective models. The principals were clear about their roles as facilitators, which was consistent with what their model supports in terms of leadership stance. The only direct reference to the role of the principal in reform implementation in Success for All is in its description of the required Advisory Committee, similar to New Jersey’s School Management Teams. (Slavin, 1996, p. 8). The Success for All principals saw the issue of lack of supplies as the single most important limitation to consistency of model implementation at their schools.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse principals had the greatest disparity in terms of response. This may be significant, in that Modern Red Schoolhouse has a training program for leadership development for principals through principal coaching as an ongoing initiative to improve the principal’s ability to implement the reform plan at the school. (Kilgore, 1997, p. 48). The first-cohort principal pushed the reform model on the school and saw the leadership role as managerial. This principal found the problems of staffing, supplies, lack of training, and lack of information impeding the progress of model implementation at the school. The second-cohort principal saw the leadership role
as facilitative. The principal became a sounding board for the staff, which helped ease
the implementation of the model at the school. The problems for this principal focused
on the learning process of the model, a different view than for the first-cohort principal.

The Accelerated Schools’ principals were consistent in their responses in the area
of their role in model implementation as facilitators and keepers of the dream. They were
consistent in their concern for lack of financial remuneration for staff members serving
on the school management teams and during budget preparation. In addition, they saw
their leadership as support and encouragement for their staffs during model
implementation, particularly since this is the only model that has a coaching team on
which the principal is an active member who turnkey trains the rest of the staff in the

The Comer or School Development principals found the lack of state support and
developer support the major limitations to full model implementation at their respective
schools. The model has a Principals’ Academy as part of the first two years of
There was no evidence of this in the responses from either Comer principal in the current
study, which supports their finding of lack of support from the developer. Their central
offices provided the impetus for model selection, but both principals used a broad-based
selection process to assure appropriate buy-in of the selected model. The first cohort
principal’s role was as leader as well as manager, while the second cohort principal found
the leadership role to be as a facilitator, in line with the tenets of the Comer model in the
in the leadership strand.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator provided information on the
The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator provided information on the organizational structure of the principals in this study and that relationship to the selection whole school reform models as well as their response to mandated decentralized governance.

The information in the study reported a match for seven of the eight principals in terms of their preferences and their selected whole school reform models. Only two of the four preference types were manifest in the current study population. Five of the eight principals demonstrated strong humanitarian (personal) focus. This is analogous to the requirements of the Abbott legislation: a focus on broad human goals, having organizations that serve people, decentralization, seeking growth and development, and strong people involvement. The remaining three principals had a strong authoritarian or impersonal thrust. Their preferences included specifics, certainty, control, narrow goals, and a focus on results. This is partially congruent to Abbot requirements in the area of focus on results, but does not support the requirement of mandated decentralized governance. The importance of congruence among the leader, the model selected, and the schools staff is a critical factor that has the potential for predicting student success. (Demarest & Fields, 1997, p. 33).

It is recommended that the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator be administered to all prospective administrative candidates in Abbott districts. School management teams, under Abbott mandates, are required to make recommendations for principal vacancies when they occur. It is further recommended that the MBTI be administered to a staff in need of a principal. The results of these two administrations could assist school in pursuing principal candidates who would be a match for the school. This could help to
ensure a greater potential for success for that school in terms of student achievement.

Karen Osterman and Susan Sullivan’s study entitled, “New Principals in an Urban Bureaucracy: A sense of Efficacy,” found that, “Strong leadership, particularly from the principal, is essential if change is to occur at the school level.” (Osterman & Sullivan, 1996, p. 661). Abbott legislation treats the issue of the effective principal in a superficial manner. The responsibility for this rests with each Chief School Administrator. The Standards for School Leaders appear to be an important link to this issue, but nowhere are there any specific requirements that bring clarity to this issue. These standards are focused on true, effective leadership, as was the intent of this study. The use of these standards in reexamining administrative evaluation instruments in Abbott districts would provide a venue for improving the quality of leadership in Abbott schools commensurate with the mandate to promote and realize high student achievement in all Abbott schools. The current Rutgers University study also does not specifically address the issue of effective leadership under state mandates. The focus is again on school-based management from the perspective of the school team rather than issues pertaining to effective leadership in those schools. (Erlichson & Goertz, January 2001).

The study reflected some lack of understanding of the requirements of the Abbott legislation. The principals in the current study demonstrated a great deal of knowledge about the regulations, but at very similar levels in terms of legislative comprehension, with gaps in areas that were critical to the potential success of model implementation at their schools. It is recommended that, when legislation is mandated that results in the level of change for school leaders that Abbott presented, that the State Department of Education has a responsibility to train the school leaders in the tenets of the actual
legislation. The responsibility of implementing a whole school reform model is difficult and complex. The requirements of mandated legislation are concerned with many issues other than whole school reform implementation. Principals and school teams need intensive training in the requirements of the law, as well as the processes for completing all required tasks. This needs to be provided by the State Education Department.

Further study in the area of principal leadership as it is affected by mandated legislation should be conducted. Although there is a great deal of research that surrounds the issue of effective leadership, little if any of that research pertains to the changes that are inherent in mandated reform legislation in terms of the effect it has on principal leadership. Replication of the current study to include multiple principals in the various reform models could provide a greater platform for this type of research to be conducted. It is hoped that this study will contribute to a better understanding of the importance of the role of the principal under mandated decentralized governance during the implementation of required whole school reform programs and will encourage more research in this area critical to success of our schools in the 21st century and beyond.
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Appendix A

Table 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reform Models</th>
<th>Success for All</th>
<th>Success for All</th>
<th>Modern Red Schoolhouse</th>
<th>Modern Red Schoolhouse</th>
<th>Comer</th>
<th>Comer</th>
<th>Accelerated Schools</th>
<th>Accelerated Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reform Cohort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years as an Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1
The Role of the Principal in Mandated Whole School Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as an Administrator (continued)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTI Identity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiersey Identity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Interview Monologue
INTRODUCTORY MONOLOGUE FOR INTERVIEW AND MYERS BRIGGS ADMINISTRATION

Thank you for your agreement to participate in this important study. The advent of mandated school reform in New Jersey has precipitated interest in the role of the principal as it pertains to mandated reform as well as mandated decentralized school governance. The information that will be collected will provide a focus on the principal, an area that has received little in-depth study in relationship to the current state mandates. The results of the interviews will provide this researcher with information about principals and their participation in four models of Whole School Reform. It will allow the researcher to examine common themes among the principals, and to relate the information to the models that they have chosen to implement. Furthermore, the information obtained from the administration of the Myers Briggs will allow the researcher to examine the possible relationship between leadership style and the type of whole school reform model chosen for his/her school.

The interview will take between one and one half-hours to complete. The Myers Briggs will require an additional thirty minutes at a later date, to be mutually agreed-upon. All personal responses will be kept confidential. Although you are not required to participate, your assistance is appreciated. Please, however, consider your participation as a contribution to the body of knowledge in leadership theory and educational practice.
Appendix C

Interview Protocol
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR DISSERTATION

1. Please describe the process that you and your school used to select the whole school reform model your school is implementing.

2. What role did you as the principal play in the selection process?

3. Please describe your role in the implementation process of your chosen model of reform.

4. What is the composition of your school management team?

5. How were the members of this team selected?

6. What are the responsibilities of the management team of your school?

7. What has been the impact of school-based management on your role as the instructional leader of your school?

8. What limitations, if any, have you experienced while implementing your chosen model of Whole School Reform?

9. Have you taken any steps to address the limitations? If so, what steps have you taken in this regard?

10. How has state-mandated school reform affected time issues for you as the principal of your school?

11. What effect has mandated reform had on reporting issues for your school?

12. How do you maintain control yet give your staff the support and encouragement needed to be effective in their work with students within the parameters of decentralized governance under whole school reform mandates?

13. What changes have you experienced in your role as principal, with the advent of whole school reform, in its requirement under current Abbott legislative guidelines, in your relationship with your district's Central Services staff, Board of Education, and with the New Jersey Department of Education?
Appendix D

Letters
Date:

Dear Superintendent (Insert Name):

I am currently enrolled in the Executive Doctoral Program at Seton Hall University. My dissertation topic is “The Role of the Principal under Decentralized Governance in Four Models of Whole School Reform in New Jersey.” I am requesting your permission to conduct this study with elementary principals in your district. The time that will be needed to participate will not interfere with the principals’ regular duties.

Interviews will be conducted, as well as the administration of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. No names of schools or principals will be used. I will submit a completed copy of my research upon completion of my dissertation to you. Please feel free to contact me at (609) 989-2868 if you have any questions.

Thanking you in advance for your anticipated permission.

Sincerely,

Gail F. Dubin
Doctoral Candidate: Seton Hall University
Dear Principal (Insert Name):

I am writing to request your participation in a study that examines the role of the principal in decentralized governance under mandated whole school reform in New Jersey. There have been a great number of studies of school leadership, but very few, if any, take into account the opinions of participants in mandated reform, that is, practicing principals.

This study will be an evaluation of principal attitudes across the state of New Jersey. As the researcher, I have chosen schools from the thirty Abbott districts to be part of the study. The schools were selected based on their participation in one of four of the state-approved models of whole school reform. I have chosen these schools as a representative sample of all Abbott schools in New Jersey. Your participation in the study will be a valuable addition to my research.

I am conducting this study as part of my doctoral dissertation in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision at Seton Hall University. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board.

Your participation in this study will consist of an interview and the administration of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The interview will take no more than one hour and one half. The Myers-Briggs will take no more than twenty-five minutes to complete. All responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Individual respondents will not be identified in this study.

I will be contacting you to ascertain your willingness to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (609) 989-2868. I greatly appreciate your time.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Gail F. Dubin
Doctoral Candidate: Seton Hall University