INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.

- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.

- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

The principal's role in establishing developmental readiness programs

Glascock, Cynthia Jane, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1987

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN ESTABLISHING

DEVELOPMENTAL READINESS PROGRAMS

by

Cynthia Jane Glascock

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1987

Approved by

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following
committee of the Graduate School at the University of
North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser _____

Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

ii

GLASCOCK, CYNTHIA JANE, Ed.D. The Principal's Role in Establishing Developmental Readiness Programs. (1987) Directed by Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. 84 pp.

The purpose of this study was to provide principals with a better understanding of their role in establishing developmental readiness programs by (1) examining the concept of developmental readiness; (2) examining the role of the principal as an instructional leader; and (3) establishing guidelines for principals as leaders in creating developmental readiness programs.

Portraiture, a type of qualitative research, provided the basis for this study. Three principals who have given leadership to a developmental readiness program were interviewed to gain insight into their roles as leaders.

The results of this study have been the development of guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs and are summarized below.

1. The principal must be knowledgeable of the developmental needs of young children.

2. The principal must seek approval from the superintendent and the board of education to initiate a new setting.

3. The principal must know the history and culture of the setting.

4. The principal must look to the future as well as the past and anticipate the consequences of each.

5. The principal and staff must identify their assumptions.

6. The principal must take time with the staff to reach and record consensus on the values that will guide the new setting.

7. The principal must establish ground rules in advance for operating the new setting.

8. The principal must separate people from the problem.

9. The principal's presentation of self is important and essential to good communication.

10. The principal and staff must recognize that adequate resources do not exist and plan accordingly.

11. The principal must establish realistic goals and objectives.

12. The principal must identify potential sources of conflict and establish a plan for dealing with them.

13. The principal must establish a realistic timetable.

14. The principal must create an environment which allows everyone the opportunity to learn, create, and grow.

15. The principal must encourage team solidarity and direct the team process.

16. The principal must support and respect staff members.

17. The principal must realize that problems will always exist and develop mechanisms for dealing with them.

18. The principal must record efforts to create the new setting.

19. The principal must evaluate the program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For many years, the criterion for school entrance has been a chronological age set by state law. Such a law assumes that all children develop at the same rate and are ready for the same experiences at the same age. However, children do not all develop at the same rate. The issue of developmental age versus chronological age has been examined now for a least 30 years. Reviews by the Hewitt Research Foundation consisting of more than 8,000 studies have not found substantial research to suggest that "normal" children should be schooled before age eight (Moore, 1985, p. 63). Some studies have indicated early school entrance as a cause for reading and emotional problems. Some have concluded that pushing students to learn before they are ready may be a detriment to later learning. Research from the Gesell Institute of Human Development reveals that possibly a third of our children who begin school based on their chronological age are overplaced and having a difficult time in school.

Elkind (1981) suggested that schools hurry children because administrators are under stress to "produce better products" (p. 48). He compared what we do to children to a

bottle factory assembly line where we fill each child a little fuller at each grade level. The comparison is frightening, but unfortunately holds more truth than most educators would choose to admit. However, it is time that educators take a long, hard look at what is happening to children in their beginning school years.

Children need to learn and want to learn, but we have a responsibility to give them the greatest opportunity for this to occur based on their developmental timetable and not on that of teachers or parents. Keniston argued that we have allowed quantitative standards to define our "children's worth" (Elkind, 1981, p. 53).

Public schools are notorious for professing to meet the individual needs of students, but this is a false claim when the developmental needs of children are overlooked. Alternatives must exist for young children who are not developmentally ready for more formalized academic learning experiences. It is the principal's responsibility to take the lead in establishing more appropriate settings within the public school for these students.

Rousseau once said:

Hold childhood in reverence, and do not be in any
hurry to judge it for good or ill... Give nature
time to work before you take over her task, lest
you interfere with her method... A child ill taught
is further from virtue than a child who has learned
nothing. (1957, p. 71).

The message is clear to those who have seen young students pushed to read and write before being ready. Alternatives exist if principals and other administrators will begin to unlock the doors.

Purpose of the Study

This study will focus on the principal's role in creating settings appropriate to the needs of developmentally young students who enter school. An understanding of the concept of developmental readiness is vital to understanding the need for more flexible programs for developmentally young school-age children.

The principal's concept of his role as an instructional leader influences programs for children in the school. An understanding of how the principal perceives curriculum directly influences the process of creating settings.

The purpose of the study is three-fold:

1. To examine the role of the principal as an instructional leader focusing on conceptions of the principalship and the principal as a leader in creating settings

2. To examine the concept of developmental readiness

3. To establish guidelines for principals as leaders in creating developmental readiness programs.

This study does not attempt to establish a particular program for developmentally young children. It only intends

to establish a need for more flexible programs to meet the needs of these children. Since the needs of children vary, it is considered more important in this study to provide guidelines for principals to apply in creating new settings to meet these needs.

Methodology

Portraiture, a type of qualitative research, provided the basis for this study. Three principals were interviewed in an effort to describe the essential features surrounding their leadership and their understanding of the developmental needs of children in the creation of a developmental readiness program. Lightfoot (1983) used portraiture in her portrayal of six schools in The Good High School. Awarded the 1984 American Educational Research Association Award, this work serves as a model for describing the persons and settings visited. Observation and ethnographic description as well as interviewing were important techniques used in the process (p. 13).

The following passage from Lightfoot's (1983) book was helpful in formulating a basis for writing portraiture:

> ...I visited the schools with a commitment to holistic, complex, contextual descriptions of reality; with a belief that environments and processes should be examined from the outsider's more distant perspective and the insider's immediate, subjective view; that the truth lies in the integration of various perspectives rather than in the choice of one as dominant and "objective"; that I must always listen for the deviant voice as an important version of the truth (and as a useful indicator

of what the culture or social group defines as normal),
not disregard it as outside of the central pattern. I
also believe... that... research should be critical and
generous, allowing subjects to reveal their many dimen-
sions and strengths, but also attempting to pierce
through the smooth and correct veneers. ...the
portraits I have written move from the inside out,
search out unspoken (often unrecognized) institutional
and interpersonal conflicts, listen for minority voices
and deviant views, and seek to capture the essences,
rather than the visible symbols of school life (pp. 13-
14).

A preconceived set of questions was not used in the
interview process. At least a day was spent with each
principal observing interactions with others, discussing
how each went about creating a developmental readiness
program, and creating a feeling for each principal's
conception as an instructional leader.

Definition of Terms

An outline of key terms provided a common frame of
reference for this study. The development of these defini-
tions was enhanced by Scheffler's The Language of Education.
Scheffler (1960) identified three types of educational
definitions:

1. Descriptive: "used for explanatory reasons to
   clarify the normal application of terms, to describe
   prior usage of terms" (pp. 15-16).

2. Stipulative: "a given term is to be understood in
   a special way for the space of some discourse or
   throughout several discourses of a certain type"
   (p. 13).

3. <u>Programmatic</u>: "to embody programs of action"

(p. 22); "an expression of a practical program"

(p. 19).

In this study the following definitions are primarily descriptive:

<u>Developmental age</u>: Age at which the child is func-
tioning overall which takes into account the social,
emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of
development.

<u>Conception</u>: A "paradigm, a pattern of thinking" as
defined by Brubaker (1985), also defined as role of
the principal.

The next definitions are stipulative:

<u>School readiness</u>: Ability to cope with the school
environment, physically, socially and emotionally,
as well as academically without undue stress.

<u>School success</u>: Achievement without undue stress.

The last two definitions are programmatic:

<u>Developmental Readiness Program</u>: A program which
allows children to be placed on the basis of
developmental age rather than intellectual level
or chronological age and which provides for their
developmental needs rather than forcing them to
function at a level they are not prepared for.

<u>Curriculum</u>: "What persons experience in a setting"
(Brubaker, 1982, p. 2).

Summary

The remainder of the study is divided into three major parts. A review of the literature in Chapter II examines the issue of developmental readiness as well as the role of the principal as an instructional leader and a leader in creating settings.

Chapter III contains portraits of three principals who have given leadership to developmental readiness programs. Attention will be given to the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. The conception of each principal's leadership is revealed.

Guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs are presented in Chapter IV. Guidelines were formulated from the portraits of the principals and other data found to be germane to the subject.

Chapter V includes a summary of the related literature and interpretations of the principals' portraits and conclusions from these findings. Recommendations are made for further study of the principal's role in establishing developmental readiness programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate the principal's role in establishing developmental readiness programs. In doing so it was necessary to explore the concept of developmental readiness and the principal's role as instructional leader. Special consideration was given to two areas: conceptions of the principalship and the principal as a leader in creating settings based on the work of Seymour Sarason.

Developmental Readiness

Much of the research relating to developmental readiness stems from the work of Arnold Gesell which began in 1911 at the Yale Clinic of Child Development and continued at the Gesell Institute of Human Development. Gesell's work was based on his contention that "humans develop in a patterned predictable way" (Ilg, Ames, Haines, & Gillespie, 1978, p. 3.)

Measuring and observing children and then summarizing the results in the form of averages for different age levels dominated research in child development during the first half of the twentieth century. These studies, known as normative, descriptive investigations, focused on a vast number of children's characteristics, ranging from

measurements of height and weight to observations of social relations. Gesell identified "maturity traits and gradients of growth" for the following aspects of developmental behavior:

1. Motor characteristics
   a. Bodily activity
   b. Eyes and hands

2. Personal hygiene
   a. Eating
   b. Sleeping
   c. Elimination
   d. Bathing and dressing
   e. Health and somatic complaints
   f. Tensional outlets

3. Emotional expression
   a. Affective attitudes
   b. Crying and related behaviors
   c. Assertion and anger

4. Fears and dreams

5. Self and sex

6. Interpersonal relations
   a. Mother-child
   b. Child-child
   c. Groupings in play

7. Play and pastimes
   a. General interest
   b. Reading
   c. Music, radio, and cinema

8. School life
   a. Adjustment to school
   b. Classroom demeanor
   c. Reading
   d. Writing
   e. Arithmetic

9. Ethical sense
   a. Blaming and alibiing
   b. Response to direction, punishment, praise
   c. Responsiveness to reason

           d.   Sense of good and bad
           e.   Truth and property

    10. Philosophic outlook
           a.   Time
           b.   Space
           c.   Language and thought
           d.   War
           e.   Death
           f.   Deity
           (Thomas, 1985, pp. 118-119)

Gesell adopted a multifaceted view of children. His descriptions of behavior by age levels is highly recognized today. There are complaints by some that his work focused too much on typical behaviors and that one can easily be misled as to what is an average child.

Ames, Ilg, and Learned, co-workers of Gesell, have continued his work and within the last three decades have applied the notion of developmental levels to the realm of education. They began in the 1950s to question the readiness of some children to do the work required of them at school and to study the concept of developmental age as opposed to chronological age in school-age children.

The Gesell Institute conducted a three-year study in the Hurlbutt School in Weston, Connecticut, during the late 1950s to investigate their concern of children being placed in a grade on the basis of their chronological age without consideration of their maturity or readiness level. Their subjects were kindergarten, first, and second grade students. Students were examined by means of the Gesell developmental tests as

well as others. Their results ranged from a low of 34.5% to
a high of 68% of students ready for the work of the grade in
which they had been placed on the basis of their chronolog-
ical age (Ilg et al., 1978, p. 7).

A similar study was conducted by them in 1963 using
a group of North Haven, Connecticut, kindergarten students.
Only 32% of these students were found to be ready for their
grade (Ilg et al., 1978, pp. 7-8).

In the spring of 1964, follow-up to the three-year
Weston study showed a correlation of .74 between their
original kindergarten predictions and school placement
six years later (Ilg et al., 1978, p. 9). The Gesell
Institute began publishing its findings and proposed a
system of Developmental Placement Programs as a means for
remedying the overplacement of children. A full develop-
mental placement program includes pre-kindergarten,
kindergarten, and pre-first grade. All children will not
need each of these levels.

The Gesell Institute of Human Development, in A Gift
of Time recommends one of the following placements for
kindergarten children whose developmental age may not be
consistent with their chronological age:

1. Attend a pre-kindergarten for one year followed
   by kindergarten the next year, or

2. Spend two years in kindergarten, or

3. Stay at home a year and come to kindergarten the next year, or

4. Attend kindergarten and then a pre-first grade class (1982, p. 3).

The developmental point of view recognizes children as total beings. The physical, social, emotional, and intellectual aspects of development depend on and support each other. One aspect of the child's development should not be pushed ahead of another. The developmental point of view accepts that readiness for any task has its roots in the biological/maturational makeup of the child (Carll & Richard, p. 3). School readiness is the ability to cope with the school environment physically, socially, and emotionally as well as academically and intellectually, without undue stress.

The Gesell Institute offers the following generalizations based on their research over the years:

1. Boys develop more slowly than girls in the early years.

2. Girls have a better chance for success when they are fully five before entering kindergarten and boys when they are fully five-and-a-half.

3. Intelligence cannot determine readiness.

4. A kindergarten teacher's judgement about a child and his readiness correlates well with developmental findings.

5. Educators should be willing to replace children when it is evident that a child is overplaced (Ilg et al., 1978, pp. 18-19).

Developmental placement programs are simply programs which allow children to be placed on the basis of behavior age rather than intellectual level or chronological age.

Gesell and others at the Gesell Institute were not alone in advocating that developmental readiness be taken into account when children are placed in a school program. Uphoff and Gilmore (1986) summarized their research along with the work of Forester, Huff, & Mawhinney as follows:

1. The chronological older children in a grade tend to receive many more above-average grades from teachers than do younger children in that grade.

2. Older children also are much more likely to score in the above-average range on standardized achievement tests.

3. The younger children in a grade are far more likely to have failed at least one grade than are older children.

4. The younger children in a grade are far more likely to have been referred by teachers for learning disabilities testing and subsequently have been diagnosed as being learning disabled than are older students in a grade.

5. The academic problems of younger children who were developmentally unready at school entrance often last throughout their school careers and sometimes even into adulthood (p. 86).

Moore (1985), president of the Hewitt Research Foundation, claimed that review by the Foundation of more than 8,000 studies has "failed to turn up any replicable research suggesting that normal children should be schooled before age eight" (p. 63). He asserted that John Dewey in 1898

advocated that age eight is early enough for the more formalized process of reading and writing (Moore, 1985, p. 62). He, along with Dorothy Moore and others, contended that we do not fully understand the developmental needs of children and that what is known is often ignored. They believe that the development of a child's brain, vision, hearing, perception, emotions, sociability, family and school relationships, and physical growth must be taken into account in determining readiness.

Ames (1966) reported that at least one child in three may be overplaced in school (p. 3). She also suggested that a child's behavior age rather than chronological age be used to determine readiness for school.

Hamalainen (1952) conducted a study of 4,000 children to determine the effect of school entrance age policies and found that 24% of children entering school at 4 years 9 months were found to have difficulty while only 6% of normal-aged children had similar problems (p. 410).

Donofrio (1977) recognized that children who began school together but differed in age by several months were not always alike in their readiness for school work. Miller and Norris (1967) in one of their studies found that children entering first grade between 5 years 8 months to 5 years 11 months did significantly worse on three readiness tests than did children aged 6 years and over.

Psychologists DiPasquale, Moule, and Flewelling (1980) have also done research in this area and found that boys born late in the year are significantly more likely to be referred to psychological services for academic problems in the primary grades than are boys born early in the year.

In a collection of writings compiled by Hildreth (1941), the need was established for "promoting children in terms of development rather than in terms of preconceived standards that represent what we wish children would accomplish rather than what they are actually able to achieve" (p. 7).

Gross and Gross (1977) expressed their concern for young children when only their academic needs are focused on and not their total needs. They stated:

> We are witnessing a growing emphasis upon the child as a brain; upon the cultivation of narrowly defined cognitive skills and abilities; and above all, upon the creation through our preschools and schools, of a race of children whose values and progress are judged primarily by their capacity to do well on tests of intelligence, reading readiness, or school achievement.
> Although children are whole people - full of fantasies, imagination, artistic capacities, physical grace, social inclinations, cooperation, initiative, industry, love and joy - the overt and, above all, the covert structure of our system of preschooling and schooling largely ignores these other human potentials in order to concentrate on cultivating a narrow form of intellect. (Gross & Gross, 1977, p. 236)

Doremus (1986) suggested that schools force children to work beyond their developmental readiness for two reasons. The first is "organizational efficiency" and the second is people's lack of understanding and application of child

development principles (Doremus, 1986, p. 34). This lack
of understanding is responsible for parents equating school
almost solely to academic tasks and is at the root of what
Doremus (1986) labels the "sooner is better syndrome" (p. 35).

David Elkind (1981) in The Hurried Child contended that
schools hurry children because administrators are "under
stress to produce better products" (p. 48). He proposed
that because of this pressure adults ignore that which they
know about children. He compares what we do to children to
a bottle factory assembly line where we fill each child
"a little fuller at each grade level" (Elkind, 1981, p. 48).
Elkind does not argue the fact that children need to learn
the basics, but that adults need to consider what they do
to them in the way they teach them. He quoted Kenneth
Keniston who stated:

> We measure the success of schools not by the kinds of
> human beings they promote but by whatever increases
> in reading scores they chalk up. We have allowed
> quantitative standards so central to the adult economic
> system to become the principle yardstick for our def-
> inition of our children's worth. (Elkind, 1981, p. 53)

The pressure for early academic achievement puts
pressure on children to grow up fast. According to Elkind
(1981), humans establish during childhood "...either a
firm sense of industry or an abiding sense of inferiority..."
(p. 108). Children faced with academic demands before they
are ready often meet with failure, and consequently, their
self-concept and future learning are damaged. Being bright

and being ready for formal academic experiences are two very separate issues. When children are pushed into schooling experiences for which they are not developmentally ready, their chances for failure are increased.

Economic, political, and social considerations have had their influence on the education of young children. During the 1960s, American education was sharply criticized and a push for more academic rigor began. Elkind (1986) contended that "miseducation" occurs when young children are faced with learning tasks for which they are not developmentally ready. He stated:

> We miseducate children whenever we put them at risk for no purpose. The risks of miseducating young children are both short-and long-term. The short-term risks derive from the stress, with all its attendant symptoms, that formal instruction places on children; the long-term risks are of at least three kinds: motivational, intellectual, and social. In each case, the potential psychological risks of early intervention far outweigh any potential educational gain. ...It is reasonable to conclude that the early instruction of young children derives more from the needs and priorities of adults than what we know of good pedagogy for young children. (Elkind, 1986, pp. 634, 636)

Six different alternatives are suggested by Uphoff and Gilmore for children who are not ready for more formalized academic learning experiences. These are as follows:

1. Change the cut-off date for school entrance

2. Require schools to use a developmental screening instrument to determine children's readiness before entering kindergarten or first grade

3. Allow children to repeat a grade

4. Assign unready children to programs which will meet their needs

5. "Kick the curriculum back upstairs" in the schools (Uphoff and Gilmore, 1985, pp. 89-90)

Not everyone agrees with the belief that school entrance age or developmental age is a major factor in school success. Gredler (1978) concluded from his research and the findings of Pringle, Butler, and Davis that socioeconomic status is more of a factor in school success than entrance age. Even though Gredler does not support age as a factor, he contended that what is needed is better instruction which takes into account the individual needs of children. He cautioned that another factor which may contribute to lack of school success for young children is the teacher's expectation. This is particularly true for males who are the youngest in their class.

Shepard and Smith (1986) suggested from their research that "the disadvantage of achievement experienced by some younger children in relation to older classmates may more likely be a combination of youngness and low ability" (p. 79). They agreed that the "age effect" literature does confirm that children who are youngest in their first grade class are at some disadvantage but point out that the difference is only about seven or eight percentile points on achievement (Shepard & Smith, 1986). Research by Shepard and Smith (1985), Langer, Kalk, and Searls (1984), and Miller and Norris (1967)

found that the effects of being old or young in a grade tended to decline as the grade level increased.

Shepard and Smith did not propose changing school entry age or providing developmentally young students with an extra year of school. They recommended more appropriate programs responsive to the individual needs of students.

Research by May and Welch (1984), which examined the use of developmental placement, indicated no significant differences between students who had been given an extra year prior to second grade, students who had been recommended to have an extra year whose parents had refused this option, and students who had tested to be developmentally ready for the next grade. They suggested further research which takes into account the effects of developmental placement on social-emotional growth, and like others they indicated a need for flexible programs to meet the individual needs of young children more adequately.

It is evident that further research is necessary. Developmental placement programs are young and there are numerous variables to be dealt with in the research such as self-concept, social-emotional growth, teacher expectations, and parental attitudes. The research does offer consensus on two points. The first of these is that young children have many different needs, and the second is that more flexible programs are needed to meet the varied needs of these children.

Soderman and Phillips (1986) summarized the need for further study when they stated:

> Early childhood educators must direct more attention to research and revamp early learning environments to accomodate a wider range of legitimate differences in children. We need to know more about how young children develop and to create the assessment, curricular, and evaluation tools that will enhance their human potential. And when we find children unresponsive to those tools, we must adapt the tools to better meet the children's needs. After all, that's our business. (p. 72)

The Principal as Instructional Leader

Instructional leadership is a fairly new term in the literature relative to effective principals. Edmonds (1979) cited strong instructional leadership of the principal as one of the characteristics of effective schools. Other characteristics are a clear instructional focus, teacher behaviors which convey high expectations, positive school climate conducive to teaching and learning, and program improvements based on measurement of student achievement.

De Bevoise (1984) defined the concept of instructional leadership as "those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning" (p. 15). The actions center on school-wide goals, a clear purpose of schooling, evaluation and supervision of teachers, staff development activities, and positive relationships with and among the staff.

Effective schools research by Edmonds (1979), Brookover and Lezotte (1979), and Rutter (1979) indicates that the key

factor in effective schools is the principal's leadership.

These and other researchers almost always conclude that the

principal's role is a key factor in bringing about better

school achievement. Behling and Champion (1984) stated:

> While the research is clear that principals can and
> many do have a positive impact on the instructional
> program, some schools have become so large that the
> principal's influence on the instructional program
> is less direct than was formerly the case. However,
> even in large schools, principals who have a strong
> desire to improve the instructional program seem to
> find ways through their varied administrative duties
> to influence teaching and learning. (p. 5)

Behling and Champion have identified key ideas from

the research available on the principal as an instructional

leader. They report:

1. All principals who are effective instructional
   leaders must be good managers, but not all good
   managers are good instructional leaders.

2. Leadership styles vary and no one style is best
   for improving instruction in all schools.

3. The most effective instructional leaders among
   principals view constraints differently from the
   way less successful principals do.

4. The most effective instructional leaders are able
   and aggressive strategists.

5. There is a positive relationship between the level
   of professional leadership and teachers' morale
   and performance and pupils' learning.

6. Principals must demonstrate both human consideration
   and initiation of structure to be effective.

7. Leadership styles are difficult to change.

8. Effective principals are committed to education
   and can distinguish between long-term and short-
   term instructional goals.

9. Principals who manage educational changes in their schools know how to use various decision-making processes appropriately.

10. The most effective principals often have a leadership style described as "charismatic."

11. Instructional leadership may come from the principal or others in the school.

12. Innovations and other program changes tend to dissolve without the support of the principal.

13. Some principals are involved directly and other principals influence the instructional program more indirectly.

14. Only in-depth studies of the principal reveal the full extent of the principal's influence on the instructional program.

15. While principals may feel inadequate to conduct staff development activities, they can learn to conduct meaningful training programs which can improve instruction.

16. Principals can influence staff development and the instructional program by the way they manage rewards and incentives.

17. Effective principals will use knowledge and skills that they gain from well-conceived and clearly focused inservice training to influence their own behavior and the instructional program in the school.

18. Effective time management is an important element in whether the principal has a strong, positive influence on instruction in the school.

19. Human relations is a prime factor in the success of a principal.

20. A positive school climate, while difficult to describe or measure, has impressed researchers as being present in schools that work well.

21. The principal's executive leadership has an effect on the morale of the school, teachers' professional performance, and the students' learning. (Behling and Champion, 1984, pp. 43-47)

These key ideas or concepts come from over 100 original studies reviewed by Behling and Champion.

Gersten and Carnine (1981) contended that principals are not adequately trained to be instructional leaders and that all the other demands on their time prohibit them from being key instructional leaders. Therefore, they proposed a team approach where the principal sees that others carry out the functions believed to be essential for instructional improvement.

As seen, researchers are not in agreement about who should perform the functions of educational leadership. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), Hord, Hall, and Stiegelbauer (1983), and Bossert and others (1981) are in agreement with Gersten and Carnine. Agreement is found in some of the effective instructional leadership functions. These include communicating a vision of the school's goals and standards, monitoring the performance of students and teachers, recognizing and rewarding good performance, and providing good staff development (Bossert, 1981; Dwyer & others, 1983; Duckworth, 1983; Gersten & Carnine, 1981).

Principals perform a myriad of duties and use a variety of styles in accomplishing these duties. No particular leadership style is deemed best from the research relevant to instructional leadership. De Bevoise (1984) suggested that "research needs to clarify how different styles and personalities interact with specific contexts to produce

either desirable or undesirable consequences" (p. 17). There

is a real need for research to consider more than character-

istics and functions in determining a principal's effective-

ness.

All principals are not the same. Principals perceive

their roles differently and thus establish different prior-

ities. Dwyer (1984) conducted research among principals

who were nominated by fellow administrators as successful

instructional leaders and reported the following:

> We found no single image or simple formula for success-
> ful instructional leadership. We did find principals
> engaged in effective, routine acts that required no
> new programs, innovations, or extensive changes in
> their roles. Their successes hinged on their capacity
> to connect these routine activities to their over-
> arching perspectives of the context of their schools
> and their aspirations for their students.
>   These principals assessed their environments,
> knew their limitations and strengths, and understood
> the kinds of programs and outcomes they desired for
> students. They not only saw themselves as pivotal
> points around which these elements turned, but they
> believed in their abilities to influence each of
> those parts....
>   ...But it is important to remember that the acts
> of instructional leadership that we witnessed were
> as richly varied as the settings and the individuals
> themselves. (p. 33)

Leadership has not always been defined in instructional

terms. Behling and Champion (1984) wrote that "the term

'principal' dates back to the 19th century when the head of

a school was the 'principal teacher' who had such adminis-

trative responsibilities as ordering supplies and doing

housekeeping chores in addition to teaching classes" (p. 5).

Conceptions of the Principalship

Brubaker (1985) in Emerging Conceptions of the Principalship cited the development of the principalship through five conceptions, from a Principal Teacher to a Curriculum Leader. Each conception of the principalship may be thought of a a "paradigm or pattern of thinking" (Brubaker, 1985, p. 1). One assumes certain things when accepting any conception of the principalship. These assumptions may be said to form a platform (Brubaker, 1985). Brubaker (1985) has proposed five areas to be a part of this platform: the history and culture of school settings, values, politics, aesthetics, and spiritual or religious dimensions.

"Emerging from one's platform for the principalship are the parameters of one's vision as to what the principal can be and do" (Brubaker, 1985, p. 2). This vision is referred to as one's horizon.

A description of Brubaker's five conceptions of the principalship follows:

1. Principal Teacher: Routinely engages in classroom teaching for a portion of each school day; also responsible for daily school routines and clerical duties; does not believe special training is needed to be an effective principal.

2. General Manager: Is the official liaison between the school and the central office; spends the majority of time on clerical duties; relies upon common sense and reacts to problems as they arise; has the right to give and enforce orders to teachers; implements the curriculum as mandated by the state and local school board.

3. <u>Professional and Scientific Manager</u>: Spends more time in classroom supervision than routine administrative duties; uses test data as a basis for planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction; is accustomed to the bureaucratic command-compliance organizational system; is interested in efficiency and the use of time to meet management goals and objectives.

4. <u>Administrator and Instructional Leader</u>: Recognizes that his/her role encompasses both governance functions and instructional leadership functions; handles governance functions through the bureau-cratic organizational structure; expects and accepts some friction between governance and instructional leadership functions; treats teachers as professionals, giving them significant input into staff hiring, scheduling, evaluation, procurement of materials, selection of objectives, methods, etc.

5. <u>Curriculum Leader</u>: Views the curriculum in very broad terms (more than a course of study) to mean: what each person experiences in cooperatively creating learning settings; believes that the role of principal is too complex to reduce to simple technical procedures; does not attempt to dichoto-mize administrative and instructional functions, realizing that all tasks impact on what is learned; believes that the learning of adult educators is as important as the learning of children and youth. (Brubaker & Simon, 1986, pp. 4-5)

Brubaker and Simon conducted a survey on principals' leadership roles based on these five conceptions of the principalship. Their data revealed that 71% of those surveyed view their present leadership role as "Administrator and Instructional Leader" (Brubaker & Simon, 1986, p. 5).

It is apparent that assumptions account for actions. This tacit dimension should not be ignored. There is a need to understand these assumptions so that workable theories can be formulated from which theory can be put into practice.

The available literature is a reminder that the principal is expected to be an administrative leader and a leader in the area of curriculum. The curriculum is traditionally viewed as "a course of study" which is not nearly as encompassing as Brubaker's definition of curriculum in his conception of the principal as a "Curriculum Leader". Accepting the curriculum to be "what persons experience in a setting which includes all of the interactions among persons as well as the interactions between persons and their physical environment" (Brubaker, 1982, p. 2) provides a basis for looking at the principal's role in holistic terms. The traditional view forces fragmentation as the distinction between administrative duties and curriculum leadership duties must be made.

Brubaker (1985) in "A Revisionist View of the Principal as Curriculum Leader" insisted that "this more encompassing and personal definition supports the view that many of the principal's activities known as administrivia can be turned into instructional leadership activities [and that] the principal's curriculum leadership role is therefore enhanced" (p. 175).

The principal is responsible for providing leadership to teachers, students, and others with whom he interacts in creating learning settings.

The Principal as a Leader in Creating Settings

Settings are created every day. However, it is not common to find the creation of settings being systematically

studied. Sarason, in <u>The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies</u> (1972), provided readers with a framework for creating settings. He defined the creation of settings "as any instance in which two or more people come together in new relationships over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals" (Sarason, 1972, p. 1).

Sarason explored settings from marriage to revolutions as a reminder of the vast array of settings in society.

He stated the following:

> Creating a setting is conceptually and action-wise as complex a task as can be undertaken, and if existing descriptions do not reflect these complexities - if they intimidate the would-be conscientious describer - it is all too understandable. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the complex task is made a near impossible one by the lack of an organized set of conceptions which would help select and order data according to the basic problems confronting the creation of any setting. (p. 21)

Sarason set forth many propositions or conceptions which he believes to be necessary for successfully creating and sustaining new settings. One of these is confronting history. Recognition that a problem has a history is not sufficient. "One has to know this history in a way so that its dilemmas, mistakes, and solutions can be used produc-tively now" (Sarason, 1972, p. 36). Looking at past history will be difficult because it is rarely recorded and when recorded it is not specific enough.

Rules by which individuals are governed is a necessity which, Sarason (1972) clearly argued, is a downfall of many

settings. The downfall occurs because of inept rules (if any rules) which ignore problems that are encountered. Looking at past history is vital in formulating rules.

Sarason (1972) explored in some depth the role of the leader and the leader's core group in creating settings. He summarized the role and interactions of both the leader and the core group as "a fantastically complicated social process containing one booby trap after another" (Sarason, 1972, p. 243). The dreams of leaders must eventually be exchanged for realities. How or whether leaders act on these realities can determine their survival.

The idea of "unlimited resources" is a myth (Sarason, 1972). Adequate resources do not exist.

It is also detrimental to assume that there is agreement on values and goals by all members in choosing and allocating resources in a setting.

It is important to take time to reach and record consensus on the underlying values that guide the new setting. Sarason's theory (1972) looks beyond values and includes "substantive knowledge, a historical stance, a realistic time perspective, vehicles of criticism, and the necessity for and the evils of leadership" (p. 6).

The value of a new setting is primarily judged in terms of what it does to help others. Sarason (1972) warned that "the failure to view as a coequal value what it must do for

itself results over time in rigidity in thought and action, resistance to ideas requiring change, and a parochialism which insulates it from the changing needs of the society it purports to serve" (p. 141). For settings to be sustained, it is necessary to value one which allows its members to learn, change, and grow.

New buildings designed to house new settings often interfere with the achievement of the goals of the setting. Preparing a new building for occupancy many times becomes a diversion. As a result of this diversion the programs and services to be offered in the new setting can not be given the attention and effort necessary for their establishment. Sarason (1972) contended "that building can become an end itself rather than a means to certain ends..." (p. 161).

Buildings, leaders, core group members, resources, values, history, and assumptions are all to be given consideration in creating new settings.

Sarason (1972) talked about the fact that "the more things change the more they remain the same" (p. xiii). He said that we accept this fact without really exploring the why or the alternatives to prevent such a reoccurrence. Sarason challenged us to think in new ways when creating settings in an effort to create truly new settings and to maintain them.

To begin to think in new ways and to come up with viable alternatives, one must face realities and cease living in a fantasy world. According to Sarason (1972), one must come to grips with the fact that adequate resources do not exist and ignore dealing in such a "narrow present" framework which excludes the past and future. He spoke often of the reality that there are problems and that there will always be problems. Motivation for success will not conquer obstacles encountered in creating a setting (Sarason, 1972, p. 141).

Brubaker (1985), drawing on the work of Sarason and others in his article "A Revisionist View of the Principal as Curriculum Leader", stated:

> The principal's main claim to expertise is his or her ability to exert curriculum leadership. What difference will this expertise in creating learning settings make? Learning settings should be more responsive to the needs and desires of all within such settings due to more effective communication. Doing with others, rather than doing unto others, will give legitimacy to the learning of adults, including the principal. The result should be motivation by the principal's example. Values will be central to the creation of learning settings with the central question being, 'How should we live together in learning settings?'... (p. 180).

Summary

This chapter has focused on two major topics: developmental readiness and the principal as instructional leader.

Research in the area of developmental readiness points to the fact that young children have varied needs and that

there is a need for more flexible programming to meet these differing needs. More conclusive research is needed regarding the "birthdate effect" and results of programs which provide children with extra time in school. For this to occur, better methods for evaluating programs must be utilized. At present, there is a tendency to measure student progress by academic standards alone and to ignore the physical, social, and emotional well-being of children which is vital to the concept of developmental readiness. Academics is only one area of children's needs to be given consideration.

Research verifies that principals have a positive impact on the instructional program. However, there is not agreement about who should perform the functions of educational leadership. Consensus is found regarding effective leadership functions. These include communicating a vision of the school's goals and standards, monitoring the performance of students and teachers, recognizing and rewarding good performance, and providing good staff development.

Leadership has not always been defined in instructional terms. Brubaker (1985) described five conceptions of the principalship, from a Principal Teacher to a Curriculum Leader. The role the principal assumes is based on assumptions which provide the basis for any concept.

Brubaker (1982) defined curriculum as "what persons experience in a setting which includes all of the inter-

actions between persons and their physical environment" (p. 2). This view of curriculum enables one to view all of the principal's activities in terms of instructional leadership activities.

Seymour Sarason provided a framework for creating settings. He defined the creation of settings "as any instance in which two or more people come together in new relationships over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals" (Sarason, 1972, p. 1).

Many conceptions for creating and sustaining a new setting have been suggested by Sarason. These include recognition of history, consensus of values, establishment of a time table, development of realistic goals, acknowledgment of problems, and development of mechanisms for solving problems. Assumptions of members should not be ignored as they impact on members' values. Motivation for a new setting is not enough to create or sustain a setting.

The remaining chapters will look at the principal's leadership role in creating new settings for developmentally young children.

CHAPTER III

PORTRAITS OF THREE PRINCIPALS

The portraits in this chapter are an effort to describe
three principals and the essential features surrounding their
leadership and understanding of developmental needs of child-
ren in creating a developmental readiness program in their
school. Portraiture is a type of qualitative research. As
Lightfoot (1983) stated in The Good High School:

> Even though the observer is more conscious of defining
> the canvas and shaping the connections among central
> themes, portraits seek to capture the insiders' views
> of what is important. Paradoxically, the observer
> is aware of offering shape to the portrait, and at
> the same time is aware of being shaped by the context
> (p. 14).

The gathering of data for these three portraits was a
relatively easy task, certainly easier than writing the
portraits. The three principals interviewed were eager to
share information about their developmental readiness programs
but somewhat skeptical about what might be said about them.
No preconceived questions were used in the interview even
though at times leading questions were used to keep the
dialogue flowing.

These three principals were selected because they had
each created a new setting for developmentally young children
in their school. The settings were created out of a sense
of need and recognition of students' differences.

The developmental readiness program implemented by each of these three principals is a pre-first grade class called Primary I. This class is an optional program for students who have completed kindergarten and are deemed unready to be successful in a more structured first grade setting. Primary I is an opportunity for students to function at their own developmental level rather than at one predetermined by others. It allows developmentally young students an additional year to mature and to enhance their chances for school success.

The concept of developmental age is not easily understood. It is more a qualitative than a quantitative concept. Developmental age is not a neat number like a chronological age. It has to take into account the social, emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of development.

The Primary I program is an environment for learning for those children who are six years old chronologically, but who are five or five-and-a-half developmentally. The program is movement and experience oriented and it allows students to explore and discover. Probably its most important aspect is that the individuality of each child is respected.

Establishing a developmental readiness program involves more than an acceptance of the philosophy of developmental readiness. It includes a knowledgeable principal with a well-conceived strategy for creating this new setting. The

principal's leadership is vital to a developmental readiness program.

The principals portrayed in this chapter were willing to create a new setting, one which they felt offered a better program for developmentally young children.

Emma Routh

There are more than four hundred students at New Market School where Emma Routh is in her fifth year as principal. Prior to being a principal she was an elementary classroom teacher and a director for the Chapter I program.

The school is located in Sophia, North Carolina, a small rural community in Randolph County. The buildings were constructed as early as 1928 and as recently as 1980. The school is well cared for with shrubs and flowers surrounding much of the building.

On this particular day as I go up the walk to enter the building, I meet two teachers going into the office. They are talking and laughing and stop to speak. They explain that the secretary is not in her office, but has temporarily moved to another area of the building because of allergies. The smell of fresh paint looms in the area. Emma Routh appears and reiterates the story the teachers have just told. Emma Routh disappears to answer a ringing phone explaining that that line does not ring in the secretary's temporary office. Her eyes sparkle and she laughs quietly as she

prepares for this other role.

Emma Routh is curious about exactly what I want to know from her and in her direct, non-threatening manner inquisitively inquires. She laughs and pretends not to know any more than I do. She contends that she is not an authority on developmental readiness. She developed the first readiness program in the county and has trained all the school personnel in the county who have since developed a readiness program in their school. Her eyes twinkle and she talks rapidly as she shares her story of implementing a Primary I program over three years ago. She explains, "I'm not sorry I did it, but I probably would have done some things differently if I had it to do over again." She did not make up her mind to implement a Primary I program until late May before that first year. She explains apologetically, "I knew there was a need. My kindergarten teachers really leaned on me because of the number of students they felt were not ready for first grade. I knew what needed to be done even though the groundwork had not been laid." She sold the superintendent on the idea of the new program but was cautioned not to expect everyone else to believe in the program the way she did. It was made clear that parents would have a choice as to whether or not their children would be placed in the program if recommended.

The principal wrote every parent who had a kindergarten student in the school inviting them to a meeting to explain

the Primary I program. Parent attendance was low. The parents attending had no problem with the concept of the program but, she sighs, "These parents were not the ones whose children needed the program."

She was so convinced that the Primary I program was the right thing for some children that she continued by herself testing every child she felt might be developmentally young and holding conferences with the parents of each of these children. She laments, "There was no time to train my teachers to do the necessary testing. It took most of my time, but it was something I felt really needed to be done for the sake of the students. One parent came back to talk to me five times." Sixteen parents agreed to place their child in the Primary I program. Some were skeptical, some agreed because they trusted the principal, and a few understood that their child needed an extra year to develop at his own rate. In retrospect, Emma Routh does seem amazed that the program was actually implemented that fall. "I've never decided if I should have pushed so hard to begin the program in such a short amount of time," she admits. She continues, "We have the class and I am more convinced than ever that it is good for children." She leans back, laughs lightly, and seriously says, "The thing that saved me was that I had a teacher who wanted a change and spent her whole summer preparing for the new class in the fall."

Prior to the second year, Emma Routh trained her kinder-
garten and first grade teachers to administer the Gesell
Screening Test which is the developmental readiness instru-
ment used for determining placement in addition to teacher
judgement and classroom performance. The teachers did all
the testing and conferring this year. Every kindergarten
child was tested. Students were then placed in Primary I
without parents' making the choice of accepting the recom-
mendation. One can sense the mixed feelings she had about
this process when she says, "I think if we are going to
have the program, then we should be able to place those
students who are developmentally young and will gain from
the experience. However, not giving parents a choice
created problems. Unhappy parents who do not support the
program can kill the program and I had some who tried."

The following year parents were given a choice about
placement, but parental acceptance was down during this
third year. "I was told that I was trying to glorify
myself and that I was just trying to get more teachers. I
still have staff who have not bought into the concept."

The Primary I program is now in its fourth year at New
Market School. Parents and other community members have
become more knowledgeable about the program. Parents, teachers,
and principals from surrounding communities inquire frequently
about the program. Emma Routh has requests from parents out-
side her school district to test their children. "I try to

help others when I can. We enjoy having visitors. I'm afraid I don't know as much as others expect me to know." Her modesty is sincere, but those who work with her respect her knowledge and understanding of children. "She taught me all I know," says one of her teachers.

As we are walking down the hall another teacher stops and says, "Mrs. Routh, you have got to come and see Jimmy. I am worried about his reading. I need to know what you think." Emma Routh smiles with a twinkle in her eye and responds, "I'll be glad to help, but I'm sure you know as much as I do." Her enthusiasm for children to be successful and to feel good about themselves is contagious. The classroom walls are filled with student work. Their work products can be seen in the hallways. She admits, "I have preached so much about the things I believe in that if I get out of line my teachers don't mind reminding or questioning me. I'm glad they will question me. They have taught me a lot."

Continued communication with staff, parents, and community members has been vital to the Primary I program. Emma Routh developed a booklet called Questions Parents Ask..., which has been distributed each year to kindergarten parents and anyone else who would take a copy to read or share with someone else. Information has been shared at P.T.A. meetings. Advisory council members have been

kept informed about the Primary I program. She delights in telling, "We now have a grandparents' day. We invite them to lunch and share information with them about the program. They visit in the class. We overlooked the grandparent factor during our first year and that was a big mistake." Jokingly she says, "I have convinced a lot of parents to place their children in the program either by them trusting me because I am the principal or by being able to talk a lot."

The Primary I class has gone to McDonald's for lunch today. Children are taking cookies they made "by taste" to three different nursing homes. This reminds her to tell me about the Thanksgiving dinner they had cooked. Her pride in the students' accomplishments is heard in her voice.

She asks, "Did you know I got interested in this a long time ago? I was teaching fifth graders at the time and I became so concerned about the lack of progress of some of my more capable students. It was as if they didn't care, and yet I believed that they wanted to do better." She began searching for some answers and years later was introduced to the work of Arnold Gesell. "I used the Gesell literature in rearing my own child."

The subject changes as she uncovers a chocolate santa on her desk. "I never thought I could become so involved in fundraising. You would be amazed at how many of these we have sold." In an almost apologetic tone, she explains

how much they have spent on reading materials this year. "I have learned to accept, even to encourage fundraising because it is necessary if students and teachers are going to have what they need."

"You know, I would love for them to experiment with co-principals and let me be a part of it. I would be happy being the instructional leader. I do all the other things that are expected of me, but I really like being involved in the instructional program. There is never enough time to do everything I want to do." Emma Routh spends much of her time in classrooms and meeting with teachers. She encourages creativity in her staff and encourages them to think for themselves. As one teacher says, "She isn't afraid to tell us what she thinks, but she doesn't mandate how we will do things." Routh grins as she tells me that may be true, but "I can be persuasive when I believe in something."

One enthusiast claims that Routh not only encourages creativity and independence, but allows people room to make mistakes. She is not afraid to make mistakes herself and views mistakes as a chance to learn something new.

"Everyone knows that I am not afraid to speak out," she says. "I guess I should learn not to be so out-spoken. Maybe I would stay out of trouble then."

She talks about the community being "different" and that she has had to learn over the years how to be effective with it.

We are back to our original topic, and she asks if I have seen the Primary I curriculum developed by the teacher of this class and another teacher of Primary I students in the county. Her pleasure in their accomplishment of this task is clear. She is eager to have her teacher share her expertise with others. "I am amazed at all the new things she keeps coming up with for the students. I don't have to help her. I learn from her."

"Our problems and our accolades have come from parents and their communications with each other." She doesn't seem discouraged by problems. She believes in what she and her staff are doing for developmentally young students. Her voice is quiet but serious as she admits, "We overpushed in the beginning and we promised too much. We should not make promises. I truly don't know how we made it through that first year." She sighs, "Primary I is not the answer to everything", and then says with a sense of certainty, "Those children are so confident and open. They have a sense of enthusiasm for their world. We would have killed that for most of them if we had sent them on to first grade. It is almost morally wrong not to do something." I feel wiser from my conversation with her and yet angry because all children do not have this opportunity. She shares success stories about the children who have been in the program and calls each child by name. She follows their progress closely.

There is guilt on her face when she talks about students who never entered the program because of their parents' refusal. She believes she should be able to place students where their needs will be met best.

Her mood changes as she begins to laugh and asks, "Did you know I swallowed a fly at school?" She continues by telling me about all the dairy farms that surround the school and the problems they created this fall when doors and windows were open most of the time. She is already thinking about next year's budget and the need to request screens for the windows. "I guess I should learn not to talk so much, but then people would worry about me." She makes it easy to laugh with her. It is this type of openness that makes it easy to talk with her and to listen to her.

She follows me to the door when I leave. Several classes pass us going to lunch. Teachers speak to us both and some students wave and speak to Emma Routh. They do not seem intimidated by the stranger in their presence. She smiles and responds to them. She invites me to come back. There is little doubt in my mind but what the new bulbs that have been planted against the buildings will all be blooming in the spring just as she expects and believes her students will bloom.

Stan Hedrick

There is a nip in the air as I get out of my car to go into the building. An activity bus is parked in front

of the main entrance and I see noses pressed against the windows watching me. Some students wave. The wreaths on the doors of the school catch my eye and I see the twinkling of lights on a large tree in the entrance.

I am met by the principal, Stan Hedrick, as I enter the office. He offers me coffee and his assistant principal comes out to welcome me to the school. She leaves to check on a student but indicates that she will join us later. A teacher stops to ask him a question.

Liberty School houses students in kindergarten through eighth grade. Its 675 students attend classes in buildings built from 1941 to 1979. The school is just past the business district. None of its six different buildings is visible from the front. The buildings form an interior court except for a shop building which is separate. Many members of the staff park across the street in front of the church.

There is a gingerbread house on one corner of his desk. I notice several cards on a bookshelf next to his desk. I can read the word "SUPERBOSS" on the front of one. Hedrick is outside his office talking to a teacher. I notice a bulletin board behind me. It is filled with pictures of different ball teams, newspaper clippings about the school, and other pictures. There is a picture of Hedrick with a monkey around his neck. I later found out this was a puppet named Ernestine who was used to promote a fundraising event.

There is a grin on Hedrick's face which is typical.

Hedrick sits at his desk and fidgets for a few minutes.
His face gets a little redder as he grins and asks what I
want to know. He seems to relax and with pride says, "I've
got top-notch people." They implemented a Primary I class
last year so they are only into their second year. "I can
tell you it's needed but there are other things that need
me too. It's just a part of the school around here," he
says mater-of-factly.

Hedrick shares facts from some research he has conducted
a few years ago. His data pertain to students in kindergar-
ten through fourth grade and indicate that they retain an
average of 24 students each year out of each grade level.
You can sense his frustration. "They are good kids but
frustrated and some have become discipline problems." He
shares concern that some of these students will become drop-
outs. He blames the state testing program for requiring so
much from first grade students. He talks about the pressure
on superintendents, principals, and teachers to push students
beyond what they are sometimes capable of doing. Hedrick is
excited now. His voice rises and he speaks a little faster.
"You have got to read The Hurried Child. It talks about the
pressure we place on young children." His concern is genuine
and I think I may be in for a sermon, but he relaxes and says,
"I know you know all about this and don't have time to hear

this," and in the next breath, "Primary I has prospered here at Liberty School."

Hedrick explains that the initial impetus for the program came from his kindergarten teachers. The kindergarten teachers saw a need. They had kindergarten students who did not need to repeat kindergarten, but were not ready to be successful in first grade.

Hedrick talked to the superintendent about allowing Liberty School to implement a Primary I program. Both the superintendent and the Board agreed. "I talked to Emma Routh about her mistakes. I really learned a lot from her." Emma Routh provided the training for his staff which included the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, special education teachers, and kindergarten and first grade teachers. He feels now that it was a mistake to train the special education teachers. He offers no explanation. He continues, "I don't think I should be part of it except when there is conflict." Hedrick believes that the kindergarten teachers should do all the testing with students and conferring with parents. Experience has taught him that he needs to be available to talk with parents when they are dissatisfied after conferring with the teacher. He is concerned that parents have not had anyone other than the superintendent to talk with these past two years, because he has been a part of every conference with the teacher and parent. "We

have made some mistakes in our conferences, some big ones,"
he states emphatically. The staff members oversold the pro-
gram during its first year, according to Hedrick. Now they
share information with parents and encourage parents' accep-
tance of their recommendation, but accept the parents' deci-
sions concerning placement without pressure. "Parents can
hurt you and your program when you force them into a deci-
sion."

He talks about the need for meeting students' needs
early on in their school life. "Primary I is not the answer
for every child. We have a few parents who are beginning to
demand that their child be placed in the class. These are
parents who have had or have a child in the program. They
decide that what is good for one child is good for all
children." He grins and leans forward in his chair, "We
sometimes have to urge parents to send their children on to
first grade." One senses that this is a welcomed problem.

"I know my parents and this helps. It is one of the
advantages of having been at a school for eleven years."
He hands me a copy of a newsletter he has sent to parents
this month. Newsletters are sent each month keeping parents
abreast of student and school activities as well as inform-
ing parents of staff and student accomplishments.

His mood changes and he looks worried. He shifts in
his chair and I wonder if I am keeping him from something.

Before I can ask him the phone rings in his office. He
looks at me apologetically and answers, "Stan Hedrick."
He listens mostly at first and then says, "You all had a
good basketball game yesterday. You should feel good about
that game. I really enjoyed it." He continues talking
briefly and then returns to me. "There's so much on teachers
and principals. There is no way anyone can relax." He is
worried and concerned about staff morale. They have a
courtesy committee whose task is to encourage high morale.
"We took a bus to Burlington last week to see the 'Nutcracker'.
We had a lot of fun, but not everyone went."

"I can remember a time when principals in the county
were close. We used to stick together and support each
other. Now that has changed too." He seems to pale in
color as he talks and his voice is quieter. "We need to do
something. We need each other. Often we never even know
that another principal is experiencing a problem until it is
over. We used to keep better contact." His concern is
genuine.

Hedrick is a member of "PAPA," a professional organiza-
tion for principals and assistant principals. He asks if
I am a member. I shake my head no. It is evident that he
believes in the organization as he shares in great detail
some of their goals and activities. "More people need to
join. We need to stick together and be heard." He continues

until he decides that I am not interested in joining and seems satisfied when he learns that I at least belong to another professional association.

Hedrick suggests that we visit the Primary I class. As we leave the office area he points out the new sofa and chairs outside the office area. They were not donated, but he got a "real deal." He ushers me through the media center where we stop to look at the new plants that have been added.

The students do not seem to mind our intrusion. They continue their activities. One student looks up at Hedrick, points to his blocks, and says, "I've built to the sky before." Hedrick responds with a smile, "That's great, Johnny. I like your work, but can you tell me what happened to your eye?" Hedrick listens attentively as Johnny tells about a recent accident at home. We sit at a table for a few minutes observing the students. Hedrick goes across the room and returns with a scrapbook. It is filled with pictures of students with their work products. I see copies of letters explaining the Primary I class that have been sent to parents. Hedrick tells me about each page. He calls the students in the picture by name. A student hands a bottle of glue to him to open. It is stuck. He finally opens it and with a wide grin on his face returns it to the student. Proudly he says, "They all know me. I come in here a lot. They are always doing something different."

"You like the curtains?" he asks. They were bright blue and white and covered a large window area. They seemed such a part of the comfortable atmosphere I felt in the room. "The teacher made them. I really like the way they brighten the room," he says.

The room is filled with different types of blocks, housekeeping furniture, paint easels, books, games, and other equipment and materials. Hedrick explains that he has used money from fundraising activities to purchase equipment and materials. Teachers have shared unused items with the class. "It really hasn't been a big problem. Many of the things were already here available to us."

The teacher is working at a table with six students. They are working on recognizing the letter "l". Students are designing their own "l's" with colored pieces of macaroni. Two students are finished. The teacher praises their work. Hedrick introduces me to the teacher. She makes me feel welcome and invites me to join the group. She apologizes for not greeting us earlier. She assists a student who is having trouble with his glue.

I can see Hedrick in the housekeeping center with two students. I overhear him order a double cheeseburger with onions. The boys laugh out loud and quickly deliver a plate to Hedrick with a make-believe hamburger on it.

The teacher smiles easily and talks in a quiet voice. Frequently she glances around the room and seems content

with what she sees. I begin to move away from the group and
she asks if I have any questions. She is happy with the class
and feels that the parents are too. "It's fun to watch them
grow. Their kindergarten teachers can really see a differ-
ence in them. They keep me on my toes. We do a lot of dif-
ferent activities in a day. I don't want them to get bored."
Hedrick joins us and compliments the job the teacher and aide
do. The teacher quickly responds, "He is very supportive of
us."

We visit in three other classrooms on our way back to
the office. It is snack time in the kindergarten room and
Hedrick jokingly asks a student, "Where is my sausage biscuit?"
Seven students hold out their biscuit to give to him. He
laughs and thanks the students and decides we should leave
before he gets the students in trouble. The teacher nods in
agreement but quietly tells me that they enjoy having him
come to the room.

The other classes are enjoying snacks also. In one
Hedrick invites me to meet Ralph, a hamster who was deter-
mined to hide from us. After several minutes of coaxing by
Hedrick and students, Ralph appears for a very brief visit.
Before we leave the room several students are out of their
seats talking with the principal. The teacher reminds the
students that they should be in their seats finishing up
their snack. Hedrick with a blushed face looks apologetically

at the teacher and announces that we should be on our way.
She invites us to stay. She grins and winks and says, "We
overlook him. We're really glad to see him. We missed
seeing him earlier this morning." They kid each other for
a few minutes and we are out the door.

The assistant principal joins us in the office. This
is her first year at Liberty School. Hedrick compliments
the job she has done at Liberty. He respects her opinion
and confides in her often. "She really knows how to get
things done and everyone likes her." She acknowledges her
pleasure at being at Liberty. She apologizes for not joining
us sooner. It is obvious that she is accustomed to being
a part of everything going on in the school. Before leaving
to talk with a student, she remarks, "Dr. Hedrick is good
about letting me try out my ideas with others."

"We have made some changes in our Primary I class this
year. We think it is better." His Primary I teacher had
helped to develop a Primary I curriculum this past summer.
The program encourages learning by exploration and activities
rather than learning by paper and pencil tasks.

Hedrick talks about the time spent in preparing the
entire staff for the Primary I class. He has learned from
Emma Routh the importance of everyone in the school "under-
standing" the program. Staff members have had and have
children in the class which, he feels, has helped to give

other parents more confidence in the program. He is constant-
ly looking for ways to evaluate the program but has not yet
found methods which meet the standards needed. Informal
methods have indicated positive results. "Student progress
and self-concepts have prospered," according to Hedrick. He
expects the program to continue in the future and believes it
should become a part of every primary school program. They
will continue to share information with parents through P.T.A.
meetings, advisory council meetings, and informal meetings
with parents of kindergarten students. He enjoys talking
about the class. His pride in having one of the four classes
in the school system shows in his voice and face. Crediting
others for the success of Primary I comes easily to Hedrick.
He does not hesitate to credit Emma Routh for her help and
the staff for their support and efforts.

"Come back and bring some of your teachers with you
next time. We would love to show them what we are doing."
Hedrick follows me to the door and grinning, says, "Do you
miss our steak lunches?" For years Hedrick has treated his
staff and central office personnel to a cookout with all the
trimmings at the end of the school year. He is the chief
cook and sees to it that everyone has more than enough to eat.

Hedrick cares about others. He is not afraid to try
new ideas but willingly admits to some that have not worked.
Hedrick is not afraid to take a stand on an issue but in

retrospect feels that you have to know when to back off and regroup.

Being a principal is not always easy according to Hedrick. He is having a good year which he attributes to a lot of hard work. He explains that working hard is not new for him but sometimes you have to work even harder to be successful. He feels he has gained good experience in his 11 years at Liberty and in his prior years as a "team principal" and university teacher.

Driving down the road I wonder if I remember to make others feel as good about themselves as Stan Hedrick does. That part of his job seems effortless.

Dale Stevenson

It would be hard to miss seeing the new Hardee's Restaurant which is located next to Ramseur School. The school is located on the main highway through Ramseur. This K-8 school looks new on first appearance. It is only after entering and touring the school that one becomes aware of a shop and a gym built in 1949 which were not rebuilt in 1980 with the rest of the school.

Wreaths with bright red bows and painted pictures representative of the holiday season adorn the front doors and windows. The art work has been done by students at the school. Students' art work is neatly displayed across one wall of the main entrance. A brightly decorated seven-foot

tree stands nearby, visible from the front door. A smaller decorated tree with assorted packages underneath sits atop the counter in front of the office area.

Stevenson is coming down the hallway talking to a teacher. They are laughing. He sees me and extends his hand. It is a friendly handshake. He compliments his students and staff when I mention the decorations. The principal offers me a cup of coffee. While he is getting the coffee I take a seat in his office. Next to me I notice a floor lamp with a strangely decorated lamp shade. Stevenson catches me staring at this faded yellow shade with blue and red fringe stuck around the middle and the black fringe around its bottom and immediately blushes and laughs. The lamp was presented to him by staff members in honor of his 40th birthday. They had also brought a big black hearse to school in celebration of the day. There must have been other surprises because he shook his head and indicated that they were paying him back for some of the pranks he had pulled on others. He did not seem to mind.

Stevenson was seated behind his desk and I was seated facing a wall. He must have read my mind. "I need to move that chair. I'll move to the sofa." We could.face each other now. He seems disappointed that I have not brought any teachers with me to visit his Primary I class.

Stevenson's interest in the Primary I program came from his attending a session on the program at the Fall Advisory

Council meeting for the County Schools. The information

shared at the session by Emma Routh and Stan Hedrick con-

firmed feelings Stevenson already had concerning some

students who were not successful in first grade. He had

shared the information from this meeting with kindergarten

and first grade teachers. The decision to implement a

Primary I program was jointly made between them. The

teachers were also sure that there were kindergarten students

not developmentally ready for first grade. Stevenson along

with his kindergarten and first grade teachers and guidance

counselor learned from Emma Routh more about the develop-

mental concept and how to administer and score the develop-

mental readiness screening test. He and his kindergarten

teachers visited the Primary I classes at New Market and

Liberty. They met with parents to explain the program before

testing any of their students. One of the goals at their

parent meeting was to assure parents of their making the

decision for placement. The school would only make a rec-

ommendation to them based upon test results and student

performance in the classroom. They were also careful not to

promise parents a "cure-all" for their child's school life.

"I heeded the advice Stan and Emma gave to me about not

trying to oversell the program. I think our following that

advice has made a real difference." He explains, "I really

wanted it to work. I have a daughter who needed this type

of program opportunity four years ago. Fortunately, she has made it fine, but a lot of others do not." He does not seem surprised by the 70 to 75 percent parent attendance at their initial meeting.

Time has been spent making the staff knowledgeable about developmental readiness and the purpose for the Primary I class. Support for the program was not a problem, even though Stevenson suggests that teacher interest was varied.

Ramseur's Advisory Council has been supportive of the school initiating a Primary I class. A grin comes over Stevenson's face and he admits, "My Advisory Council chairman recognized that her son was developmentally young and wanted this chance for her son to develop at his own rate. Her support was certainly a positive factor."

Information was carefully screened to give parents just enough information to make them want to ask questions and to guard against overwhelming them.

The "right" teacher for the program is important. Stevenson reports that he picked a teacher who already believed in the concept of developmental readiness and one who was well known and respected in the community.

"I helped with some of the testing but the kindergarten and first grade teachers did most of it. I did try to sit in on most of the parent conferences. I wanted to know what parents' concerns were and I also wanted to make sure

that parents were not pressured into making a decision that they could not live with." His tone of voice is sincere and it is clear that he wants to avoid problems that the other two schools have experienced when they have tried to "sell" parents on the program. Parent acceptance has been positive in most cases. "This first year has been smooth so far."

No big problems are indicated regarding the program. However, Stevenson tries to remain realistic and shares several concerns. He senses that some staff members perceive the Primary I class as a special program where students receive special privileges. He says this is just not true and explains, "It is more activity-oriented because of the needs of the students, but these same types of activities could occur in other classes if desired."

The size of the class causes him to worry about next year. "There is an effort to keep class size to about 18 to 21 students. Having to use one of our allotted teaching positions based on our total school enrollment leaves us with little flexibility regarding class size. My number of kindergarten and first grade students dictate my Primary I class unless I am lucky enough to have the magic number of developmentally young students to constitute a class."

Concern is also expressed about teachers making judgements about a student's developmental level prior to testing. He believes that teacher judgement regarding students' developmental levels is often accurate, but that patience must be

exercised in making these judgements. Stevenson has a worried look on his face. "There are too many times when factors other than developmental age are involved and it's often difficult to make the distinction without the facts."

The principal suggests that we visit the class. On the way we are detained by a couple of teachers who stop to speak. The conversation is cheerful and relaxed. One teacher jokingly asks Stevenson when he is going to get in her room today. Another wants to know if he has tried a piece of her cake yet.

As we near the Primary I class, music can be heard. It gets louder as the principal opens the door for me. I see the teacher in the circle with the students. Everyone is up following the directions of the "Hokey Pokey" record. Some students can be heard singing out the directions. The teacher acknowledges our presence with a nod and a smile. I follow Stevenson to the back of the room where he points to different activity centers that students work in each day.

Our attention is drawn to the trailer sitting in the yard outside the large window area. "We have Christmas trees in that trailer. It's a Beta Club project. We haven't sold very many yet, but we hope to sell a lot this afternoon and a lot tomorrow. With all this rain it's easier to stop by here and pick one out rather than going to the woods. Our price is good too." Stevenson will help the students sell

their trees on this rainy Friday night and the next day. He
does not seem to mind the time, but he does want to sell all
the trees so that the students will not be disappointed.

The teacher joins us. He tells her that he has been
telling me about the good job she is doing and how pleased
he is with the class. Her enthusiasm shows as she quickly
begins telling about the things they have been doing and the
changes they have seen in students. She asks Stevenson if
he happened to notice Johnny when we came in the room. They
have talked earlier about their concern for him. Johnny has
been withdrawn and shown little interest in others or progress
in his tasks. His participation in the "Hokey Pokey" has not
gone unnoticed by either of them. She tells Stevenson that
he should have been with them earlier this morning to have
heard Robert's joke for the class. She shares it with us
and Stevenson laughs. The teacher and I continue to talk.
Stevenson goes over to speak to the aide. He speaks to
several of the children. One waves to him from across the
room.

Stevenson thanks the teacher and we leave so they can
go to lunch. "Are you in a hurry? If not, we can visit
some other classes." There is both art work and class work
displayed on the walls outside teacher's doors. He comments
on the "creative talents" of his staff. "There is always
something new and different on these walls. I like seeing

the student's work."

Kindergarten students are coloring a worksheet at their desk. Stevenson walks around and looks at their work, often stopping to make a positive comment. The teacher is assisting a student and looks up at us.

In the next room the principal stops outside the student area to point to the teacher's work station. It is a workroom with storage. The upper portion is glass which allows the teacher to view the students from inside. He adds, "Every class should have one. It's one of the best things they did when they built this school."

Students are busy playing and working at different centers in the room. The teacher is at a small table with a student making a Christmas ornament. She holds up her red stained hands which sparkle with glitter and laughs. "One of these days you are going to come in here and find us all neat and cleaned up," she says. Stevenson kids her that that will never happen. She informs me that he is probably sorry that he moved her to kindergarten this year. He laughs and shakes his head. "She knows she does a good job." A half decorated tree stands behind her. Only ornaments made by students were on this tree.

There are mini-blinds on the window area in the room. They are different from the school blinds in other schools which have twisted slats and often do not pull all the way

down. Stevenson boasts that the P.T.A. has purchased mini-blinds and ceiling fans for the classrooms. "Our P.T.A. is quite active and knows how to make money. The parents really support this school. None of us especially like fundraisers, but we never complain about the benefits we get from them. We have bought equipment and materials for our Primary I class with these funds as well as other instructional items for all of our classes."

"She is a good teacher. She had taught first grade before I moved her to kindergarten. She has had to make some adjustments but she understands what these students need. Our kindergarten teachers still have a tendency to push academics more than some children are ready to handle." He seems to be thinking out loud to me as we walk down the hall.

I can not help but notice the floors as we walk. He compliments his custodial staff but also admits to helping out with the floors on occasion. He says he does not mind and it has been a good way to make the custodial staff aware of his expectations. I remember how hard it was raining when I entered the school earlier and I think about the 572 students who also entered this morning.

Stevenson inquires about my job as we walk. He has been an assistant principal at the school where I work. He asks about different staff members and talks about the

community in general. Talking reminds him of several inci-
dents with staff which he retells with humor.

Back in his office I am aware of how neat his desk top
appears. He assures me his desk is not always this way.
However, he has only been back a day since being away for
an out of town conference and has already handled all of
his mail. The bookshelf behind his desk is uncluttered
and pictures of his family are neatly displayed. His love
for sports is apparent from some other items displayed.
Being a sports enthusiast he enjoys attending the school
sponsored sports events.

Outside his office is a large bulletin board filled
with calendars of upcoming events, duty assignments for
teachers, and other informational items available for
immediate access.

Dale Stevenson believes you must treat people with
decency. Honesty is a trait he expects others to practice.
His sense of humor makes it easy for others to get to know
him. He expects the best from others and deals with every-
one in a nonthreatening, direct, straightforward manner.
Stevenson's years in service abroad and his experiences
as a teacher, coach, and administrator help him more effec-
tively relate to others. He says, "I know how I like to be
treated and I try to treat others with the same respect."
He admits to becoming impatient with others when they continue

to make the same mistake repeatedly. Dealing with minor problems before they become major problems is the norm with Dale Stevenson.

The future for Primary I at Ramseur School seems bright. The principal and community support the program. Stevenson will keep himself aware of any factors which may create concern and deal with these before they influence the program negatively. "I do not anticipate problems occurring but you never know. Things have gone so smoothly this year. I think I was smart to wait and let others try it first so I could learn from them," he says with confidence. He wants to go and visit the other Primary I classes in the county again soon because he believes he could learn even more from them now.

Being an avid golfer and knowing that I had some know- ledge of the game myself, Stevenson could not let me leave without telling a golf joke first. He loves making others laugh.

Summary

These three principals have been responsible for creating and implementing a developmental readiness program in their school. Their recognition of students' needs and willingness to take a risk reflect their school leadership. Lightfoot (1983) said it well in The Good High School when she stated:

> The people most responsible for defining the school's vision and articulating the ideological stance are the principals and headmasters of these schools. They are the voice, the mouthpiece of the instruction, and it is their job to communicate with the various constituencies. Their personal image is inextricably linked to the public persona of the institution.
>
> The literature on effective schools tends to agree on at least one point - that an essential ingredient of good schools is strong, consistent, and inspired leadership. The tone and culture of schools is said to be defined by the vision and purposeful action of the principal. He is said to be the person who must inspire the commitment and energies of his faculty; the respect, if not the admiration of his students; and the trust of his parents. He sits on the boundaries between school and community; must negotiate with the superintendent and school board; must protect teachers from external intrusions and harrasment; and must be the public imagemaker and spokesman for the school.... (p. 323).

Emma Routh, Stan Hedrick, and Dale Stevenson "match some of the stereotypic images of principals" (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 325). Their responsibilities are the same, yet their leadership styles reflect their individual characters. Respect for others, a sense of humor, and a willingness to admit to mistakes and to learn from others are traits common to all three.

These principals have been actively involved in the Primary I programs at their schools and have given the program more than just verbal support. Their knowledge and understanding of the developmental needs of young children have provided the impetus for change in their schools. Communication, both positive and negative, based on time and understanding of staff and parents has been a vital factor in the program.

Emma Routh's vitality and determination in doing what she believes in are enhanced by her charisma. Her staff respects her for her expertise. They have learned to trust her compassion for others. Principal Routh is willing to speak out, but she is also willing to listen. She expects the best from others but is far too realistic to expect the best to be perfect.

Principal Hedrick's concern for others is genuine. He represents a father figure in some ways. Offering guidance and protection are natural for him and while he is supportive of his staff, he encourages their support of each other. His own confidence allows him to admit to the need for support from his own colleagues. He thinks through decisions and seeks advice before acting blindly. However, he quickly makes decisions when necessary. A strong commitment to religion influences his attitude toward others. Concerned with retention and school dropout rates, Hedrick sees Primary I as a chance to do something positive for students.

Principal Stevenson integrates "male and female" tendencies (Lightfoot, 1983) in his leadership. Organization, efficiency, and clear expectations bring the "male" image into focus. However, his manner of interactions with others fits the "female" image. He respects others and involves them in decision-making. He supports his staff and is not afraid to joke with them. Being serious is just as easy for

him as this nonserious side which is kept intact. A straight-
forward manner accounts for the trust and respect the staff
feels for him. Dealing calmly and matter-of-factly with
potential problems is routine for Stevenson. His Primary I
class is important to him because he believes in the differ-
ence it can make in the future of some students. He will
stay involved with the program so he can offer the support
needed for its continued acceptance by staff, parents, and
community members.

Routh, Hedrick, and Stevenson created new settings in
their school. It is hoped that their experiences will make
it easier for other principals to establish developmental
readiness programs in their schools.

Their conceptions of the principalship fit neatly into
Brubaker's (1986) description of the principal as "Adminis-
trator and Instructional Leader." They believe in the con-
ception of the "Curriculum Leader", yet there is still frag-
mentation between their administrative and curriculum leadership
duties.

CHAPTER IV

GUIDELINES FOR PRINCIPALS

AS LEADERS IN ESTABLISHING DEVELOPMENTAL READINESS PROGRAMS

It is the principal's responsibility to establish more

appropriate settings for developmentally young students with-

in our public schools. Alternatives must exist for young

children who are not developmentally ready for more formal-

ized academic learning experiences.

The concept of developmental readiness is not new. The

Plowden Report (1966) stated:

> At the heart of the educational process lies the child.
> No advances in policy, no acquisitions of new equip-
> ment have their desired effect unless they are in
> harmony with the nature of the child, unless they are
> fundamentally acceptable to him.
>   Knowledge of the manner in which children develop,
> therefore, is of prime importance, both in avoiding
> educationally harmful practices and in introducing
> effective ones. (p. 7)

Educators have long accepted the fact that children do

not all develop at the same rate, yet we continue to place

them in classes which do not take their developmental needs

into account.

Creating a new setting is not an easy task. Sarason

(1972) in The Creation of Settings and Future Societies

provides principals with information which should be given

consideration when creating a new setting. Sarason (1972)

is concerned with what happens when "two or more people come together in new and sustained relationships to achieve certain goals" (p. 1). Sarason offers a sensible and useful framework for the creation of human settings.

Based on Sarason's framework, observations of three principals, and an application of the framework to their leadership, the following guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs are offered:

1. The principal must be knowledgeable of the developmental needs of young children. As Sarason (1972) related, "The heart can make up for a lot of inadequacies, but an empty head is not one of them" (p. 67). In addition to the principal's being knowledgeable, he must help his entire staff to be as knowledgeable as possible. The principal must also have a plan for educating parents and the community.

2. The principal must seek approval and support from the superintendent and the board of education when initiating the new program. The superintendent and board members must be kept informed about the program since it is realistic to assume that parents who oppose the program will contact them.

3. The principal must know the history and culture of the setting. It is necessary to identify the cultural imperatives. For example, the fact that parents and many teachers expect children to begin formal reading after kindergarten cannot be ignored. Confronting history is important. Sarason

(1972) stated, "One has to know this history in a way that problems encountered in the past can be used productively now" (p. 36).

4. The principal must look to the future as well as the past. The principal must anticipate the consequences of the past and the future. The conviction that the new setting is the best for developmentally young children, and the motivation for success will not in themselves solve all other problems.

5. The principal and staff must identify their assumptions, keeping in mind that implicit assumptions outnumber explicit assumptions. Preconceived beliefs and practices must be dealt with openly. Sharing assumptions will allow for reciprocity of perspectives and mutual understanding. When assumptions remain hidden, the obvious is often not perceived.

6. The principal, being aware that actions may contradict talk, must take time with the staff to reach and record consensus on the values that will guide the new setting. Not taking time to clarify values will often lead to conflict in a group setting.

7. The principal and staff must agree in advance on the rules, based on the explicit underlying values of the new setting.

8. The principal must separate people from the problem. The important yet difficult recognition that others' percep-

tions are their realities should not be ignored. Awareness of emotions should be kept in perspective.

9. The principal's presentation of self is important. Effective self-expression is imperative to good communication. Honesty is essential. The tendency to portray situations in an idealized manner cannot be overlooked. The principal must be mindful of presentation of-self when communicating with both staff and parents.

10. The principal along with the staff must recognize that adequate resources do not exist and in reality will never exist. Alternatives must be explored for the best allocation of available resources.

11. The principal must establish realistic goals and objectives for the new setting that are in keeping with the agreed upon values.

12. The principal must identify potential sources of conflict, and begin to establish a plan for dealing with them.

13. The principal should establish a timetable recognizing that it may not be adhered to. Problems should be anticipated and realistic alternatives explored.

14. The principal recognizing the need for learning, change, and growth, must concentrate on creating an environment that will permit continual innovation, creativity, and enthusiasm for the staff. A sense of playfulness on the

principal's part is healthy. Emphasis should be placed on the process of the setting and the "unfolding" of each member.

15. The principal must encourage team solidarity and direct the team process, being prepared to deal with those who impede the process.

16. The principal must support the staff members in their efforts and show respect for each person's potential.

17. The principal must realize that there will always be problems and build in mechanisms for facing these problems.

18. The principal must record efforts to create the new setting from the beginning.

19. The principal must evaluate the program and follow through with continuing the evaluation process, as it will take years to effectively evaluate the program.

Creating a setting is difficult, but necessary if change is to occur. These guidelines are not intended to be all-inclusive. As new settings are created and principals record their efforts, it is hoped that additional guidelines can be offered to assist principals to lead this endeavor.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The principal's role in establishing developmental readiness programs was addressed in this study to increase the awareness and understanding of school principals. Guidelines were established for principals as leaders in creating developmental readiness programs.

The criterion for school age is a chronological age set by state law which ignores the fact that all children do not develop at the same rate. Research suggests that a third of the school population starting school is over-placed. Proponents of the developmental point of view argue that a child's developmental age must be taken into consideration when placement in school is made. Developmental age takes into account the social, emotional, physical, and intellectual aspects of development at which the child is functioning overall. Developmental placement programs are simply those which allow children to be placed on the basis of developmental age rather than intellectual level or chronological age.

Being bright and being ready for formal academic experiences are two separate issues which parents and

unfortunately some educators frequently misunderstand.

Not everyone agrees with the idea that school entrance age or developmental age is a major factor in school success. However, research does offer consensus on two points. It is agreed that more flexible programs are needed to meet the varied needs of young children, and that principals are responsible for creating programs for these students.

Researchers almost always conclude that the principal's leadership is a key factor in effective schools. Principals use a variety of leadership styles and no particular style has been deemed best from research findings.

Brubaker (1985) described five conceptions of the principalship, from a Principal Teacher to a Curriculum Leader. The principal's role is based on assumptions which provide the basis for any concept.

Special attention was given to Seymour Sarason's book, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (1972). Sarason provided a framework for creating settings--fresh efforts by two or more persons who join together in sustained relationships to reach certain common goals. Sarason emphasized the need to be realistic in creating a setting. According to Sarason, one must recognize that adequate resources do not exist (which is rarely assumed) and try not to deal in a "narrow present" framework that excludes the past and future. He asserted often that there are

problems and that there will always be problems. Rules by which individuals are governed are a necessity, but Sarason clearly argued, cause the downfall of a setting. The downfall occurs because of inept rules (if any rules) which ignore problems. Looking at past history is vital in formulating rules. Buildings, leaders, core group members, resources, values, history, and assumptions are all to be given consideration in creating new settings. Sarason offered a challenge to think in new ways when creating settings in an effort to create truly new settings and to maintain them. He warned that motivation alone will not conquer the problems encountered in creating a setting.

The three principals interviewed had a vision. Their vision was to implement a developmental readiness program-a program to meet more appropriately the needs of developmentally young children who were unready to meet successfully the demands of a first grade class. The portraits described principals with different leadership styles but with many similarities. A concern and respect for others was a dominant theme among them. Their leadership could be summarized as having images associated with both "male and female stereotypes" (Lightfoot, 1983). Neither the female quality of nurturance nor the male quality of authoritativeness can be ignored. These principals willingly admitted to mistakes and concerns. Their conception of the principalship was

that of "Administrator and Instructional Leader."

Next, 19 guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs were presented based on the Sarason framework for creating settings, observations of three principals, and an application of the framework to their leadership.

Conclusions

The result of this study has been the development of guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs. The salient elements of the guidelines can be found in the 19 guidelines presented at the end of the previous chapter. These guidelines, which represent the major conclusions of the study, are summarized below:

1. The principal must be knowledgeable of the developmental needs of young children.

2. The principal must seek approval from the superintendent and the board of education to initiate a new setting.

3. The principal must know the history and culture of the setting. The cultural imperatives must be identified.

4. The principal must look to the future as well as the past and anticipate the consequences of the past and the future as they apply to the new setting.

5. The principal and staff must identify their assumptions.

6. The principal must take time with the staff to reach and record consensus on the values that will guide the new setting.

7. The principal must establish ground rules in advance for operating the new setting.

8. The principal must separate people from the problem. People's emotions should not be ignored, but they should be kept in perspective.

9. The principal's presentation of self is important and essential to good communication.

10. The principal and staff must accept the fact that adequate resources do not exist and plan accordingly.

11. The principal must establish realistic goals and objectives for the new setting.

12. The principal must identify potential sources of conflict and make plans for dealing with the problem.

13. The principal should establish a realistic timetable.

14. The principal must create an environment which allows everyone the opportunity to learn, create, and grow.

15. The principal must encourage team solidarity and direct the team process.

16. The principal must support and respect the staff.

17. The principal must accept the fact that problems will always exist and develop mechanisms for dealing with problems.

18. The principal must record efforts to create the new setting.

19. The principal must evaluate the program.

Recommendations

The information, insights, and understandings gained from this study provide impetus for further study. Programmatic use of Sarason's framework, along with information provided by three principals, was made by presenting guidelines for principals as leaders in establishing developmental readiness programs. Several other areas warrant exploration and research which will influence the principal's role in meeting the needs of young children.

Sarason (1972) offers the challenge to think in new ways when creating settings and to come up with viable alternatives. Only a few alternatives for meeting the needs of developmentally young students were addressed in this study. It was not the purpose of this study to suggest a particular program for developmentally young children. That task remains to be done in the future.

Developmental placement programs are young and there are still numerous variables to be dealt with in the research such as self-concept, socioeconomic status, social-emotional growth, teacher expectations, and parental attitudes. Some research has already occurred in these areas but results are inconclusive.

Additional qualitative studies are needed to provide data for refining the guidelines established in Chapter IV. As principals create new settings for developmentally young students and record their efforts, new understandings and problems will be revealed.

The evaluation of developmental readiness programs is an area open for further inquiry and investigative study. The writer perceives that this area needs immediate attention in order to meet the needs of young children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ames, L. B. (1966). Is your child in the wrong grade?
    New York: Harper and Row.

Behling, H. E., & Champion, R. H. (1984). The principal
    as an instructional leader. Lutherville, MD: Instruc-
    tional Improvement Institute.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective
    principal: Perspective on school leadership. Boston:
    Allyn and Bacon.

Bossert, S., Rowan, B., Dwyer, D. C. & Lee, G. V. (1981).
    The instructional management role of the principal:
    A preliminary review and conceptualization. San
    Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research
    and Development.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). Changes in school
    characteristics coincident with changes in student
    achievement. East Lansing, MI: Institute for Research
    on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State
    University.

Brubaker, D. L. (1976). Creative leadership in elementary
    schools. Dubuque, IO: Kendall/Hunt.

Brubaker, D. L. (1982). Curriculum planning. Glenview, IL:
    Scott, Foresman.

Brubaker, D. L. (1985). Emerging conceptions of the
    principalship. Unpublished manuscript.

Brubaker, D. L. (1985). A revisionist view of the principal
    as curriculum leader. Journal of Instructional Psychology,
    12(4), 175-180.

Brubaker, D. L. & Simon, L. H. (1986). How do North Carolina
    principals view themselves and other principals?
    Carolina Comment, 9(1), 4-6.

Carll, B. & Richard, N. (n.d). One piece of the puzzle.
    Lumberville, PA: Modern Learning Press.

De Bevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 15-20.

DiPasquale, G. W., Moule, A. D., & Flewelling, R. W. (1980, May). The birthday effect. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 13, 4-8.

Donofrio, A. F. (1977, June). Grade repetition: Theory of choice. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 10, 349-351.

Doremus, V. P. (1986). Forcing works for flowers, but not for children. Educational Leadership, 44(3), 32-35.

Duckworth, K. (1983). Specifying determinants of teacher and principal work. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984, February). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subleties in the principal's role. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 32-37.

Dwyer, D. C., Lee, G. V., Rowan, B. & Bossert, S. (1983). Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(1), 15-24.

Elkind, D. (1981). The hurried child. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Elkind, D. (1986, May). Formal education and early childhood education: An essential difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 631-636.

Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981). Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Gesell Institute of Human Development. (1982). A gift of time. New Haven, CT.

Gredler, G. R. (1978, May). A look at some important factors in assessing readiness for school. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11, 284-290.

Gross, B. & Gross, R. (1977). The children's right movement: Over-coming the oppression of young people. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hamalainen, A. E. (1952, March). Kindergarten-Primary entrance age in relation to later school adjustment. Elementary School Journal, 52, 406-411.

Hildreth, G. (1941). Readiness for learning. Washington, DC: Association for Childhood Education.

Hord, S. M., Hall, G. E., & Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1983). Principals don't do it alone: The role of the consigliere. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Ilg, F. L., Ames, L. B., Haines, J., & Gillespie, C. (1978). School readiness. New York: Harper and Row.

Kinchen, J. B. (1984). A framework for higher education leader performance based on frameworks of Erving Goffman and Seymour B. Sarason. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Langer, P., Kalk, J. M., & Searls, D. T. (1984). Age of admission and trends in achievement: A comparison of blacks and caucasians. American Educational Research Journal, 21, 61-78.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

May, D. C. & Welch, E. (1984, June/July). Developmental placement: Does it prevent future learning problems? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17, 338-341.

Miller, W. D. & Norris, R. C. (1967). Entrance age and school success. Journal of School Psychology, 6.

Moore, R. S. (1985, September). It depends on your aim. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 62-64.

Moore, R. S., & Moore, D., with Willey, T., Moore, D., & Kordenbrock, D. (1979). School can wait. Provo: Brigham Young University Press.

Plowden, Lady Bridget, and others. (1966). Children and their primary schools: A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Rousseau, J. J. (1957). Emile. New York: Dutton.

Rutter, M., Maugham, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., with Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools with their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sarason, S. (1972). The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1985). Boulder Valley kindergarten study: Retention practices and retention effects. Boulder: Boulder Valley Public Schools.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1986). Synthesis of research on school readiness and kindergarten retention. Education Leadership, 44(3), 78-86.

Soderman, A. K. & Phillips, M. (1986). The early education of males: Where are we failing them? Educational Leadership, 44(3), 70-72.

Thomas, R. M. (1985). Comparing theories of child development. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Uphoff, J. K. & Gilmore, J. (1985). Pupil age at school entrance - How many are ready for success? Educational Leadership, 43(1), 86-90.