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Preface

Sadness in My Heart

My thoughts flow vigorously
through my mind
as I see the tears fall endlessly
because we, the younger generation, are blind.
Blinded by the white world
and what it brings,
we forget about our world
and all our sacred native things.
We have held our tradition
for so very long.
The elders are praying, wishing,
that it will live on.
We're forgetting about them
and our future,
Slowly we're losing them
and our culture.
We can't see
how we're hurting ourselves
by losing our identity,
our culture, tradition, heritage, and ourselves.
We are not Native Americans
without our world.
We are just dark-skinned Americans
in a white world.

Vena Romero, 13-year-old Native American Student
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The purpose of this study was to provide a profile of gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse ethnic populations (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic) in the southeastern region of the United States. In this research, data from educators was analyzed by means of surveys and in-depth inquiries to provide a profile of gifted education identification procedures. The objectives for this study were to determine with respect to the identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education: their proportional representation in gifted education programs, the utilization of multiple identification measures with these populations, the consideration given to their gifted and cultural characteristics, and the availability of gifted programs designed to meet their needs. With respect to ethnically diverse students, it was concluded that they are proportionally underrepresented in gifted education, that identification procedures are not consistently differentiated for them, that some consideration is given to their characteristics during the identification process, and that there is limited availability of gifted education programs designed to meet their needs. Further study is required to examine the applicability of this research to other regions of the nation.
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Chapter 1: The Problem

Introduction

Given existing efforts to provide educational programs for all gifted and talented students, educators and researchers seek constantly to identify these special children and to offer meaningful and challenging academic experiences for them. Traditionally, the picture of gifted youngsters portrays healthy, well-developed children who may be extremely curious, possess and utilize large vocabularies, manifest independence in academic and social activities, enjoy complicated games, read extensively, question incessantly, and test above grade level (Tuttle, Becker, & Sousa, 1988; Sapon-Shevin, 1994). This portrait is typically perceived as a very homogeneous one as well, containing primarily children from the dominant culture and few from culturally diverse ethnic populations.

In many school divisions, the paramount consideration when identifying students for gifted education classes has been intelligence quotient (Torrance, 1965). Crediting Lewis Terman for the initial studies of the IQ to determine giftedness, Seagoe (1975) revealed that in many
educational settings, the IQ had become the sole determiner of admission to academically accelerated programs. Countering this easy reliance on the IQ as the measure of giftedness were numerous multi-talent approaches to defining giftedness that encompassed not only general intellectual ability but specific academic aptitude, leadership ability, psychomotor ability, and talent in the visual and performing arts (Marland, 1971). Guilford's (1967) "Structure of the Intellect" (SOI) model, while not directly challenging the IQ as a measure of intellectual potential, denoted the possibility of as many as 150 separate human abilities categorized in three dimensions: operations, content, and products. Guilford's factors offer a conceptual framework that clarifies the range of special abilities that schools can cultivate through appropriate instructional programs.

Among others challenging the traditional dependency on the IQ score, Tannenbaum's (1983) construct of giftedness suggested that five conditions account for individual giftedness: 1) superior intellect, 2) distinctive special aptitudes, 3) the correct blending of nonintellectual traits, 4) involvement in a challenging environment, and 5) the advantage of good fortune at significant periods of life. Combinations
of the five determinants vary in individuals to create different patterns of
giftedness.

Also countering the long-standing belief in a single intelligence, Gardiner (1983) proposed the existence of at least seven basic
intelligences (linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-
kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, and intrapersonal) which can more
precisely identify an individual's capabilities. Within his theory of
multiple intelligences, Gardiner sought to expand human potential
beyond the limiting parameters of a single IQ score.

Echoing the findings of research on intellectual development and
the need for more inclusive measures to determine human capabilities,
Stemberg (1985a) asserted:

There is a need to generate some kind of external standard
that goes beyond the view, often subtly hidden, that
intelligence is what IQ tests happen to measure. For
whatever its operational appeal, this view lacks
substantive theoretical grounding. (p. 44)

Frasier (1989) concurred, asserting that the emphasis on the IQ
as the sine qua non of giftedness erected a barrier to equity in gifted
programs. Focusing exclusively on a high intelligence quotient as a
qualification negates the value of many other criteria that can reflect a child's potential giftedness and frequently eliminates many culturally diverse ethnic minorities from consideration for gifted education. Although the importance of a high intelligence quotient is not to be diminished, multiple sources of creativity and innate potential must be assessed if all gifted and talented children are to be correctly diagnosed and exposed to accelerated academic programs and appropriate enrichment activities (Ford & Feist, 1993).

These additional aspects of children's creativity and ability form a multi-dimensional profile of the intellectual, psychological, and social characteristics of students which reflects their talent in the artistic as well as in the cognitive domain (Chasen, Middleton, & Connell, 1994). Not only can this profile provide valuable information and aid educators in their selection of individuals for gifted classes, but it can also guide teachers and administrators to a better understanding and appreciation of the special qualities and needs of all gifted and talented students.

Significance of the Study

To address the issue of the identification of culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education programs, both the
characteristics of gifted youngsters, the characteristics associated with culturally diverse ethnic populations, and the identification procedures for gifted programs will be explored in this regionally-based study. An urgent need exists to regard all students, both those in the dominant culture and the culturally diverse, as individuals. Research has shown that understanding the complexity of giftedness and profiling significant elements in the lives of candidates for gifted programs can assist supervisory personnel in more accurate and comprehensive assessment and placement of potentially gifted children (Ogbu, 1994).

Within the last four decades, programs for the gifted and talented have been hotly debated topics in communities across the United States. Spurred by the launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the observable need for increased academic achievement in American schools, programs and accelerated curricula for very bright children were initiated in most regions of the country. Although the necessity at the time was apparent, one continuing concern of local school authorities has been the selection of children for these accelerated classes. As far back as the early decades of this century, Terman employed the IQ as the major criterion for determining giftedness in individuals (Freeman, 1979). With his cut-off figure of 140, many children were categorically
labeled "nongifted" if they failed to achieve that magic score on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. Rarely were other criteria considered.

Although allowing the IQ alone to determine placement in gifted education programs has been a simple method to categorize people and relatively easy to accomplish, many educators now insist on the assessment of additional factors for identifying the very talented (Olague, 1993; Sternberg, 1985a). More, it is claimed, than just an IQ score constitutes giftedness; it is important to regard the whole child through a variety of assessment techniques before classifying an individual as gifted or nongifted (Davis & Rimm, 1985; Callahan & McIntire, 1994). In no area is this more vital than that of culturally diverse ethnic populations. Many children in these groups might never be identified as gifted if such a designation were solely dependent on a standardized intelligence measure.

In the current, fast-paced, technological, "Keeping up with the other industrialized nations" world, the United States can ill afford to overlook its hidden talent, the talent that is often underrepresented in gifted education programs but most assuredly is present in many of the students sitting in American schools who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations. Immediate and intensive effort is required
to provide a more equitable and comprehensive system for assessing giftedness in all students, both the culturally diverse and those who move within society's dominant culture.

Through a review of the literature on the characteristics of gifted children, the identification procedures for gifted activities, and an in-depth examination of gifted education programs in selected school divisions in southeastern states of the United States, a more complete picture of the identification of students from culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education activities will be drawn. In addition to presenting the identification procedures utilized with students from culturally diverse populations, this research will reflect the proportional representation of children from these populations in gifted education programs. To assist educators in accurately identifying minority populations for gifted education, the findings of this study will profile the utilization by selected school districts of multiple measures to identify gifted and talented children, particularly children who are representative of culturally diverse ethnic populations.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide a profile of the procedures utilized for the identification of culturally diverse ethnic minority students (African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics) for gifted education activities in selected school divisions in southeastern states (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) of the United States.

This region-specific research builds on a national study of disadvantaged gifted learners (VanTassel-Baska, Patton, & Prillaman, 1991) which found that children at-risk for identification for programs designed for gifted learners included students from ethnically and culturally diverse populations. VanTassel-Baska, Patton, and Prillaman concluded that the gifted potential of these minority students was identified less frequently than was the gifted potential of dominant population students. Within the framework of this regional research, data from the southeastern states were analyzed to provide "snapshots" of gifted identification procedures for culturally diverse ethnic populations and the "big picture" of identification of these students for gifted education programs in the southeastern section of
the nation. Results of this research offer educators a profile of practices in the identification of culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education programs in a region of the country with a substantial culturally diverse ethnic population.

Statement of the Problem

Identifying the gifted and talented is a challenge that, even with modern diagnostic techniques, continues to plague educators. With numerous variables to consider, it is not surprising that school divisions, in spite of established best practices of utilization of multiple protocols, often resort to the traditional IQ score as the determining factor for admittance into gifted and talented programs. Certainly an indicator of academic performance on a particular standardized intelligence test on a given day, the IQ alone does not bring into complete focus gifted individuals and, in many instances, does not identify such children at all.

This fact is especially true if students happen to be members of culturally diverse ethnic populations and affected by specific factors that may characterize some individuals in these groups (Ford & Harris, 1994). It is the identification for and representation in gifted education
programs of these culturally diverse ethnic minority children, particularly in states with large non-dominant populations, that require the careful attention of educators. A broader appreciation of the many intellectual, social, and psychological facets of gifted children can better guide administrators and teachers in their selection of and assistance to gifted and talented students who are members of ethnic minority populations.

Scrutinizing the assessment procedures employed in the selection of children for gifted activities is essential to ensure that tests are free of cultural bias and that they accurately measure gifted behaviors. A high IQ score alone does not a gifted child make; frequently, many other creative and artistic behaviors are buried in the "test rush" to identify and place children in accelerated programs. It is this single-mindedness of purpose and assessment that can contribute to underrepresentation of culturally diverse ethnic population students in gifted education classes.

School divisions across the nation have recognized the need for varied criteria for the accurate and equitable identification of gifted students; however, implementation of these multiple methods is
inconsistent, differing considerably among school divisions and often depending upon state and local instructional philosophy.

Research Objectives

To provide a profile of the procedures utilized for the identification of culturally diverse populations for gifted education, in this study of gifted education in 12 southeastern states, the following four research objectives were considered:

1) To determine the proportional relationships of children from culturally diverse ethnic populations who are identified for gifted education and the general and student populations of culturally diverse ethnic groups.

2) To assess the philosophy regarding and the utilization of multiple measures for the identification of giftedness in culturally diverse ethnic populations.

3) To ascertain the consideration given to the characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic population children during the identification process for gifted education.

4) To determine the availability of gifted education programs
designed to meet the needs of identified students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations.

Ethical Considerations

This research was approved by the Committee on Human Subjects in the School of Education at the College of William and Mary. The study was conducted in a manner that protected the anonymity of states, school divisions, and educational personnel who participated. The research plan was designed so that there was no necessity to use names of states, school divisions, school staff members, or students. To protect the confidentiality of participants, a numbering system provided every state and school division an assigned code number. These codes were used to tabulate the data in this dissertation. The researcher is the only individual with access to the list of codes.

Limitations of the Study

This study of the characteristics of gifted students and the influence of those characteristics on the identification of culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education programs was limited to results of the SAGE (Survey of Activities in Gifted Education) surveys.
completed by state directors of gifted education and by school divisions in southeastern states of the United States, selected case studies, articles in professional journals, authoritative books on the gifted, and references to previous research studies.

The results of this research and its implications must be reviewed in the context of the following additional limitations:

1) The sample population was limited to the 12 southeastern states and 3 school divisions (one urban, one suburban, and one rural) within each of those 12 states for a total of 36 school divisions.

2) Information utilized to measure the research objectives was limited to 1994-1995 academic year data gathered in the administration of state and division level surveys and from in-depth inquiries of selected local school divisions.

3) These data were limited by responses from 11 of the 12 states identified for the study for a state level response rate of 92%. Each state director of gifted education was asked to identify three school divisions within that state. Of the 33 divisions identified by the 11 participating states, responses were received from 31 local school districts for a local division response rate of 94%.
**Operational Definitions**

To assist the reader with terminology related to this study of culturally diverse ethnic populations and gifted education programs, a glossary of specialized vocabulary is provided.

**Culturally Diverse Ethnic Population** (also Culturally Diverse, Ethnically Diverse, Minorities, Minority Groups)

students from non-dominant cultures within a society that deviate in one or more ways from the dominant culture. In this study, culturally diverse ethnic populations include: African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics. Culturally diverse or ethnically diverse may refer to children who:

...come from different cultural backgrounds that require an understanding of the cultural perspective in order to serve them appropriately.

(Van Tassel-Baska, Patton, & Prillaman, 1989, pp. 12-13)

...come from the non-dominant populations in the United States categorized by the 1990 U.S. Census as: Black, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Other.
Dominant Culture
the principal culture in a society that rules, controls, exerts authority, and influences values and lifestyles.

Eminence
achievement based on personal qualities, abilities, or talents of a high rank or reputation.

Enrichment
an activity that supplements the standard school curriculum and offers extended intellectual and cultural experiences to gifted children.

Gifted and Talented
"...children and, whenever applicable, youth who are identified at the pre-school, elementary, or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic or leadership ability or in the performing and visual arts, and who by reason thereof require service or activities not ordinarily provided by the school." (U.S. Congress, Educational Amendment of 1978 [P.L. 95-561, IX (A)])
...persons who possess three critical traits: high creativity, high task commitment (motivation), and above-average (but not necessarily high) intellectual ability (Renzulli's Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness; Davis & Rimm, 1985).

Identification

the process of the final selection of candidates for gifted education which may include: standardized and specialized tests, nomination forms, and recommendations for gifted education programs (Platow, 1984).

Mathematically Precocious

description of individuals who evidence advanced mathematical ability at an earlier age than is to be expected.

Role Model

person, usually an adult, whose behavior, mannerisms, or way of life is emulated by others, especially the young.

Rural

pertaining to or characteristic of the country as opposed to the city.
Screening

preliminary selection of students for gifted education programs;
a method of including or excluding certain segments of the
school population generally by means of standardized test
scores, academic course grades, or teacher recommendation
(Platow, 1984).

Southeastern States of the United States

for the purpose of this study, these states included: Alabama,
Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi,
North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West
Virginia.

Suburban

district adjacent to an urban area or city; usually a smaller
residential community than a city.

Urban

pertaining to or comprising a city or town as opposed to a rural
area.
Summary

Sound educational practice and research support the importance of effectively and fairly identifying gifted children within the public schools. With regard to culturally diverse ethnic populations, there exists evidence for the need of multiple assessments to tap appropriately the talents of gifted pupils within these minority groups. In the 1970s, Torrance addressed the urgency of this issue when he wrote, “there is a great deal of giftedness among the culturally different and the waste or underuse of these resources is tragic” (1977, p.3). This study provides a profile of gifted education practices in the mid-1990s in the southeastern region of the United States with regard to the characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic minorities and the identification measures employed with students who are members of these populations.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

Sound pedagogical practices and the educational requirements of twentieth century American society demand the identification and education of all gifted children regardless of whether they are members of majority or minority populations. This review of the literature on the gifted discusses the characteristics of gifted children and the practices that can ensure a favorable and enriched climate for their special talents and intelligences. An understanding of the complexity of giftedness and the need for timely, fair, and accurate identification and instruction is essential if the hidden talent in gifted American children is to be tapped.

Family Influence As a Factor in Giftedness

Research extensively supports the significance of family relationships and influences on gifted and talented children, both those in the dominant culture of society and those who are members of
culturally diverse ethnic populations. The home life of creative children is often an intellectually stimulating one purposefully structured by the adults in the home to expand and enrich the lives of family members (Sternberg & Lubart, 1995). Primary factors within the family that can influence the success of gifted children are birth order, position, and family size. In their study of superior high school students, Pulvino and Lupton (1978) showed that first born individuals score higher on the Terman Concept Mastery Test than do their younger siblings. Additionally, first born children interact more frequently with adults and consequently tend to experience an enriched intellectual environment. Parents themselves are shown to spend increased amounts of time with the oldest child in the family. However, according to Sternberg & Lubart (1995), it may not be merely the position in the family of the first born that encourages giftedness but rather the greater financial and emotional resources that parents frequently focus on their oldest child.

Eminence of first born children is indicated in Albert's (1980) investigation of eminent persons. His study revealed that many individuals who achieved eminence were first or only children and were cognitively gifted. There are exceptions to the first born theory, particularly in the arena of statesmen and politicians (Albert, 1980) who
tend to be second or middle children in larger families. However, a high percentage of philosophers, scientists, and mathematicians fall into the first born category.

An intriguing twist to the concept of birth order is that of special family position due to the death of an older sibling. Albert’s (1980) findings indicated that this ascendancy in position can be the thrust that some otherwise gifted middle children need to rise to prominence. Statistics from the research reveal that 18% of American presidents became the oldest surviving son in childhood, thereby elevating them in their parents’ eyes and expectations.

Contrary to the common belief that early parental death has a detrimental effect on a child’s cognitive development and achievement motivation, Albert’s (1980) research contended that gifted children as a group seem to rise to the challenge and perhaps strive to live up to the deceased parent’s expectations. He did note that “males who experienced parental death by age 16 had significant reductions in their affiliation and achievement motivations and significant increases in their power motivation. (Females reacted to early parental death in an opposite manner than did males.)” (p. 94). Following the early death of parents, many of the gifted individuals studied by Albert (e.g. Charles
Darwin and Golda Meir) were raised by older siblings and eventually attained eminent stature in the absence of parental influence.

Grounding his research in Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, Armstrong (1994) studied eminence attainment of minority individuals, believing that people from all cultures attain positions of eminence regardless of their family background or position in the family. Deriving his list of eminent culturally diverse men and women not from traditional IQ scores but from their highly specialized uses of the seven intelligences (linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, and intrapersonal), the author emphasized that every culture, both minority and dominant, utilizes all seven intelligences. His list of eminent individuals from minority cultures and their individual intelligences includes: African-Americans (Toni Morrison, linguistic intelligence; George Washington Carver, logical-mathematical intelligence; Martin Luther King, Jr., interpersonal intelligence); Asian-Americans (Amy Tan, linguistic intelligence; S.I. Hayakawa, intrapersonal intelligence); Hispanics (Linda Ronstadt, musical intelligence; Frida Kahlo, spatial intelligence); and Native-Americans (Jim Thorpe, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence; Black Elk, intrapersonal intelligence). Armstrong (1994) contended that eminence
attainment could be found within the culturally diverse ethnic populations of the nation as well as within the dominant culture.

Family size, as well as the potential for attaining eminence, is also a factor when discussing the gifted and talented. As the research of Pulvino and Lupton (1978) revealed, it is advantageous for a child not only to be a first born but also to be raised in a small (1-2 children) family. Pulvino and Lupton stated that “children from large families (5 or more siblings) interact less frequently with adults than do children from smaller families and therefore have less opportunity to develop intellectual skills” (p. 212). The second child in a family of two children stands a greater chance of being gifted than does the third child in a family of six. With multiple siblings in many Hispanic, African-American, Asian-American, and Native-American families, family size may negatively affect the identification of gifted culturally diverse ethnic minority children.

In addition to birth order and family size, the education and position of talented children's parents can affect the identification of youngsters for gifted programs. Genetics, of course, plays a sizable role in the determination of innate genius, but social conditions and relationships within the family can guide some individuals on an
upward path (Laycock, 1979). There are certainly many bright children who rise above an absence of familial caring to become prestigious individuals, but for the majority, parents do play an extremely significant role in intellectual and character development. Benbow and Stanley (1980) revealed that the parents of most gifted children (98% in their study) are still living although the children do not reside with them. For culturally diverse students, the family unit often plays a major role in students’ positive or negative responses to educational programs (Ogbu, 1994).

In the Benbow and Stanley (1980) study of seventh grade Talent Search participants, a high correlation was found between the parents’ educational level and the children’s SAT scores. This was particularly true of boys’ scores and their fathers’ educational level (45% beyond college). A similar correlation was revealed between the fathers’ occupational status and the SAT scores of the youngsters, both boys and girls. In this study, occupational status was assigned points, from a Supreme Court justice with 94 to a shoe shiner with 34; the average occupational statue of the Talent Search participants' fathers was 80, a score associated with a building contractor or a factory owner. The research did not include an assessment of the mothers’ occupational
status. However, a high percentage of both fathers and mothers of students in the Talent Search were shown to be accepted, responsible members of their communities and positive role models for their bright children.

It is from these positive role models that the first expectation for gifted and talented youngsters emanate. If the children do not labor under the pressure that they place upon themselves, they certainly struggle to survive the pressure and to meet the expectations of parents who see in their children potential and the need to develop it. Albert (1978) pointed out that it is within the gifted son-father relationship that the expectations are the greatest. And it is not always a case of a father wanting his son to achieve what the father was unable to; it is frequently an expectation that this talented (probably first born) son will follow in his father's footsteps and succeed.

When it is available, dominant culture parents usually expect their daughters and sons to participate in a gifted and talented program (Colangelo & Kelly, 1983) in order to heighten the chances of using their intellect and becoming successful. Although many parents see gifted and talented education as a vehicle for stretching children's minds and expanding their critical and divergent thinking abilities, others narrowly
view these programs as the road to a better college and a higher paying job. Such desires are not lost on bright children who frequently make these expectations part of their own goals or rebel against them entirely. According to Eby & Smutny (1990) and Ford (1994), some parents from culturally diverse ethnic populations, while desiring optimum educational experiences for their children, understand that involvement in gifted activities may erect a barrier between culturally diverse ethnic minority gifted students and their community.

Another factor of familial influence is that of parental creativity in the home. Domino (1979) in a study of gifted children in their home environments discovered that bright youngsters generally live in homes where parents are involved in creative pursuits that bring them public recognition. Although some of these parents also engage in hobbies typical of the general population, it is the special activity that impresses bright youngsters and fosters their own creativity. This study additionally indicated a correlation in terms of creativity between mothers and sons and between fathers and daughters. While the home environment can do little to alter genetic ability (Burt, 1975), it can offer substantial stimulus to a talented child's creative tendencies.
An open, loving, intellectual home environment where children's questions are patiently and honestly answered and where excellence is encouraged is invaluable in bolstering the gifted child (Schwartz, 1981). Without pushing youngsters into more activities than they can reasonably handle and without comparing them to other siblings, Bloom and Sosniak (1981) suggested that parents can support the talented child's endeavors and generate a willingness to share these gifts with others in the family, the school, and the community. Accomplishing these tasks well is a job that requires tact and skill on the part of parents and frequently more than a little ingenuity (Mathews, 1981; Callahan & Kauffman, 1982; Eby & Smutny, 1990).

Although the pride in bright children is great, parents of the gifted can be overwhelmed by the emotional, physical, and monetary output needed to provide adequately for a bright youngster. Not infrequently, parental concerns deal with the gifted child's effect on other siblings and the often expensive enrichment activities and lessons that can alter a previously comfortable family life style. Perceptive and often wise beyond their years, very bright children can respond to this parental frustration with personal feelings of guilt or defiance. Research has indicated that the majority of parents are
willing to make sacrifices to enhance the gifted individual, but that they also realize the potential consequences of such sacrifices on other family members (Albert, 1980; Hackney, 1981). These sacrifices can be enormous for some African-American, Asian-American, Native-American, and Hispanic families, particularly those whose financial resources place them at a low socioeconomic level (Harris & Ford, 1991).

The presence of a gifted child can have monumental positive and negative influences on family life, but in most cases, parents find that the positive considerations far outweigh the negative ones. And when it comes to providing a challenging, concerned environment where bright youngsters can begin to reach their full potential, parents generally strive to ensure that the family, in turn, has a positive effect on the gifted child.

**Intelligence Quotient As a Criterion for Giftedness**

Of all the educators and researchers who have seen value in the concept of the IQ as a measure of giftedness, Terman stands at the forefront. Early in this century, Terman modified the Binet intelligence test (designed for French educators) for use with children in the United
States. Employing this instrument, he began one of his major longitudinal studies of gifted and talented youth (Seagoe, 1975). For decades the magic numbers of the IQ became the bottom line cut-offs for entry into gifted academic programs. And, in many instances, they were and still are the sole indicators (Mills & Tissot, 1995; Sternberg & Lubart, 1995). According to Seagoe, in one locale if students have IQ scores of 140 they are automatically candidates for the gifted program; if they score 139, they are not considered. Such a single arbitrary measure of giftedness has been challenged by researchers (Ford & Feist, 1993; Callahan & McIntire, 1994) and, in some communities, has become only one of several indices of intellectual ability as educators seek to assess more accurately giftedness in dominant and culturally diverse ethnic populations. In spite of suggestions “that a culturally sensitive, multimodal assessment and identification approach be used to identify gifted, African-American learners,” (Patton, 1992, p. 153), the use of additional measures to identify the gifted and talented has frequently not diminished the basic importance of the IQ score as a ticket to gifted education activities.

Of the current tests available to determine the IQ, two of the most commonly utilized protocols are the WISC and the Stanford-Binet
Intelligence Test. Both of these individual intelligence tests consist of a series of timed subtests encompassing verbal and quantitative skills. The WISC is used frequently with experimental and control groups in research studies (Karnes & Brown, 1980) and by educators to determine children who are gifted in the domain of general intellectual ability. Both of these instruments assess general intelligence; provide either a single IQ score or verbal, performance, and total scores; and are administered by a licensed psychologist.

In widespread use also are group intelligence tests such as the California Achievement Test (CAT) and instruments produced by Science Research Associates (SRA). These evaluative devices are sectioned by subtest; are timed; yield an equivalent IQ score as well as national and local percentiles; and may be administered by a classroom teacher or other trained educator. The Otis-Lennon Test of Mental Abilities also produces an IQ rating; since it includes a quick-scoring, reliable short form, it is frequently employed in research projects (O'Tuel et al., 1983).

With broadened definitions of gifted no longer implying merely a high IQ score, instruments such as the SOI (Structure of the Intellect) Learning Abilities Test and its Gifted Screening Form which measures
Guilford's intellectual abilities can be accurate predictors of success in gifted programs. According to O'Tuel et al. (1983), the SOI Learning Abilities Test also has the reputation of being more effective in identifying gifted minority students than do the more commonly administered IQ tests. A unique feature of the SOI Learning Abilities Test is the resulting profile of a child's strengths and weaknesses which permit the development by educators of prescriptions for differentiation to fit each individual child's needs.

Included in the Gifted Screening Form of the SOI Learning Abilities Test are subtests on cognition of figural units, cognition of semantic units, cognition of semantic relations, cognition of semantic systems, memory of symbolic units, memory of symbolic systems, convergent production of symbolic transformations, convergent production of symbolic implications, divergent production of figural units, and divergent production of semantic units. Coupled with the academic variables for a given year (grade point average, English average, math average, Otis-Lennon scores, writing sample, and teacher evaluation), the score on the SOI Learning Abilities Test correlates highly with pupil success in gifted activities (O'Tuel et al., 1983). One disadvantage of the SOI Learning Abilities Test is that it
assesses factors unique to Guilford's definition of intelligence and may not transfer easily to programs based upon definitions other than the Structure of the Intellect (Eby & Smutny, 1990).

In spite of the prominence of the SOI Learning Abilities Test, the IQ score remains an important variable (as evidenced by the presence of the Otis-Lennon score) in identifying the brightest youngsters. Communities have established base IQ scores that must be achieved for students to be considered for gifted education programs. Although Terman viewed an individual with an IQ score of 140 or above as gifted (Seagoe, 1975), most states today generally set their IQ cut-off scores for gifted education programs at approximately 130 (Albert & Runco, 1986). If the Stanford-Binet is used, an IQ score of 130 would place the student in the upper 2% of a random school population; if the student is evaluated with the WISC-R, an IQ score of 130 would indicate the upper 3% of a random school population (Sattler, 1982).

Nevertheless, a cry has been raised in many quarters against the sole use of IQ scores as measures of giftedness. Getzels and Jackson (1962), Stinespring (1991), and Callahan and McIntire (1994) enhanced the definition of giftedness by reporting on creativity and psycho-social excellence as other considerations in determining students of
exceptional ability. And the use of the IQ alone has been challenged by the American Association for Gifted Children (LeMahieu, 1980). The association defines the gifted individual as

...a person whose performance in any line of socially useful endeavor is consistently superior. This definition includes those talented in art, music, drama, and mathematics as well as those who possess mechanical and social skills and those with high abstract verbal intelligence. (p. 261)

Research reveals that although the IQ is still considered a primary factor in giftedness, increasing numbers of educators and supervisors have begun to employ additional measures to identify a child's gifted abilities (Eby & Smutny, 1990; Reyes, Fletcher, & Paez, 1996).

A final concern about the utilization of traditional measures of intelligence, particularly the Stanford-Binet and the WISC, is that they, by the nature of their content, can discriminate against children from culturally diverse ethnic populations (Yarborough & Johnson, 1983). The argument that these children do not share the culture of the majority of Americans and therefore fail to measure up in terms of IQ
scores is of concern to educators and one that test producers continually seek to remedy (Sapon-Shevin, 1994).

Reliance on the IQ as a measure of giftedness is understandable; by means of one instrument with a specific cut-off score, giftedness is an easy characteristic to quantify. Because everyone takes the same test, it appears to be fair, and it is certainly more objective than a subjective evaluation of artistic talent. But what appears to be fair is not always equitable. Yarborough and Johnson (1983) found that careful measurement and screening of each individual child, including his/her IQ score, is the current method that most educators favor as they search for the full range of potential talent in America's classrooms.

Creativity and Gifted Students

In order to understand creativity in terms of the gifted, it is important to realize that this is an elusive quality that is generally considered a desirable one by society (Dettmer, 1981). However, creative students, both those who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations and those who are members of the dominant population, are frequently at odds with regular school programs
because their learning styles and preferences are often incompatible with teacher attitudes, teaching methods, and systems of reward (Torrance, 1970).

Without placing blame, Dettmer (1981) and Sapon-Shevin (1994) found that while society prizes new ideas and solutions provided by creative individuals, these same persons are sometimes regarded as troublesome nuisances in the regular school setting. Such children are taught to adapt and behave and be creative as well. These can be conflicting roles for the creative youngster, and the teacher, involved as he/she is with other students, has little time to do more than complain about the disruptive and energetic behavior of some gifted, creative children.

Several researchers (Feldhusen & Treffinger, 1977; Callahan, 1993) have noted that many teachers do not truly understand what is meant by creativity, seeing it perhaps as the quiet little girl in the first row whose penmanship is excellent and punctuation precise. Rarely do such educators view as gifted the boy who attempts to dissect the earthworm he found at lunch and who answers questions without raising his hand; he is labeled mischievous when indeed he might be gifted. Barring unusual circumstances, if a teacher were asked to list
those students in the class who might be screened as candidates for a
gifted and talented program, this boy's name would probably never
make the list (Sapon-Shevin, 1994).

Providing teachers with information on the characteristics of
creative and gifted students guards against the occurrence of such a
situation, particularly in the case of Native-American, Hispanic, Asian-
American, and African-American populations. Unique personality traits
of creative students include being critical, being independent in
thought, showing judgment and persistence, and being highly
motivated (Dunn & Price, 1980). Combining these facts with the 18
categories of learning style characteristics, a teacher or supervisor can
obtain a fairly accurate portrait of the needs and desires of the creative
child. According to Dunn and Dunn (1978), gifted learners in the
average classroom are affected by:

A. Immediate environment - sound, light, temperature,
design

B. Emotionality - motivation, persistence, responsibility,
need for structure or flexibility.

C. Sociological needs - prefers learning alone, with peers,
with adults, in varied combinations.
D. Physical requirements - perceptual strengths or weaknesses, energy levels at different times of the day or night, a need for intake, a need for mobility and frequent breaks. (p. 21)

In their study of 109 gifted students with IQs of 130 or higher and of a control group, Dunn and Price (1980) analyzed the preference in learning styles of creative children in grades 4 through 8. It was found that gifted students preferred a formal design in their environment, desired little structure, were less responsible and more persistent than the control group, preferred to learn using their tactile and kinesthetic senses, and indicated less preference than the nongifted group for the auditory sense for learning. With regard to this last category, it was revealed that many creative children learn faster than teachers can speak and therefore prefer alternatives to merely listening to lectures. In a later study (Sternberg & Lubart, 1995), researchers discovered that personality plays a large role in creativity with the following characteristics influencing creativity positively: perseverance in the face of obstacles, willingness to take sensible risks, willingness to grow, tolerance of ambiguity, openness to experience, belief in self, and courage of one's own convictions.
Studying creativity among populations of gifted minority and disadvantaged children, Torrance (1970) found that once initial resistance and shyness were overcome, student creativity and problem solving were sparked with his "magic net" drama activity in which, under cover of the "magic net," children could become whatever person or creature that they wished to be. The timidity that masked the intelligence of some minority children diminished amid the enthusiasm and delight that they found in the folds of the colorful net (Torrance, 1970). Awareness of the learning style characteristics of creative children through a variety of teaching and learning strategies can aid the classroom teacher in identifying these students and in appreciating and cultivating their special talents.

As with children in any group, individual student achievement levels vary among the creatively gifted. In the research study of Saurenman and Michael (1980), creativity was measured as it applied to gifted upper elementary students with IQs between 132 and 170. In terms of creativity, the high achieving students significantly outdistanced their low achieving counterparts.

This finding may be explained by the apparent relationship between creativity and androgyny. Correlations in the Weinstein and
Bobko (1980) study revealed that high achieving gifted individuals show heightened scores in all aspects of creativity. A female student possessing a degree of the masculine traits of independence and assertiveness was rated higher in manifestations of creativity than was the female who showed no masculine traits at all. A similar situation revealed that boys with the feminine traits of sensitivity and understanding ranked well above nonandrogynous males in terms of creativity (Weinstein & Bobko, 1980).

Additionally, research indicates that creativity can be assessed through written instruments. Using Mednick's Remote Associates Test (RAT), subjects are presented four pairs of dissimilar objects and are instructed to write down as many uses as possible for each pair (Weinstein & Bobko, 1980); a typical pair might be a newspaper and a rock. Points from one to five are awarded for associating the objects in an ingenious, elaborate, or original manner, rather than simply placing one object in or on the other. Conclusions drawn from this study support the claim of Weinstein and Bobko that high achieving, androgynous gifted children excel on written creativity measures as well as exhibit their talents in a more traditional fashion.
Challenging exclusive reliance on typical written measurements as accurate indicators of creativity, Sternberg and Lubart (1995) favored product-centered assessments over content-limited tests that target divergent thinking (e.g. listing unusual uses for a straw). Using the product-centered approach, subjects completed parallel tasks within four domains (writing, art, advertising, and science) which were judged as either more or less creative. Sternberg and Lubart (1995) reported that the most significantly creative products were in the domains of writing and art and that interrater reliability on these instruments was high (.92).

Another important aspect of giftedness and creativity is the fact that gifted youngsters may not be gifted all of the time and in all academic endeavors. According to Eby (1983), educators should speak to the concept of “gifted behavior” instead of centering on “gifted child” characteristics. For some children, creativity peaks at certain times, and that is when they manifest gifted behavior and can benefit greatly from an accelerated curriculum. Eby (1983) indicated that it is a disservice to children to lock them into a gifted and talented program for an entire school year when they display gifted behavior for only a portion of that time. And children not designated as gifted in
September can be given the opportunity to enter the program as their creativity and gifted behavior warrant admission (Renzulli, 1980).

In addition to the obvious signs of creativity that are present when gifted children display virtuosity at the piano or paint exquisite landscapes, alert, caring teachers can easily detect in children from the dominant and minority groups the more subtle characteristics of creativity even if they are occasionally masked by restlessness and nonconformity. A youngster manifesting one or more of the following characteristics may be a candidate for gifted education (Eby, 1983):

A. Displays great curiosity and imagination.
B. Generates many solutions or alternatives.
C. Is a risk-taker; shows independence.
D. Reveals originality in oral and written work; gives unusual, unique, or clever responses.
E. Other students turn to him/her for ideas and suggestions when something must be decided.

(p. 34)

It is imperative that teachers, counselors, and supervisors perceptively view the students with whom they come in contact to ensure that gifted behavior is not overlooked in any child. Safter and
Bruch (1981) and Callahan and McIntire (1994) encouraged educators to see beyond the IQ score as a sole measure of giftedness and be aware of the more creative aspects of children's personalities that can identify them as truly imaginative and gifted.

**Psychological, Social, and Physiological Concerns**

Although not usually a major factor in determining the placement of children in gifted and talented programs, psychological, social, and physiological concerns greatly affect any child's well being. An understanding and appreciation of gifted students' feelings, adaptation to surroundings, and culture can enhance the ability of an educator to work with gifted pupils. Sensitivity in these areas is especially important as educators seek to identify gifted students from culturally diverse ethnic populations.

It is clear from the research of Tidwell (1980) that the majority of talented students in the dominant population hold positive feelings about themselves. This self-concept is directly related to their outstanding academic ability and the fact that they generally see themselves in control of their own lives. Responses to Tidwell's survey revealed that relationships for most gifted children are successful ones.
Parents are usually proud of them, teachers praise them for unique accomplishments, and at least part of their peer group admires their achievements.

Supporting Tidwell's (1980) study is the research of Lehman and Erdwins (1981) which found "gifted students scoring higher than their average IQ peers on such traits as self-sufficiency, dominance, independence, originality, nonconformity, positive self-concept, and internal locus of control" (p. 134). Employing the California Test of Personality and the Children's Social Attitude and Value Scales, Lehman and Erdwins (1981) studied third and sixth grade gifted pupils in a suburban public school. The IQ range for the experimental group was from 141 to 165; control group IQ scores were between 90 and 110. Conclusions indicate that as a group gifted students possess a more positive self-concept than do their average peers.

In spite of such findings, the psychological profile of the gifted is not always the rosy picture it might appear to be. Perhaps because they regularly tend to be introspective, bright youngsters can be devastated by family tragedy such as divorce or separation of parents. Counseling (Safter & Bruch, 1981) has proved to be invaluable in aiding these children to put psychological trauma into perspective.
Loneliness and fear, particularly of failure, are among the psychological problems shared by very bright pupils (Sapon-Shevin, 1994), especially those from the Asian-American, African-American, Native-American, and Hispanic cultures. It is not uncommon to find anxiety so magnified in some gifted students that the fear of making a “B” prevents them from enrolling in more advanced courses at appropriate intellectual levels (Safter & Bruch, 1981).

In their study of high achieving and low achieving gifted students, Saurenman and Michael (1980) found a fascinating comparison between the two groups in terms of independence and self-concept. While high achieving students manifest the positive qualities listed in the Lehman and Erdwins (1981) study, low achievers are plagued by a plethora of personality and emotional difficulties. Saurenman and Michael discovered that these dependent gifted individuals are “relatively rigid in their personalities, low in self-esteem and self-acceptance, and passive and submissive in their ways of encountering and reacting to their environment” (p. 81). They are less likely to take the initiative in a situation than high achievers are, and they frequently do not seem to have developed a sense of their own separate identity.
It is this important area of self-concept that can be a particularly troublesome one for students who are representative of minority populations. For some of these youngsters, self-concept may be directly linked to the way others react to them. A teacher's comment that such children are not working up to their potential or a parent's complaint about laziness can be damaging to the self-concepts of these students (Ford, 1994). According to Comer and Haynes (1991), rather than focusing on the positive aspects of their ability, some ethnically diverse gifted pupils see themselves as reflections of what others say about them; it is their dependence rather than their independence that can foster a negative self-image. Attempting to accommodate both their culture and their educational setting, ethnically diverse students may struggle within what McAdoo and McAdoo (1985) describe as the "implicable nexus" between the cultural experiences of African-American children and their assimilation into the world of school.

Attitudinal factors additionally contribute to the psychological picture of the gifted child. While some gifted students possess a generally positive attitude and cheerful perspective on life and school, others can be negative, show self-defeating tendencies, and be easily angered if a situation does not turn out exactly as expected. According
to Plucker (1994), some gifted students exhibit little flexibility and considerable insecurity in dealing with change and non-routine occurrences. Although many talented students complain that scholastic work is boring, repetitious, and slow-moving, Kirschenbaum (1988) found that these types of complaints are registered in greater numbers by ethnically diverse gifted youngsters. As a group these students, though equally bright, tend to be more critical of their teachers and their parents than do gifted children in the dominant population.

In the Lehman and Erdwins (1981) study measuring the attitudes and values of the gifted, it was revealed that among talented students there is willingness to compromise, equality of participation in group activities, and cooperation. Supportive of this research is the fact that "evidence of maladjustment in the gifted group was negligible" (p. 136). These children appeared to possess the social attitudes that are helpful in interpersonal relationships. Scoring high on the ability to interact tactfully with others, most of the bright children in this study enjoyed working in groups and favored cooperative group efforts over competitive ones.
Relating to the idea of group work and self-concept is the area of peer relations among gifted students and between gifted and average pupils. It appears from Tidwell’s (1980) study that talented youngsters communicate and associate easily with others in gifted and talented programs. Parents frequently encourage such associations for academic as well as for social reasons. At Purdue University’s “Super Saturday” enrichment program for talented youth, parents revealed that one of the main factors that encouraged them to enroll their children was the opportunity for the girls and boys to be with others like themselves (Feldhusen & Wyman, 1980). A student comment concerning “Super Saturday” was that the program allowed her to “think freely without being embarrassed” (Feldhusen & Wyman, 1980, p. 21). Such a remark, according to the researchers, implies that in a more heterogeneous setting a bright child might not risk ridicule by openly sharing sophisticated ideas.

Generally, however, research (VanTassel-Baska, 1983) has shown that gifted students get along well with both gifted and nongifted peers. Perhaps it is an internal mechanism that permits them to adapt their social skills to the individuals with whom they are interacting. For the extremely bright, whether they are minority or dominant population,
the frustration of ridicule by less intellectual children can be painful. As a result, many bright students spend lengthy periods of time with older people who are “intellectual peers,” and research indicates that the majority of these children rate themselves as “very happy” on a scale of personal perceptions (Tidwell, 1980).

Ironically, these same individuals who say that they are happy view themselves as unpopular with their peers. Tidwell (1980) claims that “the apparent lack of correlation between popularity and happiness would seem to indicate that for this group of gifted youngsters, feelings of happiness are not contingent upon the approval or validations received from others” (p. 68). Possibly because they receive enough success experiences and rewards, the gifted and talented are not dependent on applause from their peers. These findings substantiate those of Lehman and Erdwins (1981) which revealed high achieving gifted children to be more internalized and self-sufficient in the psychological and social arenas than are their low achieving gifted counterparts.

A knowledge of behavioral traits and personality characteristics of the gifted is valuable for teachers attempting to provide a challenging
gifted education program and supplementary enrichment activities. As with other areas of psychological and social concern, research studies indicate disparity within the ranks of gifted pupils. While the majority of these individuals are well-adjusted, agreeable youngsters who rarely encounter any type of major difficulty in school, others in this group can possess negative attitudes toward academic work, choose less socially acceptable friends, manifest a lack of persistence regarding assigned tasks, and generate disruptive behavior (Safter & Bruch, 1981; Maker, 1982). Supervisors, teachers, and administrators of the gifted need to understand thoroughly the behavioral and personality traits of all gifted children if they are to be identified and if appropriate instructional activities are to be provided for them. The girl with the IQ of 140 who squirms in her seat and seems unable to complete a task may be just as talented as the serious boy with an IQ of 165 who works diligently and completes all projects on time (Dunn, Bruno, & Gardiner, 1984).

In addition to psychological and social concerns, the physiology of gifted youngsters can clarify a great deal about their abilities and inclinations (Eby & Smutny, 1990). Within the arena of physiological factors, malnutrition, weight gain or loss, cardiac illness, asthma, and
visual or auditory deficiencies are among the most common health problems to plague children, and these difficulties can prevent the gifted from working up to their potential or, in some instances, from even being identified by teachers.

By far, however, the greatest oversights in the areas of psychological, social, and physiological factors exist in the recognition of Native-American, Hispanic, and African-American children who are gifted and talented. Frequently circumstances and community mores within the minority culture work to the detriment of the bright child (Houston, 1990; Cornell, Delcourt, Goldberg, & Bland, 1995). Children who are intellectually gifted but members of a culturally diverse ethnic group may not have their special talents identified for and nurtured through a gifted education program. These children must deal with what they sense they can achieve based on an awareness of their own abilities, and they must also handle the educational establishment’s perception of them based on traditional measures of giftedness (Ford & Harris, 1990). Compounding this dilemma is the frustration that many gifted students from culturally diverse ethnic populations experience when they are unable to achieve desired perfection.
Because of the unique characteristics associated with ethnically diverse children, teachers who work with these students, have the responsibility of detecting the possible presence of gifted traits in these pupils (Foster & Seltzer, 1986). Too frequently time and patience are in short supply, and society never benefits from the unique talents of these potentially gifted children.

In part, it is this diversity that makes working with gifted and talented individuals a challenge. But research has shown that it is more than just a challenge; if all gifted children are to be identified and assisted, it is essential that their personal and cultural characteristics be understood and considered in the identification process (Ford, 1993; Borland & Wright, 1994). Otherwise, very bright, ethnically diverse, youngsters may be labeled “nongifted” because their psychological and social profiles do not fit the prescribed model of a gifted child (Renzulli, 1980).

Cultural and Ethnic Considerations

In gifted and talented programs as in the overall population, there is a preponderance of white, middle, and upper-middle class
individuals. This group manifests “talent traits” that are generally predictable; even those special characteristics of low achieving gifted students are becoming recognizable criteria for placement in gifted education programs. However, according to Domino (1979) and Lindstrom and Van Sant (1986), among cultural and ethnic minorities, these common behaviors of the gifted and talented are not easily identified. Many factors unrelated to innate intelligence can not only mask early detection of youngsters in these groups but also impede their progress once they are participants in gifted and talented activities. Baldwin (1987) stated that identifying the gifted talents of minority youngsters is a challenge because these talents are frequently hidden by cultural diversity, socioeconomic deprivation, social isolation, and a pervading sense of powerlessness.

For culturally diverse students (Safter & Bruch, 1981), “whose background, experiences and culture are significantly different from the dominant culture of society” (p. 3), being labeled gifted and talented can be a weighty burden. Many of these children live in homes where there is frequently little support for academic achievement. This nonsupportive environment can conflict with the pressures of the dominant culture, resulting in confusion and anxiety for the child.
If the youngster happens to live in a home where English is spoken as a second language, or not at all, the problems may be more extensive. Parents or guardians may not fully realize the needs of their gifted child or may be unable to deal with them emotionally, physically, or financially.

Students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic minorities are found in most gifted programs, and teachers need to be alert to the home and environmental conditions that can affect these children (Eby & Smutny, 1990). Perhaps more for this group than for the dominant population, the home situation is extremely significant since, for the ethnically diverse child, it may function in a counter-productive manner. If, by virtue of placement in a gifted program, these children feel alienated from family and friends, they may not perform well academically or artistically. According to Lajoie & Shore (1981), it is one thing to identify and enroll such youngsters in a program and quite another to keep them there.

In her work with high-achieving African-American students, Fordham (1988) echoed concerns about tapping the talent of gifted minority students. She found that tension and uncertainty mark many of these gifted youngsters as they struggle with the conflicting
demands of the individualistic ethos of the school and the collective ethos of the home community. Fordham suggested that for African American children there exists a complex relationship between racial identity and school success. In order to cope and achieve in the dominant culture academic environment, many young African Americans develop "a raceless persona in order to succeed in school and in life" (Fordham, 1988, p. 57).

For some culturally diverse students, the relationship between their home and the school may minimize opportunities to be considered for gifted and talented activities. Mothers and fathers of talented minority students may nominate their children less frequently for gifted education programs than do the parents of dominant culture children (Scott et al., 1992). Parents of the ethnically diverse can view support for their gifted children in the school's gifted education activities as an impediment to the children's affiliation with their home and neighborhood culture (Hackney, 1981; Eby and Smutny, 1990). Fear of inadequacy as a parent or inability to provide the physical resources that would be helpful to such a child can deter parents from encouraging participation in gifted classes. Not the least of parental concerns is that of finances which for many African-American, Hispanic,
and Native-American families can be erratic or even totally absent. Worry and embarrassment over not being able to purchase resource materials or finance enrichment activities may prevent parents from desiring that their children be placed in gifted programs. The operative rationale in this case is that it is better for children not to be in gifted education classes than it is for those children to be ashamed because they cannot participate in gifted education activities that require financial support from parents. Often the lack of education and absence of understanding of gifted characteristics on the part of gifted children's parents must be overcome before educators can hope to make progress with the girls and boys (Reyes, Fletcher, & Paez, 1996).

According to Yarborough and Johnson (1983) and Ford and Feist (1993), it is not merely the homes of ethnically diverse children that affect their gifted and talented abilities but the neighborhood culture as well. Even if such individuals do manage to gain the support of their families, they must deal on a daily basis with the street environment where it is unlikely that being mathematically precocious will gain them any popularity with their peers (Houston, 1990). For the majority of gifted children this situation might not present a problem since they rely on an internal locus of control. However, according to Fordham (1988),
members of culturally diverse ethnic populations tend to choose identification with their culture group over any specialized personal attributes that they may possess. This fact is indeed a challenge for educators and counselors who assist these youngsters and their families.

Another problem for some ethnically diverse children is the score that they receive on standardized tests employed to determine the IQ. Although not the sole factor for most well-designed gifted and talented programs, the IQ still remains a major consideration in the placement of pupils (Argulewicz, Elliott, & Hall, 1982; Sapon-Shevin, 1994). At a disadvantage are the students whose culture deviates considerably from the dominant culture. Poor reading ability and weak comprehension of English idioms can lower scores as can lack of exposure at home to objects and ideas that are considered commonplace in American society. A child living in an ethnically diverse and possibly impoverished environment can be at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to testing situations; yet that same child can certainly qualify as gifted if other criteria are considered.

The importance of employing multiple criteria for identifying the gifted and talented is vital for children who are members of culturally
diverse ethnic populations. Research has found that information drawn from a variety of sources (including tests, creativity scales, behavioral scales, and teacher recommendations) can significantly increase the chances of identifying the gifted among ethnic groups such as Hispanics, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans. Traditionally many of these children are highly able but are often functioning at a low academic level (Scruggs & Cohn, 1983; Maker, 1996).

One program during the early 1990s that focused on the needs of these learners whose talent was frequently untapped was Project Mandala (Damiani & Baytops, 1993). This federally funded program in southeastern Virginia sought to improve educational opportunities for special populations of gifted children including those who were culturally and ethnically diverse. A comprehensive effort, Project Mandala served identified students through curriculum in the areas of metacognition, creative arts, math, science, multiculturalism, and the humanities. Parents of targeted students were involved from the onset of Project Mandala in providing nominations of students for the program, attending parent workshops, and benefiting from support services for parents/guardians of project participants.
Care must be taken not to confuse youngsters such as the ones in Project Mandala with low achieving students; the performance of ethnic minorities generally suffers as a result of the ethnicity of the culture and environment while that of low achievers normally stems from more idiosyncratic psychological and social factors (Burt, 1975; Hackney, 1981). There is, of course, some overlap of characteristics between these two groups, but on intelligence tests low achievers can be readily identified because they generally function within the dominant culture of society. Minority children often do not perform well on these same instruments; therefore, for their accurate identification for gifted programs, a variety of protocols need to be utilized with these young people.

In the study of Argulewicz et al. (1982), the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS) were used effectively with Hispanic gifted children in a public school in the southwestern United States. Encompassing grades one through six, the study compared not only the ratings that Hispanic and Anglo-American students received on the SRBCSS, but assessed teacher evaluations of the students' learning, motivation, creativity, and leadership. Results indicated that there were significant differences in
the areas of learning and motivation and no significant differences on the creativity and leadership scales. According to Argulewicz et al., "one hypothesis is that Mexican-American children exhibit fewer learning and motivation behaviors than Anglo children when matched on IQ and achievement. A second possibility is that the differences may be the result of Anglo teachers differentially rating Mexican-American and Anglo students on the motivation and learning scales, but not on the creativity and leadership scales" (pp. 471-472).

This research with Hispanic and Anglo-American children offers support to the premise that culturally diverse ethnic minorities, because they often move along the edge of the mainstream of American life, score substantially lower on factual learning instruments. In terms of motivation, low scores can possibly attest to the decreased emphasis on motivational attributes among some minority groups. The results of this study occurred in spite of the fact that the SRBCSS was administered in Spanish to the Hispanics whose primary language was Spanish. Removing the language barrier did little to mitigate differences.

With no significant differences on creativity and leadership, the researchers hypothesized that success with these characteristics may
not be dependent on a particular culture. The fact that Hispanics scored as well as the Anglo-Americans could indicate an emphasis, or at least an acceptance, in the minority culture of creativity and leadership among young people. These attributes are, in fact, prized qualities in some subcultures in America where youngsters are expected to grapple with adult problems on a daily basis and find creative solutions for them (Scruggs & Cohn, 1983).

In the study of Scruggs and Cohn (1983), the effect of the culture of the Native American on gifted children was studied by means of an eight-year-old Native-American boy. Highly able but achieving poorly in school, Vernon demonstrated superior reasoning abilities but inadequate academic skills. In addition to being given the WISC-R, Vernon took a battery of psychological and personality evaluations before he was identified as gifted and designated as a candidate for a gifted and talented program. Initially classified as learning disabled, Vernon's real potential was recognized only through the administration of multiple protocols. The case of this boy illuminates several characteristics that are common among gifted Native-American children. On other instruments, as well as on the WISC-R, Native-American youngsters exhibit large verbal performance discrepancies
that may be due in part to cultural phenomena (Kirschenbaum, 1988). In addition, between the ages of five and ten, these children tend to score below the norm on the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt test, but by the time the students are in the fifth or sixth grade, the scores on this same instrument usually rise dramatically.

In Vernon's case, a program was devised to maximize his strengths, such as his highly developed curiosity, and to treat his deficiencies as skill areas to be expanded in preparation for joining a group gifted program. Twice a week he was driven from the reservation where he resided to Arizona State University for three-hour sessions. Exposed to a variety of cultural experiences, as well as to academic work, Vernon progressed rapidly in all areas; particularly remarkable achievement was registered in the domains of reading and vocabulary.

Not all ethnic minorities in the United States exhibit the same cultural phenomena that can mask the abilities of African-American, Hispanic, and Native American gifted children. Among Asian-American ethnic groups, particularly the Chinese and the Japanese, an extremely high percentage of precocious youth excels at whatever task is assigned and ordinarily provides some of the ablest students in gifted and talented activities (Plucker, 1994). In contrast to some other ethnic
minorities, Chinese parents traditionally place heavy emphasis on education and are interested in and supportive of educational programs to assist their children (Olson, 1981). When English is not the primary language in the Chinese-American home, priority is given to learning it as quickly as possible and not permitting lack of language ability to become an excuse or a stumbling block to academic achievement.

Although some Asian-American ethnic groups exist at a low socioeconomic level, most do not, and the fact that parents can generally afford to provide enrichment activities for their talented youngsters may indicate one difference between Asian-American and members of some other ethnic minorities in America. However, the high level of parental motivation, education, and interest that is often lacking in African-American, Hispanic and Native American parents is usually present in large measure among the fathers and mothers of Asian-American children; this fact may partially account for the scholastic success of their offspring. Often well-educated themselves, these parents prize education and instill this value in their sons and daughters. Not living within the dominant American culture has detrimentally affected the test scores of some minority groups, but talented Asian-American children seem to rise above this handicap and
usually achieve scores that are comparable to or exceed those of the dominant group in society (Olson, 1981).

A major implication for teaching children of ethnically diverse populations can be drawn from the Scruggs and Cohn (1983) study. If students are highly able but academically deficient, “ability training in skill deficit areas should be among the very highest priorities” (p. 93). For these or any other children to work at peak efficiency, they must possess the necessary tools. Being aware of the possibility of such deficiencies among minority gifted youngsters can prevent educators from inadvertently overlooking able, but scholastically weak individuals as they seek candidates for gifted and talented programs.

Innate ability is not an exclusive condition of the middle and upper-middle classes of the dominant culture in the United States. Among culturally diverse ethnic populations there reside intelligence and talent waiting to be tapped. Educators and supervisors, if they are to discover the best and the brightest, must look beneath the cultural, ethnic, and socioeconomic veneer to find gifted students who can benefit from a gifted educational curriculum and who, in turn, can benefit society.
Practices for the Identification of Gifted Students

Actual procedures for identifying gifted and talented young people vary with school divisions across the nation, but recommended practices for selecting students for gifted education are fairly consistent. Throughout the research are repeated pleas for diversified identification methods, and such diversification is particularly important when working with African-American, Asian-American, Native-American, and Hispanic populations. Rather than relying on a single measure, educators are encouraged to utilize multiple assessment protocols as they identify pupils for gifted education activities (Woods & Achey, 1990; Stinespring, 1991; Maker, 1996; Reyes, Fletcher, & Paez, 1996).

Nelson (1982) and Patton (1992) suggested that both tests and judgmental evidence be employed in the identification of all potentially gifted children but especially those from culturally diverse ethnic backgrounds. Accuracy of identification should not be sacrificed for expediency; if such a sacrifice is made, the talent of many gifted students will remain hidden and undeveloped.
Group intelligence tests are often used as initial criteria in selection for gifted programs. Such tests, if culturally unbiased, can be effective screening tools for culturally diverse groups as well as for the dominant population (Stinespring, 1991). The well-designed Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test (grades K-12) is easily administered and scored. At the lower grade levels, the test is entirely non-verbal, and Spanish directions are available for the various batteries. Both test validity and reliability are high on this instrument (Nelson, 1982). According to the Mental Measurements Yearbook, 10th Edition, the Science Research Associates (SRA) tests and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) are considered highly valid and reliable when evaluating dominant and non-dominant school populations in a group setting.

Numerous excellent individual intelligence and ability tests are recommended for accurate identification of minority students. The Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (OL-SAT) is virtually free of cultural bias, is designed for grades K-12, and ranks high in validity and reliability. Many school divisions utilize this protocol, including those with large Spanish-speaking populations (Cantu, Trevino, & Walther, 1982). Success in identifying culturally diverse students with gifted potential has also been achieved through administration of Raven's
Progressive Matrices (Mills & Tissot, 1995) and the short form of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R). The latter protocol exhibits "consistent construct validity across the white, black, and Hispanic populations" (Ortiz & Gonzalez, 1989, p. 152).

An additional and more recent measure of both cognitive abilities and achievement levels in preschool and elementary students can be found in the individually-administered Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC). According to Zucker and Copeland (1988), this test is formulated on models of intelligence that differentiate between "fluid" abilities and "crystallized" abilities and that emphasize the process by which intellectual tasks are approached. Demanding few verbal language requirements, this instrument contains tasks that minimize racial and ethnic differences and is based on a culturally diverse standardization sample. Recommended for use with students from low socioeconomic groups and African-American preschool populations, the K-ABC has been shown to correlate well with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and with other traditional measures of intelligence for school-age children (Krohn & Lamp, 1989). Among culturally diverse populations, the K-ABC appears to be a reliable predictor of success in gifted education programs.
In addition to group and individual intelligence tests, the use of protocols that measure other domains of giftedness are encouraged. According to Nelson (1982), the following instruments show promise of identifying divergent thinkers who may be overlooked by IQ and/or achievement tests: Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (visual arts aptitude, grades K-12), Seashore Measures of Musical Talent (grades 4-16 and adult), Gaston's Test of Musicality (grades 4-12), Art Vocabulary Test (grades 6-12), Creative Tests for Children (visual and performing arts, grades 4-6), Vineland Social Maturity Scale (leadership, birth to adult), and Leadership Scale of the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (leadership, grades K-12). With respect to these protocols, Mills and Tissot (1995) warn that the fairness and effectiveness of these alternative procedures, however, is highly questionable. In general, none of these alternative measures has been found to be an adequate measure of the skills and aptitudes necessary of high-level academic achievement ... It is also important to keep in mind that because of the subjective nature of many of these measures, they have the potential to be even less equitable to minority
students than an objective measure. (p. 210)

Because of the questionable effectiveness of some alternative identification measures, Richert (1987) recommended that such protocols be used not as a sole criterion for admittance to gifted education programs but considered in addition to standard aptitude and achievement measures.

To draw a complete picture of the potentially gifted, assessments beyond tests are required. Judgmental evidence to be incorporated in the file of each child should include some or all of the following items: teacher recommendation forms and rating scales, peer nominations, parent nominations, self nominations, interviews, inventories, cumulative record information, and portfolios of individual student work that may provide evidence of special or unique abilities (Nelson, 1982; Ford & Feist, 1993; Maker, 1996).

Identification of Culturally Diverse Gifted Students

Many factors may account for the low incidence of African-American, Hispanic, and Native-American students identified for gifted education programs. Culturally biased tests, the achievement ethic, and locus of control can impact negatively on gifted children from...
diverse ethnic, cultural, and racial backgrounds as they are considered for gifted education programs.

Culturally biased tests are a major problem in accurate identification of culturally diverse students (Masten, 1985; Stinespring, 1991). Nelson's (1982) ideal solution for culturally biased tests was utilization of instruments biased in favor of each child's linguistic or cultural group. Unfortunately, most "positively biased" protocols currently available favor the dominant white culture.

The most practical solution therefore is to remove from existing instruments questions beyond the normal experiential realm of African-American, Hispanic, and Native-American students; to scrutinize test vocabulary, looking for words that might have different connotations or meanings in a non-English-speaking culture; and to screen the tests for value judgments that may conflict with the values of the minority population being assessed. An additional technique for diminishing the problem of biased protocols can be the administration of non-verbal tests such as the Cartoon Conservation Test. Nelson (1982) reported success using non-verbal tests and urged the administration of unbiased tests re-normed specifically for the target minority group. Stinespring (1991) stated that efforts to eliminate test bias have not
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been entirely successful because tests as they are developed must operate on some cultural basis. He contended, however, that it is vital to ensure that the talents of culturally diverse ethnic populations “not be overlooked just because of deficiencies in talent testing” (p. 59).

The achievement ethic is a second factor contributing to difficult identification of students from culturally diverse groups. This ethic which places emphasis on deferred gratification, symbolic commitment to success, and future results is associated with the middle and upper-middle classes in American society. For students who are motivated by a survival ethic and just getting by from day to day in their ethnic or cultural enclaves, the achievement ethic may be virtually meaningless.

The everyday experiences of these children demonstrate the belief that they can hardly break free from their cultural restrictions and move down the street, let alone break free to “get to the top.”

(Stronge, Lynch, & Smith, 1987, p. 340)

Young people from ethnically diverse populations may come to school socially, psychologically, and intellectually impoverished and are often unable to function productively within the mainstream of the dominant school culture. Although a proportional percentage of students within
minority groups are gifted, these individuals may not exhibit the behaviors commonly associated with gifted children and consequently are difficult to identify (Cornell, Delcourt, Goldberg, & Bland, 1995).

Some ethnically diverse students live in homes where they may be ridiculed for their special talents, or where parents feel inadequate and incapable of providing the enrichment activities that typically accompany gifted education programs. For other minority students, coping with a street culture that places no value on academic success may be a source of stress and conflict. Forced to choose between academic opportunities and their friends, many bright minority children opt for the latter. The fear of alienation from the home and from the community culture is a powerful adversary in this battle. The chasm between the "now" reality of life in the streets and the "future" hope promoted in the classroom is frequently too great to bridge without Herculean efforts on the part of educators. This is a particularly formidable task for those attempting to shine light on the hidden gifted talent within culturally diverse populations (Eby & Smutny, 1990).

Closely connected to the achievement ethic as it relates to culturally diverse ethnic populations is the concept of locus of control. Identifying minority students for and keeping them in gifted activities
may be hampered by an individual's perception of life being controlled by external or internal forces. Students with an internal locus of control believe that events and circumstances are within their control; those with an external locus of control feel little personal mastery over their lives since they attribute successes and failures to forces outside of themselves (Kitano, 1973). An internal locus of control correlates highly with the achievement ethic and generally parallels the aspirations and value structure of the dominant culture. Students from Hispanic, Native-American, and African-American populations may not feel in control of their own destinies since perceptions of limited finances and powerful governmental and societal forces seem to be in charge of their lives. Identifying such students for gifted education is hampered by their often fatalistic "it doesn't matter what I do, so why try" attitude which does not rank among the most common characteristics of gifted children. Seeking out the gifted and talented among these culturally diverse ethnic populations is a challenge for the determined, the perceptive, and the well-trained.
Promising Identification Procedures for the Gifted

With so many variables to consider, it is miraculous that educators identify as many gifted children as they do. But there is certainly room for improvement in the tapping of talent in culturally diverse ethnic populations. Particularly promising identification methods indicate that the future will see more bright and deserving children from culturally diverse ethnic groups benefiting from the challenges of gifted education.

In 1983, Tannenbaum suggested that the identification of gifted children, especially young ones, was very much subject to error. Not all young gifted children exhibit the same behaviors, and a rigid identification process would surely eliminate some students who are truly gifted in one particular area but not in others. Rather than overlooking a potentially gifted child, Tannenbaum favored a more liberal screening process that included many children, some of whom may not distinguish themselves in school or later life.

Tannenbaum’s “open pool” identification process can be thought of as a funnel with the wide mouth at the top as the screening process. It is intentionally broad at this first stage to include all potentially gifted young people even though some “nongifted”
individuals may trickle in. As low a cut-off score as possible on IQ and/or ability tests is used at this point to ensure fairness.

In stage two, the funnel narrows in a weeding out process called identification. At this point, additional test data, judgmental evidence, and monitoring of children's work habits determine which students will be candidates for gifted education. Out of the funnel at last, Tannenbaum's final step is differentiating among gifted individuals. It is his belief that not all gifted students should be lumped together in an accelerated intellectual environment; some, instead, require specialized activities in drama, music, art, and leadership. Careful implementation of Tannenbaum's multi-step model could ensure that all students with gifted potential, both those in the dominant culture and the ethnically diverse, are identified and have equal access to enrichment programs.

A second innovative identification process sponsored jointly by Hampton University and the Hampton City Schools was Learning Experiences for Assessing Potential (LEAP) which created a large talent pool from which to identify students for gifted and talented programs. The primary purpose of this project was early identification and in-depth assessment of students.
with an emphasis on designating those children of high potential who are not easily identified through the traditional assessment techniques. (LEAP Brochure, 1988, p. 2)

The LEAP program utilized an experiential process to identify and assess gifted and talented primary children. Interdisciplinary activities encouraged the development of higher level thinking skills, and exposure to a variety of educational experiences was designed to initiate problem solving and creative thinking.

Students were selected for this K-3 enrichment program based on their scores on the Raven Progressive Matrices. Students scoring at the at or above the 95th percentile were selected for participation. These youngsters were then administered the Slosson Test, the reading portion of the Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R), the Global Ratings (reflecting the overall impression made by the child at the LEAP center), and the Human Figure Drawing Test. High scores on this latter protocol, paired with high scores in other nonverbal measures of ability, are common among children from ethnically diverse environments who might do poorly on verbal tests but who can perform well in gifted education programs. Not designed as a more equitable identification procedure for all potentially gifted children, the
LEAP project focused entirely on the identification of children from culturally diverse ethnic populations who might be overlooked in the more commonly utilized gifted identification procedures.

A similar intervention strategy to assist Hispanic children has been established in the Mission CISD in Texas. Committed to providing individualized education for gifted Hispanic students, Mission CISD initiated the Enhanced Learning Program (ELP).

Identification of ELP students is the responsibility of a selection committee...The data reviewed by the selection committee results from a process consistent across the district: Any child nominated by school personnel, parents (who receive nomination forms in both English and Spanish), and/or community members. During the screening phase, classroom teachers complete the Renzulli-Hartman "Scales for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students" for each child nominated, while ELP teachers review each child's cumulative folder and record Total Reading, Total Math, and Total Battery scores from the California Achievement Test. Any students not nominated but with achievement scores at the 90th percentile or above...
are added to the nomination pool. (Cantu, Trevino, & Walther, 1982, p. 93)

Following a check of grades and consistency of daily work, parental permission is secured for administering the Slosson Test (in English and/or Spanish). In preparation for final selection, the ELP teacher records data on an individual identification matrix with the student name coded to assure anonymity. The various items are ranked from 1 to 5, and the top 5% to 10% of the school population is selected for the gifted education program. Although it is a controversial approach, in the Mission CISD where 93% of the students are Hispanic, a proportionate number of the final selectees for ELP are also Hispanic (Cantu, Trevino, & Walther, 1982).

To minimize the cultural and socioeconomic barriers in the education of gifted and talented children, the Program of Assessment, Diagnosis, and Instruction (PADI) was created in Montgomery County, Maryland. Designed to identify talented children from very low socioeconomic environments, PADI provides the nurturing care that these students require in order to progress to full participation in a regular gifted program (Johnson et al., 1985). Assessment measures (e.g. the Group Inventory for Finding Creative Talent, the WISC-R, and
the Cartoon Conservation Scale), similar to those employed in other divisions, identify students for PADI which provides the "jump start" that many of these young people require and additionally serves as a model for other school divisions seeking reliable intervention strategies to assist talented, culturally diverse young people (Mid-Atlantic Center for Race Equity, 1983).

Two additional examples of system-wide interventions on behalf of gifted ethnically diverse children are evident in the experiences of the Kansas City, Missouri and the Peoria, Illinois school divisions. Both systems had gifted programs in place when they came under public scrutiny for alleged inequality and underrepresentation of minorities in gifted activities. Failure to enroll a proportional percentage of Peoria's African-American students in gifted programs in the early 1980s brought the city national attention and the risk of losing state funding for gifted education because of discrimination. A similar situation occurred in Kansas City. Both localities carefully evaluated their programs for identification procedure inequities and, as a result, created more comprehensive and equitable gifted education programs that addressed the needs of both the dominant and non-dominant
segments of the gifted school population (Johnson, 1982; Fetterman, 1988).

Research indicates that identification procedures for the gifted child are a work in progress. While alternatives to the traditional intelligence and aptitude tests have been recommended, school divisions across the nation continue to employ the traditional tests as the primary indicator of giftedness. While school divisions experimenting with programmatic changes to address the needs of ethnically diverse gifted children are expanding, the number of school systems requiring multiple assessments for identification for gifted programs remains small. Hopeful signs are on the horizon, however, as educators recognize the value of expanding the repertoire of procedures to identify accurately the hidden talents of the nation's minority gifted populations.

Summary

The review of the literature reveals established philosophies of giftedness, the characteristics of dominant culture and non-dominant culture gifted children, and the charge to assess these groups appropriately for gifted and talented programs. A recurring theme in
education has been the necessity for obtaining judgmental evidence as well as traditional IQ scores to determine student placement in gifted activities, particularly when evaluating African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native-American populations.

While an understanding of the characteristics and needs of the gifted is valued by educators, inconsistent utilization of multiple identification measures to tap gifted potential in minority children can result in the exclusion of some talented youngsters from gifted education activities. Research confirms the importance of assessing children for gifted and talented programs with protocols that will uncover their hidden talents and encourage excellence for all populations, both majority and minority, within American society.
Chapter 3: Procedures

Introduction

During the last three decades, educational research has determined the need to identify appropriately gifted children who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations. Substantive amounts of research have focused on national studies of specific assessment tools and their applicability to African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American, and Native-American pupils. The purpose of this study was to provide a profile of the procedures utilized for the identification of ethnically diverse gifted students in the southeastern United States, a region which contains a large culturally diverse general population.

Research Objectives

This research will provide a profile of identification procedures for gifted education that are employed with students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations in the southeastern region of
the United States. In this study, the following four research objectives will be considered:

1) To determine the proportional relationships of children from culturally diverse ethnic populations who are identified for gifted education and the general and student populations of culturally diverse ethnic groups.

2) To assess the philosophy regarding and the utilization of multiple measures for the identification of giftedness in culturally diverse ethnic populations.

3) To ascertain the consideration given to the characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic population children during the identification process for gifted education.

4) To determine the availability of gifted education programs designed to meet the needs of identified students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations.

**Ethical Considerations**

This research in gifted education was approved by the Committee on Human Subjects in the School of Education at the College of William and Mary. The study was conducted in a manner that
ensured the anonymity of all participants at the state and school division levels. Participants in the research were assured in writing of the confidentiality of their responses to the state level surveys (Appendix B), the division level surveys (Appendix C), and the in-depth inquiry protocols (Appendix D). The research was designed to eliminate the need for names of states, school divisions, or educational personnel. To protect the confidentiality of all participants, each state and local school division was assigned a code number by the researcher. State and school division surveys also had code numbers. To tabulate data for this dissertation, these code numbers have been used.

Given the nature of this research in the area of characteristics and identification of ethnically diverse students for gifted education, ethical considerations, while always important, do not pose a major problem. The nature and structure of this study safeguard the participants against unwarranted and unsolicited intrusion.

Data in this research project were collected in the public domain from consenting directors of gifted education who willingly completed and returned the SAGE (Survey of Activities in Gifted Education) questionnaire and who were interviewed by telephone. Invasion of
personal privacy or private records was not an issue. Each study participant clearly understood the parameters of the research and recognized that his/her responses would contribute to a study of gifted education.

While certainly a concern in some studies, informed consent posed no threat in this research. No portions of this study required informed consent; no risks were present, and no effort was made to remove the anonymity of gifted students or educational personnel.

Sample

The target population for this study was state directors of gifted education and directors of gifted education in urban, suburban, and rural school divisions in each of 12 southeastern states. The sample included 36 school districts - 3 from each state (one urban, one suburban, and one rural) - selected either randomly from each state or through recommendations of state directors of gifted education. Utilizing The Guide to American Educational Directories, surveys were sent to state directors of gifted education and to school division directors of gifted education or, if necessary, to other individuals responsible for a specific division's gifted education programs.
**Instrumentation**

Developed by the researcher, the Survey of Activities in Gifted Education (SAGE) requested from the respondents demographic information (e.g. school division data, geographic/demographic information, number of identified gifted students, ethnic representation in gifted classes), data related to screening and identification of ethnically diverse students (e.g. screening methods utilized, formal consideration of the characteristics of gifted children, criteria/instrumentation for gifted selection, differentiated selection procedures for culturally diverse populations), and specifics regarding the division's gifted programs (e.g. programs for culturally diverse populations, leadership/creative/fine arts activities, enrichment opportunities, and pull-out programs. To facilitate quantification and analysis of data, SAGE questions are framed in closed form (multiple-choice with an "other" option), short answer response format, and Likert scale format.

SAGE is designed as a multiple-page survey. It is printed and attractively arranged on crisp colored paper using a distinctive and
easy-to-read font and high contrast ink. Appropriate graphics designed to catch the reader’s attention and encourage his/her participation are utilized.

SAGE questions were carefully screened for ambiguities, "double-barreled" items, negative phrasing, technical jargon that could be misunderstood, and biased wording. In addition to “proofing” the survey for these potential flaws, a pilot study of SAGE was conducted by requesting that state and division directors of gifted education in five non-southeastern states complete the questionnaire and offer comments on its content and format.

These non-southeastern state directors of gifted education were sent a pilot cover letter (Appendix E), a state level SAGE survey, and a bookmark token. The pilot study of state directors adequately mirrored the larger sample that was surveyed during this research. Suggestions and comments from the pilot state directors required no changes to be made in the state level SAGE survey prior to subsequent distribution.

Local gifted education directors in the pilot states were mailed a pilot cover letter, a division level SAGE survey, and a bookmark token. The local districts in the pilot study included urban, suburban, and rural school divisions. Responses from these divisions were complete and
indicated no necessity for modification of the division level SAGE survey.

With three selected school divisions (one urban, one suburban, and one rural), an in-depth inquiry protocol was utilized to gather additional data specific to the individual division's gifted education identification practices with regard to culturally diverse ethnic populations. The in-depth inquiry data were gathered by means of telephone interviews with personnel in the selected school divisions. Piloted in school districts within the states that completed the pilot SAGE surveys, the in-depth inquiry protocols required only the re-aligning of questions prior to subsequent administration.

**Data Collection**

Each selected state director of gifted education was mailed a packet of information in March 1996 and was asked to complete a state level SAGE survey. As soon as they were identified by the state directors, each district director of gifted education was sent a packet of information and asked to complete a division level SAGE survey. (SAGE surveys for state directors differ slightly in terms of demographic items from those sent to division directors of gifted education.) The surveys
deal with demographic information, identification procedures for culturally diverse students, and questions about gifted education programs. Approximately two weeks after the first mailing, a second packet was sent to gifted education directors who did not respond to the first letter. A third mail attempt followed two weeks after the second effort to solicit additional responses. Two weeks after the third written communication, telephone calls were made to remaining non-respondents who, if they were willing, were interviewed by phone. School divisions selected for in-depth inquiries (Appendix G) submitted division level SAGE surveys and programmatic materials and completed in-depth telephone interviews.

Accompanying each mailing was a cover letter (Appendix F / State Level Letter; Appendix G / Division Level Letter) that clearly stated the purpose of the research, encouraged interest and cooperation, guaranteed confidentiality, and extended appreciation to the participants for completing and returning the instrument; a stamped/self-addressed return envelope was also a part of each packet. Included in the mailing was a token (a "Guiding the Gifted" bookmark designed by the researcher) intended both as a tangible "thank you" and to increase the response rate. Through the three mailings, follow-
up telephone contact with non-respondents, and the token bookmark, high survey and in-depth inquiry response rates were achieved. The response rate for state level surveys was 92% (11 out of 12 states); the response rate for local school division surveys was 94% (31 out of 33 local divisions); and the response rate for the in-depth inquiries was 100% (3 out of 3 local divisions).

Research Design

This study consisted of administering surveys to state and local division directors of gifted education and conducting in-depth inquiries of local school divisions to determine the current identification procedures related to students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations in the southeastern United States. A cross-sectional survey design was utilized for this descriptive research. Within this design, data were collected from a sample drawn from a predetermined population at a single point in time. The cross-sectional design was considered appropriate for this research since a "big picture" of identification practices in gifted education is sought (e.g. program description, demographic information, ethnicity representation). Identified variables (e.g. identification procedures,
consideration of cultural characteristics) were compared/analyzed at the state and local school division levels. Information was to be provided by 12 state directors of gifted education and 36 professional educators responsible for gifted programs in their geographically diverse school divisions within the southeastern United States.

Data were gathered and checked for completeness in each response category. Data were transferred to an SPSS-X system file where tabular/graphic presentations were derived to reflect state and local patterns with regard to ethnically diverse students in gifted education. In addition, descriptive statistics were compiled, analyzed, and are reported in the results of the study and discussed in the conclusion.

Summary

This research was designed to provide a profile of current (the 1994-1995 academic year) identification procedures employed with ethnically diverse children in gifted education programs in the southeastern United States. The study expanded on previous research (VanTassel-Baska, Patton, & Prillaman, 1991) which had concluded that children at-risk for identification for programs designed for gifted
learners included students from ethnically and culturally diverse populations. VanTassel-Baska, Patton, and Prillaman reported that the gifted potential of these minority students was identified less frequently than was the gifted potential of dominant population students. It was determined that for accurate identification of culturally diverse populations, multiple protocols were a necessity.

During the spring and summer of 1996, 12 state directors of gifted education and 36 local school division directors of gifted education were asked to complete SAGE surveys which included demographic data and current gifted education practices at the state and local level in the identified southeastern states. In addition, three school divisions (one urban, one suburban, and one rural) served as the basis for in-depth inquiries into local school district gifted education identification procedures.

The demographic data were compiled to develop a profile of identification practices for gifted education as they relate to children who are representative of culturally diverse ethnic populations.
Chapter 4: Findings/Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to profile the procedures utilized to identify members of culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education programs in the southeastern United States. Previous research indicated a need for closer scrutiny of the gifted identification process and the importance of employing multiple protocols in the identification of students from African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic populations. Data for this study were gathered by means of surveys to state departments of education and local school divisions in the southeastern states of the United States and by in-depth inquiries of selected local school divisions.

This chapter presents data from the 11 states and 31 school divisions that participated in this regional study. A general description of the sample is provided as well as demographic information reported by states and local school divisions. Each of
the four research objectives is presented with relevant statistical data. All data reflect the 1994-1995 academic year.

Sample Demographics

The target population for this study was state directors of gifted education and directors of gifted education in urban, suburban, and rural school divisions in each of 12 southeastern states. The research sample included 12 states and 36 school divisions in the southeastern region of the United States. One of the 12 states declined to participate resulting in a state participation rate of 92%. Of the 36 school divisions eligible to participate, 3 from the declining state did not participate bringing the available number of local divisions to 33. Of those 33, 31 responded to the survey for a local division participation rate of 94%. Each of the three local school divisions (one urban, one suburban, and one rural) that was asked to participate in an in-depth inquiry did so for a participation rate of 100%.

At the state level, the population statistics presented in Table 1 indicate that the total population of southeastern states surveyed is 56,875,517. Of this number, 12,415,293 (21.83%) are culturally
diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic). The total student population of the southeastern states is 10,273,060 (18.06% of the total population). The culturally diverse student population is 3,128,814 (30.46% of the total student population). Students identified for gifted education number 779,259 (7.59% of the total student population). The number of ethnically diverse students identified for gifted education is 111,117 (14.26% of the gifted student population). In the 11 southeastern states, culturally diverse ethnic populations comprise 21.83% of the total population, 30.46% of the student population, and 14.26% of the identified gifted student population.

At the urban division level, the population statistics presented in Table 2 indicate that the total population of the communities in which the 11 urban school divisions are located is 2,679,618. Of this number, 872,818 (32.57%) are members of culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic). The total student population of these urban school divisions is 461,856 (17.24% of the total population). The culturally diverse student population is 220,872 (47.82% of the total student population). Students identified for gifted education number 39,827
(8.62% of the total student population). The number of ethnically diverse students identified for gifted education is 6,815 (17.11% of the gifted student population). In the 11 urban divisions, culturally diverse ethnic populations comprise 32.57% of the total population, 47.82% of the student population, and 17.11% of the identified gifted student population.

At the suburban division level, the population statistics presented in Table 3 indicate that the total population of the communities in which the 10 suburban school divisions are located is 984,510. Of this number, 412,340 (41.88%) are members of culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic). The total student population of these suburban school divisions is 162,426 (16.50% of the total population). The culturally diverse student population is 64,037 (39.43% of the total student population). Students identified for gifted education number 9,224 (5.68% of the total student population). The number of ethnically diverse students identified for gifted education is 1,690 (18.32% of the gifted student population). In the 10 suburban divisions, culturally diverse ethnic populations
comprise 41.88% of the total population, 39.43% of the student population, and 18.32% of the identified gifted student population.

At the rural division level, the population statistics presented in Table 4 indicate that the total population of the communities in which the 10 rural school divisions are located is 140,642. Of this number, 54,463 (38.72%) are members of culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic). The total student population of these rural school divisions is 23,147 (16.46% of the total population). The culturally diverse student population is 7,875 (34.02% of the total student population). Students identified for gifted education number 1,631 (7.05% of the total student population). The number of ethnically diverse students identified for gifted education is 147 (9.01% of the gifted student population). In the 10 rural divisions, culturally diverse ethnic populations comprise 38.72% of the total population, 34.02% of the student population, and 9.01% of the identified gifted student population.
Research Objectives

Analysis for Proportional Representation of Culturally Diverse Ethnic Populations in Gifted Education

1 To determine the proportional relationships of children from culturally diverse ethnic populations who are identified for gifted education and the general and student populations of culturally diverse ethnic groups.

State Level

At the state level, the statistics presented in Table 5 indicate proportional relationships among the general population, culturally diverse population, and culturally diverse gifted population for each of the four culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic) as reported by 11 southeastern states.

The African-American general state population is 10,301,576 (18.11% of the total state population reported in Table 1). Students who are African American tally 2,643,322 (25.73% of the state student population reported in Table 1). African-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 73,368 (9.42% of the state identified gifted student population reported in Table 1). State
level statistics on African Americans indicate that they comprise 18.11% of the total population, 25.73% of the student population, and 9.42% of the identified gifted student population.

The Native-American general state population is 174,731 (0.31% of the total state population reported in Table 1). Students who are Native American tally 31,294 (0.30% of the state student population reported in Table 1). Native-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 1,780 (0.23% of the state identified gifted student population reported in Table 1). State level statistics on Native American indicate that they comprise 0.31% of the total population, 0.30% of the student population, and 0.23% of the identified gifted student population.

The Asian-American general state population is 340,490 (0.60% of the total state population reported in Table 1). Students who are Asian American tally 13,521 (1.18% of the state student population reported in Table 1). Asian-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 19,812 (2.54% of the state identified gifted student population reported in Table 1). State level statistics on Asian Americans indicate that they comprise 0.60% of
the total population, 1.18% of the student population, and 2.54% of the identified gifted student population.

The Hispanic general state population is 1,598,496 (2.81% of the total state population reported in Table 1). Students who are Hispanic tally 332,509 (3.24% of the state student population reported in Table 1). Hispanic pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 16,157 (2.07% of the state identified gifted student population reported in Table 1). State level statistics on Hispanics indicate that they comprise 2.81% of the total population, 3.24% of the student population, and 2.07% of the identified gifted student population.

**Urban Division Level**

At the urban division level, the statistics presented in Table 6 indicate proportional relationships among the general population, culturally diverse population, and culturally diverse gifted population for each of the four culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic) as reported by 11 urban school divisions in the southeastern United States.
The African-American general urban population is 649,778 (24.25% of the total urban population reported in Table 2). Students who are African American tally 194,166 (42.04% of the urban student population reported in Table 2). African-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 4,748 (11.92% of the urban identified gifted student population reported in Table 2). Urban level statistics on African Americans indicate that they comprise 24.25% of the total urban population, 42.04% of the urban student population, and 11.92% of the urban identified gifted student population.

The Native-American general urban population is 9,380 (0.35% of the total urban population reported in Table 2). Students who are Native American tally 2,159 (0.47% of the urban student population reported in Table 2). Native-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 33 (0.08% of the urban identified gifted population reported in Table 2). Urban level statistics on Native Americans indicate that they comprise 0.35% of the total urban population, 0.47% of the urban student population, and 0.08% of the urban identified gifted student population.
The Asian-American general urban population is 32,318 (1.21% of the total urban population reported in Table 2). Students who are Asian American tally 9,619 (2.08% of the urban student population reported in Table 2). Asian-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 1,487 (3.73% of the urban identified gifted student population reported in Table 2). Urban level statistics on Asian Americans indicate that they comprise 1.21% of the total urban population, 2.08% of the urban student population, and 3.73% of the urban identified gifted student population.

The Hispanic general urban population in 181,342 (6.77% of the total urban population reported in Table 2). Students who are Hispanic tally 14,928 (3.23% of the urban student population reported in Table 2). Hispanic pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 547 (1.37% of the urban identified gifted student population reported in Table 2). Urban level statistics on Hispanics indicated that they comprise 6.77% of the total urban population, 3.23% of the urban student population, and 1.37% of the urban identified gifted student population.
Suburban Division Level

At the suburban division level, the statistics presented in Table 7 indicate proportional relationships among the general population, culturally diverse population, and culturally diverse gifted population for each of the four culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic) as reported by 10 suburban school divisions in the southeastern United States.

The African-American general suburban population is 277,249 (28.16% of the total suburban population reported in Table 3). Students who are African American tally 53,615 (33.01% of the suburban student population reported in Table 3). African-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 1,037 (11.24% of the suburban identified gifted student population reported in Table 3). Suburban level statistics on African Americans indicate that they comprise 28.16% of the total suburban population, 33.01% of the suburban student population, and 11.24% of the suburban identified gifted student population.

The Native-American general suburban population is 7,134 (0.72% of the total suburban population reported in Table 3).
Students who are Native American tally 276 (0.17% of the suburban student population reported in Table 3). Native-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 4 (0.04% of the suburban identified gifted student population reported in Table 3). Suburban level statistics on Native Americans indicate that they comprise 0.72% of the total suburban population, 0.17% of the suburban student population, and 0.04% of the suburban identified gifted student population.

The Asian-American general suburban population is 14,261 (1.45% of the total suburban population reported in Table 3). Students who are Asian-American tally 4,593 (2.83% of the suburban student population reported in Table 3). Asian-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 515 (5.58% of the suburban identified gifted student population reported in Table 3). Suburban statistics on Asian Americans indicate that they comprise 1.45% of the total suburban population, 2.83% of the suburban student population, and 5.58% of the suburban identified gifted student population.

The Hispanic general suburban population is 113,696 (11.55% of the total suburban population reported in Table 3). Students who
are Hispanic tally 5,553 (3.42% of the suburban student population reported in Table 3). Hispanic pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 1,244 (1.45% of the suburban identified gifted student population reported in Table 3). Suburban level statistics on Hispanics indicate that they comprise 11.55% of the total suburban population, 3.42% of the suburban student population, and 1.45% of the suburban identified gifted student population.

**Rural Division Level**

At the rural division level, the statistics presented in Table 8 indicate proportional relationships among the general population, culturally diverse population, and culturally diverse gifted population for each of the four culturally diverse ethnic groups (African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic) as reported by 10 rural school divisions in the southeastern United States.

The African-American general rural population is 44,687 (31.77% of the total rural population reported in Table 4). Students who are African American tally 7,532 (32.54% of the rural student population reported in Table 4). African-American pupils who have
been identified for gifted education number 119 (7.30% of the rural identified gifted student population reported in Table 4). Rural level statistics on African Americans indicate that they comprise 31.77% of the total rural population, 32.54% of the rural student population, and 7.30% of the rural identified gifted student population.

The Native-American general rural population is 989 (0.70% of the total rural population reported in Table 4). Students who are Native American tally 49 (0.21% of the rural student population reported in Table 4). Native-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 0 (0.00% of the rural identified gifted student population reported in Table 4). Rural level statistics on Native Americans indicate that they comprise 0.70% of the total rural population, 0.21% of the rural student population, and 0.00% of the rural identified gifted student population.

The Asian-American general rural population is 1,647 (1.17% of the total rural population reported in Table 4). Students who are Asian American tally 67 (0.29% of the rural student population reported in Table 4). Asian-American pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 23 (1.41% of the rural identified gifted student population reported in Table 4). Rural level
statistics on Asian Americans indicate that they comprise 1.17% of the total rural population, 0.21% of the rural student population, and 1.41% of the rural identified gifted student population.

The Hispanic general rural population is 7,140 (5.08% of the total rural population reported in Table 4). Students who are Hispanic tally 227 (0.98% of the rural student population reported in Table 4). Hispanic pupils who have been identified for gifted education number 5 (0.31% of the rural identified gifted student population reported in Table 4). Rural level statistics on Hispanics indicate that they comprise 5.08% of the total rural population, 0.98% of the rural student population, and 0.31% of the rural identified gifted student population.

Summary

The populations of children from culturally diverse ethnic groups who are identified for gifted education indicate that their numbers are disproportionately low when compared with those of the ethnic group general and student populations and with those of the dominant population. At the state level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students are 0.90% of the total culturally diverse population and 3.55% of the culturally diverse student population;
identified gifted dominant population pupils are 1.51% of the total dominant population and 9.35% of the student dominant population. At the urban level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students comprise 0.78% of the total culturally diverse population and 3.06% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students comprise 1.83% of the total dominant population and 13.70% of the dominant student population. At the suburban level, identified gifted ethnically diverse pupils are 0.41% of the total culturally diverse population and 2.64% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students are 1.32% of the total dominant population and 7.66% of the dominant student population. At the rural level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students are 0.27% of the total culturally diverse population and 1.87% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students are 1.72% of the total dominant population and 9.72% of the dominant student population. At all levels (state, urban, suburban, and rural), the percentage of Asian-American students identified for gifted education exceeds the percentages of the Asian-American general population and student population. Statistics available for all levels (state, urban, suburban,
and rural) indicate that the percentages of African-American, Native-American, and Hispanic students identified for gifted education are lower than the percentages of each of these minority groups in their general population and their student population.

**Analysis for Multiple Measures for the Identification of the Gifted**

2. To assess the philosophy regarding and the utilization of multiple measures for the identification of giftedness in culturally diverse ethnic populations.

**Philosophy**

The philosophy of the 11 states and 31 local school divisions in this study regarding the degree to which they differentiate the gifted education identification process for ethnically diverse pupils is presented in Table 9. Responding to the degree of differentiation in gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse ethnic minorities, 9.09 of the states report differentiation “to a great extent;” 54.54% of the states report differentiation “to a moderate extent;” and 36.36% of the states report differentiation “to no extent.”
The responses of urban, suburban, and rural school divisions regarding the degree to which they differentiate gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse ethnic minorities include: 6.45% report differentiation "to a great extent;" 61.29% report differentiation "to a moderate extent;" and 32.26% report differentiation "to no extent."

Utilization of Multiple Identification Measures

At the state and local division levels, statistics reported in Table 10 indicate responses from 11 states and 31 local school divisions regarding the utilization of multiple identification measures with culturally diverse ethnic populations of students.

Percentages of states employing multiple identification measures with ethnically diverse populations include: Use of one measure-18.18% of the states; Use of two measures-63.63% of the states; Use of three measures-9.09% of the states; and Use of four or more measures-9.09% of the states. The five most commonly used measures reported by the states for the identification of ethnically diverse students are indicated by the following percentages: Traditional testing instruments-81.81%; Behavioral checklists-63.63%; Observation techniques-63.63%; Teacher
nominations/63.63%; and Non-traditional testing instruments-54.54%. The five least often used measures reported by the states for identifying minority students for gifted education are indicated by the following percentages: Creativity instruments-27.27%; Peer nominations-27.27%; Community nominations-18.18%; Leadership skills inventories-18.18%; and Self nominations-18.18%. None of the reporting states indicate use in their state of group tasks or psychomotor skills inventories as gifted identification measures.

Percentages of local school divisions utilizing multiple identification measures with ethnically diverse populations include: Use of one measure-25.81% of local districts; Use of two measures-45.16% of local districts; Use of three measures-22.58% of local districts; and Use of four or more measures-6.45% of local districts. The five most commonly used measures reported by local school divisions for the of ethnically diverse students are indicated by the following percentages: Traditional testing instruments-96.77%; Teacher nominations-77.42%; Pre-identification screening procedures-67.74% Behavioral checklists-64.52%; and Observation techniques-48.39%. The five least often used measures reported by local school divisions for identifying minority students for gifted
education are indicated by the following percentages: Peer nominations-22.58%; Leadership skills inventories-19.35%; Self nominations-9.68%; Student portfolios-9.68%; and Community nominations-3.22%. None of the reporting local school divisions indicate use in their district of group tasks or psychomotor skills inventories as gifted identification measures.

**Summary**

Both state level and division level statistics indicate that gifted identification procedures are differentiated “to a moderate extent” for ethnically diverse students (54.54% at the state level and 61.29% at the division level). Less than 10.00% of states and local school divisions differentiate gifted identification “to a great extent,” and approximately 35.00% of states and local districts differentiate gifted identification “to no extent.” While few states and local divisions indicate a great extent of differentiation in gifted identification procedures, 63.63% of the states and 45.16% of the local school districts report utilization of two identification measures for culturally diverse ethnic populations. In local districts, the incidence of differentiation of gifted identification is reported to occur more frequently with 22.58% of school divisions employing three gifted
identification measures with ethnically diverse populations. The most commonly used measure for identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education is a traditional testing instrument which yields an IQ score; 96.77% of local divisions utilize this type of protocol as a measure for gifted identification. Teacher nominations and behavioral checklists are the most frequently utilized additional measures when multiple evaluations are employed to identify culturally diverse students for gifted education.

Analysis for Consideration of Characteristics of Culturally Diverse Ethnic Populations

To ascertain the consideration given to the characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic population children during the identification process for gifted education.

Characteristics of ethnically and culturally diverse populations considered by the 11 states and 31 local school divisions in the identification of culturally and ethnically diverse students for gifted education are presented in Table 11.

At the state level, the five factors and the percentages of the states reporting their consideration in the identification process are
indicated: Cultural differences-45.45%; Linguistic factors-45.45%; Ethnicity status-36.36%; Socioeconomic factors-27.27%; and Environmental factors-18.18%.

Among the local school divisions, the percentage of local districts considering during the gifted identification process each of the five factors is indicated: Ethnicity status-54.84%; Cultural differences-48.39%; Linguistic factors-38.71%; Socioeconomic factors-16.13%; and Environmental factors-12.90%.

Summary

All states and local divisions report consideration being given to some characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic groups during the gifted identification process, but only the characteristic of ethnicity exceeds 50.00% in the frequency of consideration. The three factors most often considered in the identification process are ethnicity status (state-36.36% and local-54.84%), cultural differences (state-45.45% and local-48.39%), and linguistic factors (state-45.45% and local-38.71%).
Analysis for Programs for Identified Culturally Diverse Gifted Students

4 To determine the availability of gifted education programs designed to meet the needs of identified students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations.

The degree to which local school divisions differentiate delivery of gifted instruction for ethnically diverse students is reported in Table 9. Responding to the degree of differentiation in delivery of gifted education to minority students, 0.00% of local districts report differentiation “to a great extent;” 9.68% of local districts report differentiation “to a moderate extent;” and 90.32% of local districts report differentiation “to no extent.”

At the local division level, statistics presented in Table 12 indicate responses from 31 urban, suburban, and rural school divisions regarding the availability of gifted education programs designed to meet the needs of students who are members of ethnically diverse populations. The responses of the local districts regarding the degree to which the five programs are implemented include: Study of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative - 9.68% “to a great extent,” 83.87% “to a moderate
extent,” and 6.45% “to no extent;” Learning experiences reflecting a multicultural perspective - 16.13% “to a great extent,” 74.19% “to a moderate extent,” and 9.68% “to no extent;” Funding for enrichment activities beyond the school day - 6.45% “to a great extent,” 16.13% “to a moderate extent,” and 77.42% “to no extent;” Programs for parents/guardians that target strategies for assisting gifted students at home - 3.22% “to a great extent,” 16.13% “to a moderate extent,” and 80.65% “to no extent;” and Exploration of literature that fosters pride/identification with the cultural heritage of learners - 6.45% “to a great extent,” 58.06% “to a moderate extent,” and 35.48% “to no extent."

Statistics in Table 13 reflect specific gifted education programs that are provided by the local school divisions participating in this study. Percentages of the number of local districts that offer the three most common programs include: Pull-out programs-90.32%, Independent study-80.65%, and Academic programs-74.19%. Percentages of the number of local districts that offer the three least common programs include: Grade acceleration-25.81%, Study skills-test taking skills-25.81%, and Non-differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes-3.22%. Programs offered more
frequently to culturally diverse students than to dominant population students include: Individual tutorials for culturally diverse pupils-22.58%, Individual tutorials for dominant population pupils-19.35%; and Early intervention programs for culturally diverse students-9.68%, Early intervention programs for dominant population students-6.45%. None of the reporting local divisions indicate the availability of counseling services specifically designed for identified gifted students.

Summary

Differentiation of the delivery of gifted education for ethnically diverse students is accomplished “to no extent” by reporting states (81.81%) and by reporting local school divisions (90.32%). Approximately 9.00% of states and local districts report differentiating instruction “to a moderate extent.” Only available “to a moderate extent,” the most common existing programs designed to meet the needs of gifted minority students include: studies of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative, learning experiences that reflect a multicultural perspective, and exploration of literature that fosters pride/identification with the cultural heritage of learners. Of the reporting local divisions, 80.65%
indicate that they offer “to no extent” programs for parents/guardians of gifted students that target strategies for assisting gifted students at home. Additionally, the data reveal that 77.42% of local districts report that “to no extent” is funding available for enrichment activities beyond the school day. It is within academic classes, pull-out programs, and independent study that the majority of identified gifted dominant and non-dominant population children receive gifted education. Two programs, early intervention and individual tutorials, are typically provided more frequently to culturally diverse ethnic populations than to dominant population students.
In-Depth Inquiries

Introduction

To provide an added dimension to this study of the identification of culturally diverse ethnic populations for gifted education programs, in-depth inquiries were conducted with three school divisions (one urban/District A, one suburban/District B, and one rural/District C). Prior to conducting the in-depth inquiries in school divisions in the southeastern states, a pilot study of the protocol was administered in school divisions in non-southeastern states.

Selected from among the local divisions recommended by southeastern state directors of gifted education, three districts (each from a different state) completed the local division SAGE surveys, submitted programmatic materials related to their gifted education programs, and participated in telephone interviews based on the questions in the in-depth inquiry protocol. Although formal triangulation of data was not a requirement for these in-depth inquiries, data gathered from the SAGE surveys, the gifted education materials, and the telephone interviews provided valuable and varied
descriptive information about gifted education identification practices in individual school divisions.

While participants in the in-depth inquiries expressed support for this research effort and willingly shared information, they expressed concern that the procedures in their communities and states for identifying accurately minority populations for gifted education would not change as rapidly as they should.
In-Depth Inquiry / District A - Urban

Demographics

District A is a school division in an urban area in the southeastern United States with a total population of 50,000. Of this number, culturally diverse ethnic groups account for 21,000 or 42.00% (African-American-40.91%; Native-American-0.05%; Asian-American-0.42%; and Hispanic-0.62%) of the total population. Within District A's student population of 15,500, 48.00% of the students are ethnic minorities (African-American-45.14%; Native-American-0.30%; Asian-American-0.99%; and Hispanic-1.57%).

In this school division, the total gifted student population is 2321. Within the gifted population, 567 or 24.43% of the students are ethnic minorities (African-American-15.34%; Native-American-0.09%; Asian-American-5.21%; and Hispanic-3.79%). While ethnically diverse populations comprise 42.00% of the total population and 48.00% of the student population of District A, they account for 24.43% of identified gifted students.

African Americans, the largest minority group in District A, are 40.91% of the total population, 45.14% of the student population, and 15.34% of the identified gifted population. By contrast, Asian
Americans form 0.42% of the total population, 0.99% of the student population, and 5.21% of the gifted student population. Hispanics are 0.62% of the total population, 1.57% of the school population, and 3.79% of the gifted population. Native Americans comprise 0.05% of the total population, 0.30% of the school population, and 0.09% of the identified gifted population.

**Screening and Identification**

In District A, students are evaluated on a continuous basis throughout the school year for gifted education with the most concentrated effort being exerted early in the first semester. No attempt is made in this division to differentiate identification procedures for ethnically diverse youngsters. The screening process, managed by an in-school screening committee, includes a review of cumulative folders and grades, teacher and parent recommendations, and previous placement in a gifted program in other school divisions.

Procedures in this district for identifying students for gifted education include: the administration of traditional tests (Otis-Lennon School Ability Test/OLSAT and/or the Wechsler Intelligence
Scale for Children-Revised/WISC-R) by division-level personnel and behavioral checklists completed by classroom teachers. Identification procedures are usually conducted in the student's home school and generally last no more than 90 minutes. For a student to be considered for gifted education, a minimum IQ score of 125 and rankings of at least the 90th percentile on standardized achievement subtests are required. Although the least objective of the identification measures utilized, District A reports that the behavioral checklists are the best indicator of success for culturally diverse gifted children. Once identified for gifted education, children in District A and their parents are given detailed informational packets on the division's gifted education program, briefed on the format and activities of the gifted and talented program, and apprised of the requirements and expectations accompanying the program. Identified students are then officially offered the opportunity to participate in the gifted education program.

While ethnically diverse students are not singled out in any way for identification for gifted education programs in District A, the impact of linguistic and socioeconomic factors are considered during the identification process for all students. Students who are
members of minority populations are most frequently recommended for identification by one of their teachers rather than by a parent, and they often come to the attention of the screening committee because of high scores on standardized assessments.

Gifted Education Program

In District A, the delivery model for gifted education provides differentiated classroom instruction in grades K-2 for identified gifted students, a pull-out program for gifted students in grades 3-9, and accelerated classes and community mentorships for students in grades 10-12. The majority of identified gifted students in District A receive gifted instruction in the bi-weekly pull-out program which is offered at a central gifted education center within the school division.

Instruction within the gifted program in this school division does not reflect a multicultural emphasis, but it does incorporate a multicultural component. Students in the program have considerable freedom of choice with respect to their topics for independent investigations and research, and teachers present the broad scope of human history and culture within the framework of
their lessons to provide the multicultural component of instruction. The gifted program in District A is primarily academic and does not provide specific dramatic, musical, or kinesthetic activities to any gifted students. While this division's gifted program does not differentiate with respect to ethnic minority students, attendance of these students in gifted education classes and their retention in the gifted education program are consistently high. Parents of most gifted students in District A are supportive and encourage their children to achieve both in the regular classroom and in gifted education activities.

Summary

The philosophy of District A regarding identification of children for gifted education and the delivery of gifted education reflects the position that all youngsters, regardless of their race or ethnicity, should be afforded the same opportunities for gifted education. In this school division, no special provisions are made, nor considerations given, to seeking out in a differentiated manner potentially gifted individuals within ethnically diverse populations. With respect to major challenges facing educators in the
identification of gifted minority students, District A indicates the need for developing and utilizing effective identification measures with students in grades K-2 that would target potential talent in young ethnically diverse pupils.
In-Depth Inquiry / District B - Suburban

Demographics

A suburban school division in the southeastern region of the United States, District B lies within a community with a total population of 130,000. Culturally diverse ethnic groups in this community number 27,300 or 21.00% (African-American-12.47%; Native-American-0.64%; Asian-American-2.35%; and Hispanic-5.53%) of the total population. District B's student population is 14,100 students. Of this number, 11.75% are ethnic minorities (African-American-6.80%; Native-American-0.08%; Asian-American-3.30%; and Hispanic-1.57%).

In District B, the total gifted student population is 1288. Within the gifted population, 115 or 8.93% of the students are ethnic minorities (African-Americans-4.58%; Native-Americans-0.00%; Asian-Americans-4.35%; and Hispanics-0.00%). Ethnically diverse populations in District B comprise 21.00% of the total population, 11.75% of the student population, and 8.93% of the identified gifted population.

African Americans, the largest minority population in District B, form 12.47% of the total population, 6.80% of the student
population, and 4.58% of the identified gifted population. Asian Americans form 2.35% of the total population, 3.30% of the student population, and 4.35% of the gifted student population. Hispanics are 5.53% of the total population, 1.57% of the student population, and 0.00% of the gifted population. Native Americans comprise 0.64% of the total population, 0.08% of the student population, and 0.00% of the identified gifted population in District B.

**Screening and Identification**

Students in District B are considered for gifted education at three points during the academic year, in September, January, and May. While no differentiation exists in the identification procedures for ethnically diverse populations, District B does differentiate "to a moderate extent" the delivery of gifted instruction to minority students. A screening committee within each school comprised of an administrator, a guidance counselor, and three teachers considers candidates for gifted education. The following are reviewed during the screening process: teacher nominations, parent nominations, peer nominations, grades, behavioral checklists
completed by parents and teachers, and scores on norm-referenced tests.

District B's identification procedures for gifted education include administration by central office personnel of one or more of the following protocols to potentially gifted students: the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC), the WISC-R, or the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT). Cut-off scores for entry into this division's gifted program are IQ scores of at least 120 and percentile rankings of at least 95% on achievement subtests in math computation and language skills. In terms of culturally diverse populations, District B considers the IQ score to be the best indicator of success in gifted education programs.

Although students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations are not given preference during the identification process, District B reports that linguistic factors are considered for all children during identification for gifted education. In this school system, it is teachers who most frequently recommend ethnically diverse students for gifted education screening.
**Gifted Education Program**

The delivery model for gifted education in District B provides gifted education instruction in grades 4-12. This school division is required by state law to differentiate the instructional curriculum for gifted students, and this differentiation occurs in the regular classroom setting and in various enrichment opportunities available to identified gifted students. Gifted pupils in grades 4-8 experience accelerated curricular emphasis in math, language, and integrated arts. Gifted high school students enroll in Advanced Placement and honors classes designed to maximize their abilities. In addition, numerous university and community mentorships are available to these older students.

District B reports efforts to provide instructional opportunities for ethnically diverse gifted pupils through multicultural learning experiences and an exploration of topics that encourage understanding and appreciation of a broad array of cultural heritages. Attendance and retention in the division's gifted education programs by minority students is comparable to that of dominant population students in the same programs. While District B sees active support from the parents of all gifted students as the
goal, the division considers involvement by parents of ethnically diverse pupils to be adequate.

Summary

District B operates a gifted education program within the framework of the regular school schedule and seeks to identify all gifted children, those from dominant and non-dominant populations, for gifted and talented education. Statistics indicate that African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanics comprise a small proportion of the population in this suburban community and its school division. Representation of ethnically diverse populations in District B’s gifted program includes only African Americans and Asian Americans at the present time. No unique criteria are set for the identification of the ethnically diverse, but delivery of gifted instruction does reflect a moderate effort to meet the needs of the gifted minority children who are in the program. Language barriers and lack of state funding for gifted education are perceived by District B as major challenges facing educators as they strive to identify ethnically diverse children for gifted education.
In-Depth Inquiry / District C - Rural

Demographics

District C is a small school division in a rural area in the southeastern United States with a total population of 3729. Within this population, culturally diverse ethnic groups account for 1305 or 35.00% (African-American-34.49%; Native-American-0.08%; Asian-American-0.16%; and Hispanic-0.27%) of the total population. The student population of District C is 622. Ethnic minorities form 36.66% of the student population (African-American-36.34%; Native-American-0.00%; Asian-American-0.00%; and Hispanic-0.32%).

In District C, the total gifted student population is 54. Within the gifted population, 11 or 20.37% of the students are ethnic minorities (African-American-18.52%; Native-American-0.00%; Asian-American-0.00%; and Hispanic-1.85%). While ethnically diverse populations comprise 35.00% of the total population of this community and 36.66% of the student population of District C, they account for 20.37% of students identified for gifted education programs.

African Americans, the largest ethnic minority in District C, are 34.59% of the total population, 36.34% of the student population, and...
18.52% of the identified gifted population. Hispanics form 0.27% of the total population, 0.32% of the student population, and 1.85% of the gifted population. Asian Americans constitute 0.16% of the total population, 0.00% of the school population, and 0.00% of the identified gifted population. Native Americans are 0.08% of the total population, 0.00% of the school population, and 0.00% of the gifted population.

**Screening and Identification**

Students in District C may be referred at any time for gifted education screening. An in-school screening committee acts on recommendations from teachers, parents, and students. Reviews of student records, grades, student portfolios, and standardized assessments are included in the committee's review of an individual child. This school division indicates that "to a moderate extent" it differentiates both the identification procedures for ethnically diverse students and the delivery of gifted education for minority populations.

District C utilizes a variety of instruments for identification of gifted students. Included in this list are some tests that are
particularly appropriate for distinguishing the strengths of minority children: the WISC-R, the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC); the Ravens Advanced Progressive Matrices, and the Test of Cognitive Skills (TCS). Division-level personnel administer these individual and group tests in the student's home school. In District C, the cut-off IQ score for admittance to gifted education programs is 125 and scores on standardized achievement subtests must be no lower than the 95th percentile. According to District C, the best indicator of success for ethnically diverse gifted children is their IQ score. Children identified for gifted education in District C are invited to participate in the program and provided with information about accelerated instruction and enrichment opportunities. The division involves parents in the gifted education of their children through meetings and a newsletter from the gifted education department in the school district.

In addition to differentiating gifted identification procedures for ethnically diverse students, educators also consider, for both dominant and non-dominant populations, the impact of environmental factors (e.g. impoverished home environment, dysfunctional family, single-parent home, substance abuse) on
children and their display of giftedness. Although recommendations of students for identification for gifted education emanate from several sources, in District C, the majority of these recommendations are submitted by teachers in the school that the child attends.

**Gifted Education Programs**

Gifted education is delivered in District C to students in grades 3-12. Grades 3-5 receive differentiated instruction in the regular classroom, grades 6-8 attend a bi-weekly pull-out program at the division's gifted center, and grades 9-12 are scheduled for honors classes at the high school level. The older students also have opportunities to participate in seminars, mentorships, and independent study coordinated by the division's gifted education director.

In response to the family and community experiences of its ethnically diverse gifted pupils, District C offers to all gifted students learning activities that reflect a multicultural perspective and encourage collaboration and community effort. This division's gifted program is an academic one and does not offer specific creative classes in leadership and the fine arts. District C reports
that the majority of both dominant and non-dominant population students attend gifted programs frequently. There is some movement in and out of gifted education, but minority children in this division are no more likely to withdraw from the gifted education program than are dominant population students. Parents of both groups are supportive of their gifted children and the division's gifted education program.

**Summary**

Regarding gifted education, the philosophy of District C is based on the premise that every effort should be made to identify ethnically diverse children for gifted education and provide appropriate accelerated instruction for these pupils. Statistics reveal that in this small school division, representation of ethnic minorities in gifted education is low with no Asian Americans or Native Americans participating in the program at the present time. Looking to the future, District C identifies three major challenges facing educators as they continue to identify accurately the gifted among minority children: overcoming language barriers,
understanding cultural differences, and accepting cultural and social differences.
Summary of In-Depth Inquiries

Demographics

Demographics of the in-depth inquiries indicate that the total culturally diverse ethnic populations in District A (Urban), District B (Suburban), and District C (Rural) are 42.00%, 21.00%, and 35.00% respectively. In each of these three districts the largest minority population is African American: District A-40.91% of the total district population, District B-12.47% of the total district population, and District C-34.49% of the total district population.

The total culturally diverse ethnic student populations in these three districts are District A-8.00%, District B-11.75%, and District C-36.66%. The largest minority student population in each of the districts is African American: District A-45.14% of the district student population, District B-6.80% of the district student population, and District C-36.34% of the district student population.

In these three districts, the total culturally diverse identified gifted student populations are District A-24.43%, District B-8.93%, and District C-20.73%. The largest minority identified gifted student population in each of the districts is African American: District A-15.34% of the district identified gifted student population, District B-
4.58% of the district identified gifted student population, and District C-18.52% of the district identified gifted student population.

Proportional representation of culturally diverse students in gifted education programs varies among the in-depth inquiry districts, but is consistently lower than dominant population representation in gifted education programs in each district.

In District A, the percentages of African-American and Native-American students identified for gifted education are lower than the percentages of general population and student population for each of these two minority groups. However, in District A, the percentages of Asian-American and Hispanic students identified for gifted education are higher than the percentages of general population and student population for each of these two minority groups.

In District B, the percentages of African-American, Native-American, and Hispanic students identified for gifted education are lower than the percentages of general population and student population for each of these three minority groups. The percentage of Asian-American students in District B who are identified for gifted
education is higher than the percentage of general population and student population for this minority group.

In District C, the percentages of African-American, Native-American, and Asian-American students identified for gifted education are lower than the percentages of general population and student population for each of these three minority groups. In the case of District C, however, the percentage of Hispanic students identified for gifted education is higher than the percentage of general population and student population for this minority group.

**Screening and Identification**

In Districts A, B, and C, gifted education identification procedures for ethnically diverse populations include regular screening and either on-going or periodic opportunities during the academic year for identification protocols to be administered to students. In each of these districts, gifted education screening is a function of the individual school, and identification for gifted education is the responsibility of central office personnel. The three districts require the use of traditional tests that produce an IQ score and one or more other identification measures.
Districts A and B indicate that they do not differentiate identification procedures for culturally diverse children; District C reports some differentiation in the identification process for students who are members of minority populations. All districts require minimum IQ scores and percentile rankings for admission to gifted programs. In identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education, District A considers linguistic factors, and District B considers linguistic and socioeconomic factors; District C reports that consideration is given to environmental factors for students of both non-dominant and dominant populations. The best indicator for success of culturally diverse children in gifted education classes according to Districts B and C is the IQ score; District A reports that the behavioral checklists are the best indicator of success for these students.

**Gifted Education Program**

With respect to the delivery of gifted instruction, Districts A and C provide differentiated classroom instruction, pull-out programs, mentorships, and accelerated classes; District B offers only differentiated instruction to gifted pupils in the regular
classroom setting. District A does not differentiate gifted instruction for minority pupils, District B differentiates to a moderate degree for culturally diverse gifted populations within the regular classroom setting; and District C incorporates a multicultural component into its gifted programs for all students.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

Summary of the Study

This study provides a profile of the procedures utilized for the identification for gifted education of students from culturally diverse ethnic populations in the southeastern United States. Within the framework of this region-specific research, data from southeastern states were analyzed to provide an overview of gifted education identification procedures for ethnically diverse students. Results of this research offer educators a profile of practices in the identification of ethnically diverse students for gifted education programs in a region of the nation with a substantial culturally and ethnically diverse population.

A developing awareness in recent years of the need to make gifted education offerings available to all qualified children including those in American schools who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations has prompted extensive research in this area. Coupled with an appreciation of the cultural, social, and psychological milieu in which many minority children exist is the
understanding that broad-based selection criteria are required if the gifted in these non-dominant groups are to be identified and placed in appropriate gifted education programs.

Concern among educators that a single criterion is insufficient evidence of giftedness has opened the door to assessment of multiple aspects of an individual’s life before a child is denied admittance to or placed in a gifted education class. With emphasis on the whole child rather than merely on an intelligence test score, it is less likely that the hidden talent of young people who are members of ethnically diverse populations will be overlooked in the search for gifted children.

Although some school divisions in this study continue to focus on the IQ score a student achieves as the primary measure of readiness for gifted education, many of districts surveyed indicate the use of multiple assessment measures for gifted identification. Completed state and district SAGE surveys, gifted education plans, in-depth inquiries, and the research reveal that a multi-step gifted education identification process is employed by school divisions in the southeastern United States as they select students for their gifted programs and activities. Traditional testing instruments,
teacher nominations, and behavioral checklists form the basis for most identification procedures. Occasionally, non-traditional testing instruments and specialized measures are employed to further assess a child's potential. While not regularly utilized for gifted identification, these supplemental protocols can be particularly valuable in targeting students from culturally diverse ethnic populations who may confront cultural, social, and economic barriers to academic success.

In addition to profiling identification measures used in the southeastern United States, this research reveals that while some school divisions claim less than proportional representation of minority populations among their gifted and talented students, several school districts appear to be doing an admirable job of attempting to identify children from these populations and to provide appropriate gifted education for them. It is not only sound educational practice that supports thorough and equitable identification procedures; the collective conscience of the community admonishes that the precious talent of all children be tapped.
Limitations of the Study

The results of this research and its implications should be interpreted within the parameters of the following limitations:

1. The sample population is limited to the 11 states and 31 school divisions in the southeastern United States who responded to the SAGE surveys.

2. Information is limited to the data gathered from responses to state and division level SAGE surveys and from the in-depth inquiries.

3. Demographic statistics reflect only the populations of the urban, suburban, and rural districts that participated in the study.

4. Data presented are limited to statistics and information pertinent to the 1994-1995 academic year.
Conclusions

Within the framework of these limitations, conclusions drawn from this research include:

**Research Objective 1 - To determine the proportional relationships of children from culturally diverse ethnic populations who are identified for gifted education and the general and student populations of culturally diverse ethnic groups.**

Statistics on children from culturally diverse ethnic groups who are identified for gifted education indicate that their numbers are disproportionately low when compared with the numbers of the general population of the ethnic groups and the student population of the ethnic groups and with the numbers of the dominant population.

At the state level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students are reported as 0.90% of the total culturally diverse population and 3.55% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population pupils are reported as 1.51% of the total dominant population and 9.35% of the dominant student population. At the urban level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students comprise 0.78% of the total culturally diverse population and 3.06%
of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students comprise 1.83% of the total dominant population and 13.70% of the dominant student population.

At the suburban level, identified gifted ethnically diverse pupils are 0.41% of the total culturally diverse population and 2.64% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students are 1.32% of the total dominant population and 7.66% of the dominant student population. At the rural level, identified gifted ethnically diverse students are 0.27% of the total culturally diverse population and 1.87% of the culturally diverse student population; identified gifted dominant population students are 1.72% of the total dominant population and 9.72% of the dominant student population.

At all levels (state, urban, suburban, and rural), the percentage of Asian-American students identified for gifted education exceeds the percentages of the Asian-American general population and the Asian-American student population. Statistics available for all levels (state, urban, suburban, and rural) indicate that the percentages of African-American, Native-American, and Hispanic students identified for gifted education are lower than the percentages of each of these
minority groups in their general populations and their student populations.

**Research Objective 2 - To assess the philosophy regarding and the utilization of multiple measures for the identification of giftedness in culturally diverse ethnic populations.**

Both state level and division level statistics indicate that gifted identification procedures are differentiated “to a moderate extent” for ethnically diverse students (54.54% at the state level and 61.29% at the division level). Less than 10.00% of states and local school divisions differentiate identification “to no extent.”

While few states and local divisions indicate a great extent of differentiation in gifted identification procedures, 63.63% of the states and 45.16% of the local school districts report utilization of two identification measures for culturally diverse ethnic populations. In local districts, the incidence of differentiation of gifted identification is reported to occur more frequently with 22.58% of school divisions employing at least three gifted identification measures with ethnically diverse populations.
The most commonly used measure for identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education is a traditional testing instrument which yields an IQ score; 96.77% of local divisions utilize this type of protocol as a measure for gifted identification. Teacher nominations and behavioral checklists are the most frequently utilized additional measures when multiple evaluations are employed to identify culturally diverse students for gifted education. Mentioned most frequently by participants in this study as the best indicator of success for culturally diverse students in gifted education programs is the IQ score.

Research Objective 3 - To ascertain the consideration given to the characteristics of culturally diverse ethnic population children during the identification process for gifted education.

All states and local school divisions report some consideration being given to characteristics (Linguistic factors, Socioeconomic factors, Environmental factors, Cultural differences, and Ethnicity status) of culturally diverse ethnic groups during the gifted identification process. However, only the characteristic of ethnicity exceeds 50.00% in the frequency of consideration. The
three factors most often considered in the identification process when working with ethnically diverse children are ethnicity status (state-36.36%; local-54.84%), cultural differences (state-45.45%; local-48.39%), and linguistic factors (state-45.45%; local-38.71%). Few divisions report taking into consideration socioeconomic and environmental factors when identifying minority populations for gifted education programs.

Research Objective 4 - To determine the availability of gifted education programs designed to meet the needs of identified students who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations.

Differentiation of the delivery of gifted education for ethnically diverse students is accomplished "to no extent" by 81.81% of reporting states and by 90.32% of reporting school divisions. Approximately 9.00% of states and local school districts report differentiating instruction "to a moderate extent." Only available "to a moderate extent," the most common existing programs designed to meet the needs of gifted minority students include: studies of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative, learning experiences that reflect a multicultural perspective, and
exploration of literature that fosters pride and identification with the cultural heritage of the learners.

Of the reporting local school divisions, 80.65% indicate that they offer “to no extent” programs for parents and guardians of gifted students that target strategies for assisting gifted children at home. Additionally, the data reveal that 77.42% of local districts report that “to no extent” is funding available for enrichment activities beyond the school day. It is within academic classes, pull-out programs, and independent study that the majority of gifted non-dominant and dominant population children receive gifted instruction. Two programs, early intervention and individual tutorials, are typically provided more frequently to culturally diverse ethnic populations than to dominant population students in the southeastern United States.

Discussion

While some researchers and educators in the southeast stand with one foot firmly mired in the infallibility of the IQ as a determiner of giftedness, others are stepping forward to the more complex but more equitable and comprehensive stance of using broad-based
criterion to select talented pupils for gifted education programs. In addition to traditional assessments, consideration of both the characteristics of gifted children and the characteristics of ethnically diverse populations is essential for comprehensive identification of gifted and talented children. Those individuals who cling to Terman's conclusion that the IQ is indeed the primary mark of giftedness may miss the artistic, musical, and dramatic gifts in both dominant and ethnically diverse populations of students.

This research underscores the importance of utilizing multiple identification measures to tap the giftedness in culturally diverse students who may, for a variety of reasons that have nothing to do with cognitive ability, obtain low scores on a written intelligence test. An example would be the administration of a Spanish IQ examination to a person who neither reads, writes, nor speaks that language. Does this individual's failure on such an instrument truly measure intelligence or innate capabilities? Most educators would respond negatively, of course, but when culturally-biased tests are required of some children of ethnically and linguistically diverse populations, a similar situation can occur.
The need to identify for gifted education children who are members of minority populations and to provide appropriate gifted education experiences for them is imperative if schools are to have truly comprehensive educational programs that do not discriminate against African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, Hispanic, and other ethnically diverse populations. To address this need, school divisions in the southeastern United States currently incorporate selected multiple measures into their gifted identification procedures.

Additional protocols that could assist in accurate identification would include psychological and social profiles of potentially gifted students as well as teacher and parent recommendations, academic records, creativity measures, portfolios, and scores on culturally-unbiased standardized tests. While the use of multiple measures of identification cannot guarantee the selection of all gifted young people, it does advance the capability of educators to be more accurate and equitable in their identification of gifted and talented children who are members of culturally diverse ethnic populations.
Data derived from the state and local school division responses to the SAGE surveys and from the in-depth inquiries reveal that in the southeastern United States there is recognition among many educators of the need to identify all gifted children and to challenge them with instructionally sound gifted education programs. The data also indicate that minority children in the southeastern states, with the exception of Asian Americans, are not identified for gifted education in proportionate numbers to the general and student populations of their ethnic groups. Except in rare instances, the percentages of African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics identified for gifted education in a local school division are extremely low when compared with the total culturally diverse student populations of these minority groups in the community.

Careful consideration should be given to several issues prior to drawing conclusions that, because culturally diverse ethnic populations are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs, educators in the southeastern United States are not appropriately tapping hidden talent within these groups of children. Issues impacting on the identification of gifted students who are members
of minority populations include: the fairness of subjective measures for identification of children for gifted programs; an understanding of the concept of multiple intelligences and differentiated giftedness; the absence of systematic identification procedures in states without a gifted education mandate; the belief that the IQ score remains the best indicator of success in gifted education; the need for adequate funding to provide for appropriate identification protocols; the expectation of equality of identification procedures and delivery of instruction for all students; and an appreciation of the “culture of the community” that can influence the academic performance of ethnically diverse student populations.

**Recommendations**

As a result of the findings in this regional study of gifted education identification procedures employed with students who are members of ethnically diverse populations, recommendations are offered in an effort to increase the accurate identification of and service to gifted African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic children. General recommendations include: 1) the establishment of state guidelines for the identification
of children for gifted education, with particular focus on the needs of minority populations who may be under-identified and under-served; and 2) the development of appropriate counseling services to meet the special needs of gifted students, both those who are culturally diverse and those who are members of the dominant population.

Specific recommendations respective of identification for gifted education address three groups of individuals - young children who are members of minority populations, culturally diverse adolescents, and the parents of ethnically diverse youngsters. It is suggested that consideration of these three recommendations will assist in more appropriate identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education activities.

First, as indicated by reports from the local school divisions surveyed, few early intervention programs that might create the climate in which gifted and creative behaviors can emerge are in place in the southeast. Where they do exist, it is encouraging to see that they appear to be targeting culturally diverse populations. However, additional opportunities for pre-school and K-2 youngsters to experience activities that bring their talented tendencies into focus and to the attention of educators are needed if all ethnically
diverse gifted children are to be identified and served appropriately in challenging gifted education programs.

Second, efforts need to be initiated by educators to understand the importance of the culturally diverse home community to adolescent members of culturally diverse groups. The literature abounds with references to the "pull" of the home and the neighborhood as they compete with the academic world of school for the allegiance of young ethnic minorities. Thorough knowledge of ethnically diverse students' perceptions, concerns, and reasons for not desiring to be identified as gifted can provide the springboard to solutions that will encourage non-dominant population gifted students to excel without sacrificing their personal identity or their strong connections to ethnic communities.

Third, while some gifted education programs provide parents with periodic newsletters and occasional meetings, great effort by educators needs to be focused on the parents of culturally diverse students who have been identified as gifted or who are in the screening process for gifted education. Few respondents in this study indicate the implementation of organized efforts to assist ethnically diverse parents in understanding, encouraging, and
providing psychological support to their gifted children. Such parental involvement can not only assist in identifying potential giftedness but can strengthen the likelihood that culturally diverse students will fully develop their gifted potential.

**Implications for Educators**

In view of research on children from culturally diverse ethnic populations, the characteristics of gifted pupils, and current identification procedures for gifted and talented programs, it is possible to suggest that educators who screen students for placement in gifted activities could benefit from a thorough understanding of this profile of gifted education identification procedures in the southeastern United States. At the very least, a review of this study should serve as a stepping stone to more complete, accurate, and equitable identification of all gifted children from dominant and non-dominant populations.

It is permissible and certainly advisable for educators to continue testing for the IQ. However, two cautions are offered in this regard: the intelligence test should not be the sole criterion for placement in a gifted education program, and the instrument should
be one that is not culturally biased. At the local school division level, educators might adapt the various criteria suggested in this study into a format suitable for their particular situation, incorporating in some manner the following facets of each child into the identification process: nomination and referral forms; portfolios of student work; individual academic records; ability and/or talent evaluations; and cultural/ethnic considerations. A complete picture of the potentially gifted minority child is essential if accurate identification is to be accomplished and subsequent gifted instruction is to be delivered effectively.

Although talented African-American, Native-American, Asian-American, and Hispanic students have been identified for gifted education programs in the southeastern United States, the creativity and curiosity of many others remain hidden, waiting to be discovered and nurtured with appropriate gifted education activities. Educators have an obligation to meet the special needs of these gifted minority children and, in turn, the needs of the region and the nation. Especially significant is the accurate and early identification of bright children who are members of culturally diverse ethnic groups and the placement of these youngsters in challenging gifted
education programs. It is important that this comprehensive search for gifted children encompass all strata of society, from the mountains of the mainstream where identified giftedness is more commonplace to the valleys of the ethnically diverse where buds of hidden talent await the discovery and encouragement that will permit them to blossom.
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APPENDIX A
## Table 1

**Demographic Statistics / State Level (N = 11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>58,875,517</td>
<td>5,170,502</td>
<td>3,125,368</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>13,501,000</td>
<td>21.83 % of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse</td>
<td>12,415,293</td>
<td>1,128,663</td>
<td>665,701</td>
<td>68,400</td>
<td>2,281,669</td>
<td>18.06 % of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>10,273,060</td>
<td>933,915</td>
<td>538,770</td>
<td>307,508</td>
<td>2,295,170</td>
<td>18.06 % of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse</td>
<td>3,128,814</td>
<td>284,438</td>
<td>171,024</td>
<td>14,729</td>
<td>573,793</td>
<td>30.46% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>779,259</td>
<td>70,842</td>
<td>54,928</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>206,565</td>
<td>7.59% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse</td>
<td>111,117</td>
<td>10,102</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>28,919</td>
<td>14.26% of Gifted Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,679,618</td>
<td>243,802</td>
<td>179,641</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>32.57% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Population</td>
<td>872,818</td>
<td>79,347</td>
<td>85,782</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>306,000</td>
<td>17.24% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>461,856</td>
<td>41,987</td>
<td>26,478</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>82,868</td>
<td>47.82% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>220,872</td>
<td>20,079</td>
<td>20,681</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73,485</td>
<td>8.62% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Student Population</td>
<td>39,827</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8,079</td>
<td>8.62% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>6,815</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>17.11% of Gifted Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>984,510</td>
<td>98,451</td>
<td>146,299</td>
<td>23,946</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Population</td>
<td>412,340</td>
<td>41,234</td>
<td>84,777</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>41.88% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>162,426</td>
<td>16,243</td>
<td>25,190</td>
<td>4,598</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>16.50% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>64,037</td>
<td>6,404</td>
<td>13,685</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>44,980</td>
<td>39.43% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Student Population</td>
<td>9,224</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>5.68% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>18.32% of Gifted Student Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Demographic Statistics / Rural Division Level (N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>140,642</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>8,364</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Population</td>
<td>54,463</td>
<td>5,446</td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11,769</td>
<td>38.72 % of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>23,147</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>16.46% of Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>34.02% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Student Population</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>7.05% of Student Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.01% of Gifted Student Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

Proportional Relationships Among Culturally Diverse Students Identified for Gifted Education and the General and Student Populations of Culturally Diverse Groups / State Level (N=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>10,301,576</td>
<td>174,731</td>
<td>340,490</td>
<td>1,598,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>938,507</td>
<td>15,885</td>
<td>30,954</td>
<td>145,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>526,206</td>
<td>18,949</td>
<td>26,876</td>
<td>313,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Pop.</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Diverse Student Pop.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>2,643,322</td>
<td>31,294</td>
<td>121,689</td>
<td>332,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>240,302</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>13,521</td>
<td>36,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>139,136</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>11,632</td>
<td>69,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Student Pop.</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Diverse Gifted Pop.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>73,368</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>19,812</td>
<td>16,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>3,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| % of Gifted Student Pop.     | 9.42             | 0.23            | 2.54           | 2.07     
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Table 6
Proportional Relationships Among Culturally Diverse Students Identified for Gifted Education and the General and Student Populations of Culturally Diverse Groups / Urban Division Level (N=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>649,778</td>
<td>9,380</td>
<td>32,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>59,071</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>2,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>58,438</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>3,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Gen Pcp.</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>194,166</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>9,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17,652</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>20,569</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Student Pcp.</td>
<td>42.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>4,748</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Gifted Student Pcp.</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Proportional Relationships Among Culturally Diverse Students Identified for Gifted Education and the General and Student Populations of Culturally Diverse Groups / Suburban Division Level (N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>% of Gen Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>277,249</td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>57,312</td>
<td>28.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,134</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,261</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113,696</td>
<td>11,370</td>
<td>25,521</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>53,615</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>11,586</td>
<td>33.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,553</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>515</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>44,687</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4469</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Gen Pop.</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Student Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>7,532</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Student Pop.</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Diverse Gifted Population</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Gifted Student Pop.</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORS</td>
<td>To A Great Extent</td>
<td>To A Moderate Extent</td>
<td>To No Extent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (N=11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division (N=31)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Differentiation of Gifted Education Identification and Delivery of Instruction Respective of Culturally Diverse Students (State/Division Levels)

To what degree do you differentiate gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse ethnic minorities?

To what extent do you differentiate delivery of gifted education for identified culturally diverse ethnic minorities?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY Questions</th>
<th>State (N=11)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Division (N=31)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional testing instruments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional testing instruments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-identification screening procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher nominations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent nominations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer nominations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-nominations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community nominations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation techniques</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity instruments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student portfolios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills inventories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm-referenced tests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor skills inventories</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral checklists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of 1 identification measure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of 2 identification measures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of 3 identification measures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of 4 or more identification measures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Utilization of Multiple Gifted Education Identification Measures for Culturally Diverse Students (State/Division Levels)
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Table 11
Factors Considered in the Identification of Culturally Diverse Students for Gifted Education (State/Division Levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>State (N=11)</th>
<th>Division (N=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic factors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic factors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12
Availability of Gifted Education Programs Designed to Meet the Needs of Culturally Diverse Students / Division Level (N=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>To A Great Extent</th>
<th>To A Moderate Extent</th>
<th>To No Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experiences reflecting a multicultural perspective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for enrichment activities beyond the school day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for parents and guardians that target strategies for assisting gifted students at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of literature that fosters pride and identification with gender, race, and cultural heritage of learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 13
Gifted Education Programs Provided for Culturally Diverse and Dominant Population Students / Division Level (N=31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>Non-Dominant Population</th>
<th>Dominant Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Reports</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of academic skills</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual tutorials</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull-out programs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process skill development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorships</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade acceleration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study skills and test-taking skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional placement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
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SAGE...Survey of Activities in Gifted Education/State Level

State________________________________________________ Phone ______________________
Director of Gifted Education______________________________

1. What is the total population of your state?

2. What is the total student population of your state (Grades K-12)?

3. What is the total culturally diverse student population (Black, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic) in your state?

4. List the enrollment totals of the following culturally diverse student populations in your state.
   ______ Black  ; ______ American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut
   ______ Asian/Pacific Islander  ; ______ Hispanic
   ______ Other

5. What is the total identified gifted student population in your state?

6. What is the total culturally diverse gifted student population (racial/ethnic minority groups) in your state?

7. What are the enrollment totals of the following culturally diverse student populations in your state who have been identified for gifted education?
   ______ Black  ; ______ American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut
   ______ Asian/Pacific Islander  ; ______ Hispanic
   ______ Other

8. State (or attach) your state's definition of gifted learners.

9. If your state defines culturally diverse gifted learners, state (or attach) the definition.
10. Does your state have a mandate for gifted education?
   ___ Yes (Please explain/attach. ______________________________ )
   ___ No

11. In your state, to what degree do you differentiate gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse and for Caucasian student populations?
    [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = No extent]

12. In your state, to what degree do you differentiate delivery of gifted education for identified culturally diverse and Caucasian student populations?
    [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = No extent]

13. In your state, which of the following methods are utilized to identify potentially gifted culturally diverse students and Caucasian students? Please check all that apply and cite specific instruments used.

   CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN

   DIVERSE

   ___ Traditional testing instruments (e.g. OLSAT)
   ___ Non-traditional testing instruments (e.g. Ravens Matrices)
   ___ Pre-identification screening procedures
   ___ Teacher nominations
   ___ Parent nominations
   ___ Peer nominations
   ___ Self-nominations
   ___ Community nominations
   ___ Observation techniques
   ___ Case studies
   ___ Creativity instruments (e.g. Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking)
   ___ Student portfolios (e.g. projects, essays)
   ___ Leadership skills inventories
   ___ Norm-referenced tests
   ___ Psychomotor skills inventories
   ___ Behavioral checklists
   ___ Group tasks
   ___ Other (Specify: ______________________________ )

14. If applicable, check the factors listed below that are considered by your state when identifying culturally diverse and Caucasian students for gifted education programs.

   CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN

   DIVERSE

   ___ Linguistic factors
   ___ Socio-economic factors
   ___ Environmental factors (e.g. dysfunctional family, substance abuse)
   ___ Cultural differences
   ___ Ethnicity status
   ___ Other (Specify: ______________________________ )
15. Which instructional programs/services listed below are provided for culturally diverse and Caucasian gifted students within your state? Please check all that apply and cite specifics, if applicable.

**CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE**

- Academic programs (e.g. English, math, science, social studies)
- Development of academic skills
- Early intervention programs
- Individual tutorials
- Pull-out programs
- Non-differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes
- Differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes
- Process skill development (e.g. critical thinking, research)
- Mentorships
- Grade acceleration
- Study skills/test-taking skills
- Creative programs (e.g. fine arts, leadership)
- Non-traditional placement (e.g. dual enrollment in high school/college, work-study)
- Independent study
- Counseling services
- Other (Specify: ______________________;_________)

16. Once identified for gifted education programs, with what degree of regularity do culturally diverse and Caucasian students in your state attend gifted education classes and programs?

**CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE**

- Always attend gifted classes/programs
- Frequently attend gifted classes/programs
- Rarely attend gifted classes/programs

17. In response to the community/family experiences of your state's culturally diverse gifted students, to what extent does your gifted program offer the following opportunities to these children? [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

- Study of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative
- Learning experiences reflecting a multicultural perspective
- Funding for enrichment activities beyond the school day
- Programs for parents/guardians that target strategies for assisting gifted students at home
- Exploration of literature that fosters pride/identification with gender, race, and cultural heritage of learners
- Other (Specify: ____________________________________________ )
18. Listed below are characteristics that may apply to gifted children. Using the following scale, indicate how these characteristics are reflected in your culturally diverse gifted student population.

[3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

- Preference for oral over written tasks
- Procrastination related to academic work
- Flexibility in thinking patterns
- Ability to generalize
- Ability to deal with the abstract and the concrete
- Difficulty with assignment/homework completion
- Erratic academic performance
- Ability to conceptualize
- Preference for expressive activities
- Need for recognition of personal accomplishments
- Need for confirmation of personal abilities
- Need for frequent feedback on progress
- Other (Specify: ____________________________)

19. Listed below are behaviors that may be displayed by gifted children. Using the following scale, indicate how these behaviors are reflected in your culturally diverse gifted student population.

[3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

- Understand consequences for personal behavior
- Exhibit risk-taking behaviors
- Work toward a goal
- Organize time
- Develop social interaction with diverse groups
- Plan for the future
- See themselves in adult roles
- Exhibit maturity
- Value personal worth and ideas
- Exhibit self-control
- Exhibit tolerance of human diversity
- Other (Specify: ____________________________)

20. With respect to identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education programs, what do you see as the major challenges facing educators?

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
21. As part of my study, I will also investigate gifted education practices in local school divisions. Please recommend three school divisions (1 urban, 1 suburban, and 1 rural) in your state that are implementing promising gifted identification procedures and instructional programs (for culturally diverse students) and provide the information requested below.

**URBAN**

School Division ________________________________________________

Director of Gifted Education ______________________________________

Address _______________________________________________________

    Street ______________________________________________________

    City/State/ZipCode __________________________________________

Telephone _____________________________________________________

**SUBURBAN**

School Division ________________________________________________

Director of Gifted Education ______________________________________

Address _______________________________________________________

    Street ______________________________________________________

    City/State/ZipCode __________________________________________

Telephone _____________________________________________________

**RURAL**

School Division ________________________________________________

Director of Gifted Education ______________________________________

Address _______________________________________________________

    Street ______________________________________________________

    City/State/ZipCode __________________________________________

Telephone _____________________________________________________

**Thank You!**

(Please check to be sure that you have responded to all of the items on all 5 pages. Then return your survey in the stamped envelope provided.)
APPENDIX C
SAGE...Survey of Activities in Gifted Education/Division Level

School Division ____________________  City/County ________________  State _____________
Director of Gifted Education ____________________________  Phone ________________

1. Which of the following best characterizes your community?
   ____ Urban
   ____ Suburban
   ____ Rural

2. What is the total population of your community?

3. What is the total student population of your school division (Grades K-12)?

4. What is the total culturally diverse student population (Black, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic) in your school division?

5. List the enrollment totals of the following culturally diverse student populations in your school division.
   __________ Black
   __________ Asian/Pacific Islander
   __________ Other

6. What is the total identified gifted student population in your school division?

7. What is the total culturally diverse gifted student population (racial/ethnic minority groups) in your school division?

8. What are the enrollment totals of the following culturally diverse student populations in your school division who have been identified for gifted education?
   __________ Black
   __________ American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut
   __________ Asian/Pacific Islander
   __________ Hispanic
   __________ Other
9. State (or attach) your school division's definition of gifted learners.

10. If your division defines culturally diverse gifted learners, state (or attach) the definition.

11. In your school division, to what degree do you differentiate gifted education identification procedures for culturally diverse and for Caucasian student populations?
   [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

12. In your school division, to what degree do you differentiate delivery of gifted education for identified culturally diverse and Caucasian student populations?
   [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

13. In your school division, which of the following methods are utilized to identify potentially gifted culturally diverse students and Caucasian students? Please check all that apply and cite specific instruments used.
   CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE
   —— ——
   Traditional testing instruments (e.g. OLSAT)
   Non-traditional testing instruments (e.g. Ravens Matrices)
   Pre-identification screening procedures
   Teacher nominations
   Parent nominations
   Peer nominations
   Self-nominations
   Community nominations
   Observation techniques
   Case studies
   Creativity instruments (e.g. Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking)
   Student portfolios (e.g. projects, essays)
   Leadership skills inventories
   Norm-referenced tests
   Psychomotor skills inventories
   Behavioral checklists
   Group tasks
   Other (Specify: ______________________________

14. If applicable, check the factors listed below that are considered by your school division when identifying culturally diverse and Caucasian students for gifted education programs.
   CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE
   —— ——
   Linguistic factors
   Socio-economic factors
   Environmental factors (e.g. dysfunctional family, substance abuse)
   Cultural differences
   Ethnicity status
   Other (Specify: ______________________________
15. Which instructional programs/services listed below are provided for culturally diverse and Caucasian gifted students within your school division? Please check all that apply and cite specifics, if applicable.

**CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE**

- Academic programs (e.g. English, math, science, social studies)
- Development of academic skills
- Early intervention programs
- Individual tutorials
- Pull-out programs
- Non-differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes
- Differentiated instruction in heterogeneous classes
- Process skill development (e.g. critical thinking, research)
- Mentorships
- Grade acceleration
- Study skills/test-taking skills
- Creative programs (e.g. fine arts, leadership)
- Non-traditional placement (e.g. dual enrollment in high school/college, work-study)
- Independent study
- Counseling services
- Other (Specify: _________________________________)

16. Once identified for gifted education programs, with what degree of regularity do culturally diverse and Caucasian students in your school division attend gifted education classes and programs?

**CULTURALLY CAUCASIAN DIVERSE**

- Always attend gifted classes/programs
- Frequently attend gifted classes/programs
- Rarely attend gifted classes/programs

17. In response to the community/family experiences of your division's culturally diverse gifted students, to what extent does your gifted program offer the following opportunities to these children? [3 = To a great extent; 2 = To a moderate extent; 1 = To no extent]

- Study of cultures of which culturally diverse students are representative
- Learning experiences reflecting a multicultural perspective
- Funding for enrichment activities beyond the school day
- Programs for parents/guardians that target strategies for assisting gifted students at home
- Exploration of literature that fosters pride/identification with gender, race, and cultural heritage of learners
- Other (Specify: _________________________________)
18. Listed below are characteristics that may apply to gifted children. Using the following scale, indicate how these characteristics are reflected in your culturally diverse gifted student population. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preference for oral over written tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procrastination related to academic work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in thinking patterns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to generalize</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deal with the abstract and the concrete</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with assignment/homework completion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratic academic performance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to conceptualize</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for expressive activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for recognition of personal accomplishments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for confirmation of personal abilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for frequent feedback on progress</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify: __________________________________________________________)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Listed below are behaviors that may be displayed by gifted children. Using the following scale, indicate how these behaviors are reflected in your culturally diverse gifted student population. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand consequences for personal behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit risk-taking behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work toward a goal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop social interaction with diverse groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for the future</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See themselves in adult roles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit maturity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value personal worth and ideas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit self-control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit tolerance of human diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify: _______________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. With respect to identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education programs, what do you see as the major challenges facing educators?

1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________________

Thank You!

(Please check to be sure that you have responded to all of the items on all 4 pages. Then return your survey in the stamped envelope provided.)
APPENDIX D
IN-DEPTH INQUIRY / INTERVIEW

IDENTIFICATION FOR GIFTED EDUCATION

If your school division has a screening process for gifted education, please describe it. At what grade level/s does this process occur?

How frequently do you evaluate students for gifted education? At what grade level/s and time/s of year do you evaluate? How is the evaluation process managed and implemented?

What determines your division's choice of identification protocols for gifted education?

Which of the protocols utilized by your division is the best indicator of success for culturally diverse gifted children? Please explain.

How important is IQ in determining eligibility for gifted education? If you require a minimum IQ score, what is it? How do you differentiate between culturally diverse and dominant student populations with regard to IQ cut-off scores?

What other protocols, if any, is your division considering as a means of identifying culturally diverse students for gifted education?

Approximately how much time is spent in the identification of a single child for gifted education?

By whom are most culturally diverse students recommended for gifted education?

Once culturally diverse children are found eligible for gifted education, what process orients/acclimates them to the gifted instructional setting?

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Describe your gifted education delivery model. What percentage of your gifted education teachers are members of culturally diverse populations?

At what site do the majority of gifted students receive instruction?

Describe any multicultural characteristics of your gifted education curriculum.

What types of mentorships are provided for culturally diverse gifted students?

If leadership, dramatic, musical, kinesthetic activities are offered to culturally diverse gifted youth, please describe these programs.

How is your gifted education curriculum differentiated to meet the needs of culturally diverse students?
What strategies reflect an effort to keep identified culturally diverse students actively involved in gifted education programs?

What is the average longevity of culturally diverse students in gifted education programs?

What kinds of parental/guardian support can you depend upon with respect to culturally diverse children?

What differences, if any, do you find among different culturally diverse gifted children with respect to representation and success in gifted programs?
March 1996

Ms. ____________________
Director of Gifted Education
State Department of Education
5284 Crenshaw Boulevard
City, State

Dear ____________________:

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary and a secondary school principal in the York County School Division, I am conducting dissertation research on the identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education programs. The attached PILOT survey - SAGE - is designed to collect both demographic data and information on gifted identification procedures and gifted education programs. The results of this study will assist educators as they seek to ensure equity and excellence in identification and services for all gifted children. As a state director of gifted education, your assistance with the PILOT stage of my project will be greatly appreciated.

The SAGE questionnaire requires approximately 20 minutes to complete and should be returned to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope prior to ______. In addition to completing the survey, please include any comments or suggestions that you feel would enhance my study. In addition, I would appreciate having copies of your identification protocols and curriculum guides for gifted education.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to respond to this request. Your response is very important to my work and will be treated confidentially. If you wish, I will be most happy to provide you with a summary of the results of this research. If you have questions regarding the SAGE questionnaire, please contact me at ____________ (home) / ____________ (office) or contact my advisor at the College of William and Mary, Dr. James Yankovich, at ____________ (office).

Again, thank you for your cooperation with this important part of my research project, and please accept the enclosed 'Guiding the Gifted' bookmark as a token of my appreciation for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Kitty Richmond
Doctoral Candidate
The College of William and Mary

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
March 1996

Mr. ______________________
Program Specialist/Gifted Education
State Department of Education
1234 Main Street
City, State

Dear Mr. ______________________:

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary and a secondary school principal in the York County School Division, I am conducting dissertation research on the identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education programs in the southeastern region of the United States. The attached survey - SAGE - is designed to collect both demographic data and information on gifted identification procedures and gifted education programs. The results of this study will assist educators as they seek to ensure equity and excellence in identification and services for all gifted children. As a state director of gifted education in one of the 12 states in this study, your assistance with this project will be greatly appreciated.

The SAGE questionnaire requires approximately 20 minutes to complete and should be returned to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope prior to __________. In addition to completing the survey, please assist me by responding to my request for information on three school districts within your state (one urban, one suburban, and one rural) that are implementing promising gifted programs and identification procedures.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to respond to this request. Your response is very important to my study and will be treated confidentially. If you wish, I will be most happy to provide you with a summary of the results of this research. If you have questions regarding the SAGE questionnaire, please contact me at ___________ (home) / ___________ (office) or contact my advisor at the College of William and Mary, Dr. James Yankovich, at ___________ (office).

Again, thank you for your cooperation with this important research project, and please accept the enclosed 'Guiding the Gifted' bookmark as a token of my appreciation for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Kitty Richmond
Doctoral Candidate
The College of William and Mary
APPENDIX G
March 1996

Dear Dr.________________:

Your school division has been recommended to me by your state director of gifted education as a participant in my research on the identification of culturally diverse children for gifted education. Thank you for your cooperation with my study.

As a doctoral candidate at the College of William and Mary and a secondary school principal in the York County School Division, I am conducting dissertation research on the identification of culturally diverse students for gifted education programs in the southeastern region of the United States. The attached survey - SAGE - is designed to collect both demographic data and information on gifted identification procedures and gifted education programs. The results of this study will assist educators as they seek to ensure equity and excellence in identification and services for all gifted children. As a division director of gifted education in one of the 12 states in this study, your assistance with this project will be greatly appreciated.

The SAGE questionnaire requires approximately 20 minutes to complete and should be returned to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope prior to __________. In addition to completing the survey, please send me a) copies of protocols used to identify culturally diverse children for gifted programs, b) curriculum guides for gifted education, and c) informational brochures and directives related to gifted education in your school division.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to respond to this request. Your response is very important to my study and will be treated confidentially. If you wish, I will be most happy to provide you with a summary of the results of this research. If you have questions regarding the SAGE questionnaire, please contact me at __________ (home) / __________ (office) or contact my advisor at the College of William and Mary, Dr. James Yankovich, at __________ (office). Again, thank you for your cooperation with this important research project, and please accept the enclosed 'Guiding the Gifted' bookmark as a token of my appreciation for your valuable assistance.

Sincerely,

Kitty Richmond
Doctoral Candidate
The College of William and Mary
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