## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

# An Evaluation of a Gifted and Enrichment Program

by

Benna Faith Strober

A Doctoral Project Submitted in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Psychology in the Department of Psychology at Pace University

NEW YORK

1995

UMI Number: 9536695

UMI Microform 9536695
Copyright 1995, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

PACE UNIVERSITY

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
PSY.D. PROJECT
FINAL APPROVAL FORM

(Please type all information)

NAME: Benna Faith Strober

TITLE OF PROJECT: An Evaluation of a Gifted and Enrichment Program

DOCTORAL PROJECT COMMITTEE:

PROJECT ADVISOR: Florence Denmark, Ph.D.
(Name) Chair and Distinguished Professor of Psychology Pace University
(Title) (Affiliation)

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Alfred Ward, Ph.D.
(Name)
Associate Professor of Psychology Pace University
(Title) (Affiliation)

FINAL APPROVAL OF COMPLETED PROJECT:

I have read the final version of the doctoral project and certify that it meets the relevant requirements for the Psy.D. degree in School-Community Psychology.

Florence L. Denmark — 6/23/95
(Project Advisor's Signature) (Date)

Alfred W. Ward — 6/26/95
(Project Consultant's Signature) (Date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Acknowledgements....iv

List of Tables....vii

Abstract....ix

I. Introduction/Review of the Literature....1

Overview

History of Gifted Education in the United States

Types of Gifted Programs

Evaluation of Gifted Programs

Specific Areas of Interest

Programs of Focus

Statement of Purpose

Research Questions

II. Method....24

Procedure Used in Evaluating the Programs

Participants

Materials

Procedure

III. Results....33

Description of the Sample

Responses to Research Questions

IV. Discussion.....74

Evaluation of the Research Questions

Recommended Changes for the Gifted and Enrichment Programs

Recommendations for Subsequent Program Evaluations

Relevancy to School Psychology and Implications

References.....94

Appendices.....99

A. Teacher Screening Form

B. Consent for Participation

C. Letter to Mainstream Teachers

D. Me Scale

E. Gifted Program Questionnaire- Parent Version

F. Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Parent Version

G. Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Teacher Version

H. Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Principal Version

I. Gifted Program Questionnaire- Student Version

J. Open Ended Questions for Gifted Students

Acknowledgements

As people who know me will say, I am never at a loss for words, particularly when it comes to telling people how I feel about them. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to give those individuals who have stood by me throughout my graduate training, while giving their guidance and affection to get through it all, their due recognition and thanks.

First, this project would not have occurred had it not been for my advisor, Florence Denmark. Her constant advice and availability to help me when I needed it are extremely apprecited. My consultant, Alfred Ward has been a true Godsend. The countless meetings we had in front of the computer, and his calmness when we thought all the data was lost was truly appreciated and greatly needed. Due to his constant presence and dedication over the past two years, this project now appears before you as a finished product. All I can say to him is thank you, thank you, thank you!!! Steve Salbod also lent me not only his statistical expertise

on this project, but his wonderful sense of humor and friendship over the years that I will never forget. He was there for me from the initial stages of this undertaking to the present, answering any and all questions I had for which I thank him.

Another quality about myself that those who know me will attest to is the importance of my family. I would not have made it through graduate school as a whole, or this project, without the overwhelming support, guidance and interest that my parents, Dr. Stephen and Lisa Strober, have given to me. The words to describe the love and pride I feel in having these two incredible individuals as my parents are hard to find. Additionally, the love and support given to me by my grandmother, Blanche Rattner, as well as her wisdom and independence, have made her into a role model for me and someone I respect and revere a great deal. Throughout the years I have also been blessed with a brother and sister-in-law who have been there for me unconditionally. For that and so much more I want to thank Dr. Jonathan and Mona Strober.

My very dear friends who have stood by me also deserve recognition. I do not think I would have made it through graduate school or this project without their support and

understanding when I could not join them due to having to put in long hours at my computer. Last, but most definitely not least, I would like to express my gratitude to Paul Zuckerman. Although our relationship did not begin until the end of my graduate training, he has been as important to me as any individual can be. For his support, guidance and love, I am eternally grateful.

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1. Overview of Program Evaluation Research Design.37

Table 2. Means and SDs for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Gender and Time of Testing.....38

Table 3. Time of Testing by Gender ANOVA Results for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program..40

Table 4. Means and SDs for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Gender of Child and Time of Testing.....41

Table 5. Time of Testing by Gender of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program.....42

Table 6. Means and SDs for Parents' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program by Gender of Child and Time of Testing (Group).....44

Table 7. Time of Testing by Gender of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program.....46

Table 8. Means and SDs for Mainstream Teachers Attitudes About the Enrichment Program by Group and Grade.....48

Table 9. Group by Grade ANOVA Results for Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program.....51

Table 10. Proportion of Principals Who Agreed and Strongly Agreed To Questions Regarding the Gifted and/or Enrichment Programs.....53

Table 11. Means and SDs for Children's Self-Esteem by Gender and Time of Testing.....56

Table 12. Time of Testing by Gender ANOVA Results for Children's Self-Esteem.....58

Page

Table 13. Means and SDs for Children's Self-Esteem by Grade and Time of Testing.....60

Table 14. Time of Testing by Grade ANOVA Results for Children's Self-Esteem.....61

Table 15. Means and SDs for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Grade and Time of Testing.....62

Table 16. Time of Testing by Grade ANOVA Results for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program..62

Table 17. Means and SDs for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Grade of Child and Time of Testing.....65

Table 18. Time of Testing by Grade of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program.....66

Table 19. Proportion of Total Inter-Teacher Agreement and Proportion of Agreement on Rating of "Exceptional" for Gifted Students' Abilities...67

Table 20. Correlations Between Gifted Students' Program Satisfaction and Parents' Program Satisfaction at Time of First Testing.....70

Table 21. Correlations Between Gifted Students' Self-Esteem and Program Satisfaction at Time of First Testing.....71

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine newly developed gifted and enrichment programs in a New York suburban school district. This evaluation attempted to measure whether the programs obtained their stated goals and objectives and gained a high level of acceptance by those involved. The participants included seventy students identified as gifted and their parents, the four principals in the district, a sample of the forty regular education teachers in the district, and a stratified sample of the parents of students involved in the enrichment program (Talents Unlimited). Subjects completed questionnaires and responded to open ended questions, in order to ascertain their opinions about the programs both at mid-year and at the end of the 1993-94 school year. In addition, self-concepts of the students identified as gifted were examined. Item analyses were conducted to measure the programs' strengths and areas in need of improvement. ANOVAs reveal significant differences among gifted males and females and between fourth, fifth and sixth graders in certain aspects of their self esteem. Significant differences were also seen over time for all parents' satisfaction with the programs,

particularly in the area of communication. Results indicated that the programs were well accepted by all involved and minimal changes were needed. Recommendations for program changes included increasing parent communication via workshops and creating a district-wide policy regarding the make-up of missed classwork by gifted students while attending the pull-out program. Recommendations for future program evaluations and relevancy to school psychology were discussed.

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION/REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## Overview

An evaluation of newly developed gifted and enrichment programs was conducted over the 1993-94 school year in a New York suburban school district. When evaluating any program, there are certain areas that must be inspected before the format of the evaluation is constructed. The following review of literature will recount the background necessary to understand how to run a gifted program evaluation from start to finish, including the general history of gifted education in the United States, types of gifted programs that have been created, the method for evaluating gifted programs, and specific areas of interest covered in the current program evaluation.

## History of Gifted Education in the United States

Educational programs for the gifted have varied over the years since their inception in the 1800s. There was only a scant amount of literature on gifted education written during the 19th century. In the early 1900s, this area gained greater recognition due to the creation of the intelligence test and the work of psychologists Terman and Hollingsworth (Fox & Washington, 1985). In 1901 the first special school for the gifted and talented was founded in Massachusetts. Baltimore and New York were soon to follow

suit. Since that time, magnet schools and the "satellite school-within-a-school approach" were two variations on the original special schools created to counter the costliness and elitism these separate schools for the gifted fostered (Fox & Washington, 1985).

Over the next few decades gifted education saw many shifts in importance in the United States. In the 1950s, when Sputnik was launched, the United States felt pressure towards fostering academic excellence. At that time, federal funds were supplied for the National Defense Education Act and for the implementation of other programs, to meet the different education needs of gifted and talented students. During the Kennedy administration, however, the focus shifted from gifted education to the special needs of the disabled and less advantaged children.

In 1972, Sidney Marland, the U. S. Commissioner of Education, reported to Congress on his findings of the education for the gifted and talented. Marland's report included a national definition of gifted students:

> Gifted and talented children are those, identified by professionally qualified persons, who by virtue of outstanding abilities are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services

> beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society. Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, visual and performing arts, and/or psycho-motor ability. (p.2)

Approximately 3 to 5 percent of school aged children fit this description and make up the group called gifted and talented students (DeLeon & VandenBos, 1985).

Others attempted to expand on Marland's original definition, and the term 'gifted child' became a category unto itself, with more characteristics than just high intelligence to define the term. Janos and Robinson (1985) conducted a meta analysis on aspects of giftedness and found that gifted children "tend to be more mature and have fewer behavioral and social problems than do other children" (p. 147). In addition, this meta analysis described gifted children as self-sufficient, energetic, having high stamina, motivated, and more task-focused than non-gifted children. In order for schools to fulfill these students' special educational needs, different educational programs were designed.

A specific yet broad outline for gifted programs was created by Congress in response to Marland's report on the

education of the gifted. The report remanded programs for the gifted to possess a curriculum denoting high level cognitive concepts and processes, specific instructional strategies for use with gifted and talented students, and special grouping arrangements to fit the specific needs of these children (Fox & Washington, 1985).

Karnes and Collins (1978) reported that, by 1978, 42 states created laws, or at least guidelines, in regard to gifted education. Yet, while all states were required to follow the parameters laid out by Marland's report and the ensuing response by Congress, the similarities seemed to end there. There was a specific population to work with, those with special needs at the high end of the intellectual spectrum, yet no uniform procedure for educating them. This led to the creation of many different educational programs for the gifted.

Types of Gifted Programs

Over the years there was a large number of programs created in order to meet the special needs of gifted children. These programs differed not only due to each specific school district's needs and beliefs, but also because definitions of giftedness varied.

The preferred method of gifted education for some

educators was the acceleration of a student's progress. Others believed students' experiences should be as varied as possible and therefore based their programs on field trips, independent projects and creative problem solving activities. Still others thought a combination of these two approaches would be most beneficial. In conclusion, the educators' beliefs and the focus on either process or content denoted what type of program would be implemented (Fox & Washington, 1985).

Researchers in the area of the gifted offered structure to schools so these students' special needs could be met by creating different educational models for gifted students. The two most widely known program models are Renzulli's Enrichment Triad (Renzulli, 1977) and the Hopkins Acceleration Model, developed by Stanley and his colleagues (Benbow & Stanley, 1983). These two programs have served as the bases for most other gifted programs.

The Enrichment Triad

There are three levels to this program. The first two are not specific to gifted students and may be made available to the entire school population. Type I activities encompass extracurricular lessons and

assignments. Type II activities focus on creative thinking and problem-solving strategies. Type III activities focus on the enrichment of the gifted students' curriculum. This program assumes that identification of students for the gifted program is based on Renzulli's three-ring model of giftedness (Renzulli, 1978), which defines a gifted student as one with above average ability in some area, task commitment and creative potential. Type III activities include some type of individual project. This program would be organized as a pull-out program for the gifted students and as a school-wide enrichment program in which the Type I and II activities would be utilized.

The Accelerative Model

Otherwise known as the Hopkins Model, this type of program grew from a combination of a number of different programs created to educate gifted children. These programs are geared for students in middle school. Students take the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) for screening into the program. They are then given peer mentors or take classes taught by college professors who run the class as a college course. Languages and mathematics are highlighted. The 'fast paced class concept' is used to guide the gifted child's education.

As these two types of gifted programs show, there is a variety of ways that gifted students can receive their specialized education. One school district might utilize a pull-out program, based on Renzulli's model, in which selected students would leave their regular classroom for a few hours a week. Another district may place students in a separate classroom filled with other selected students where they would receive all regular and extracurricular educational services simultaneously. Students may also attend a special school for the gifted. In essence, the type of program employed by a school district depends on a variety of reasons such as availability of staff and space, funding and transportation.

Whichever type of program is inevitably implemented within a certain school district, it is important to ascertain the acceptance level and effectiveness of that program within the district. This is done via a program evaluation.

Evaluation of Gifted Programs

The implementation of new educational programs requires time, money and much dedication if they are to be successful. Since these needs are well known by most educators, it is troublesome to see that evaluations of

new programs are often overlooked. The need for thorough evaluations is dictated by the duty of educators to be responsible and the combination of budget cuts with the high cost of gifted programs (Gallagher, 1989).

In an effort to encourage program evaluations, Reis (1989), as cited in Carter (1992), stated that assessment should be mandatory whenever a program is funded. Her rationale was that program evaluators would "document the effectiveness of programs, improve existing practices and respond to district administrators and Board of Education members who ask for documentation on whether specific programs make a difference" (p. 406). It thereby follows that the primary goal of a program evaluation is to gather information that allows assessment of the overall merit or worth of the program under scrutiny (Callahan & Hunsaker, 1991).

Traxler (1987) suggests that the evaluation of gifted programs should focus on "well-formulated objectives and the evaluation format should be designed before the program is implemented. The evaluator should be involved from the beginning and should be given specific guidelines" (p. 108). This is a necessity to insure that the evaluation runs smoothly and follows the natural progression of the school

year; just as the students' learning progresses, so does the evaluation of the program's perceived effectiveness on their learning. Although the benefits of a good program evaluation is evident, some have encountered difficulty in gaining this information (e.g. Beggs, Mouw, & Barton, 1989.)

Educators have discussed a variety of reasons for being unable to provide evaluative information about gifted programs (see Callahan, 1983). Most claim that standardized instruments do not provide norms for gifted students and that it is inappropriate and unethical to utilize a control group because all students identified as gifted should be entitled to participate in the program (Beggs, Mouw, & Barton, 1989). There is also a sub-population of gifted students who are not involved in gifted programs, either because they were overlooked for selection (e.g. a gifted underachiever) or, more simply by their own decision, decided not to participate. While these reasons are valid, educators must still be able to demonstrate the programs' advantages.

There are many ways to overcome these difficulties, for example, utilizing multiple assessment measures to compensate for the lack of experimental control. "Consistent evidence from multiple sources, even without

experimental control, can be strong evidence to most reasonable people about the program's effectiveness" (Carter, 1992, p. 271). Additionally, using a within subject pre-test post-test research model would enable the investigator to use the subjects as their own controls, thus increasing the empirical reliability of the obtained results.

Researchers have stated that a combination of quantitative and qualitative assessment procedures is most appropriate in attempting to evaluate and document a quality gifted program (Beggs, Mouw, & Barton, 1989; French & French, 1991). Open ended interviews are good evaluative tools to utilize since all gifted programs are idiosyncratic and therefore require naturalistic evaluation methods (Ellis, 1989). It therefore follows that the evaluation in this study employs these methods of research in the analysis of the gifted program under scrutiny.

As the general effectiveness of the current gifted and enrichment programs is under investigation, it must be stated that attendance in a special program may affect children differently. All of the children selected for the gifted program are similar in the fact that they were chosen for this program, and also exhibit high intelligence.

However, these two areas may be the only similarities shared. This study will therefore examine specific areas in which the children may differ, thereby uncovering whether or not the children possess different attitudes and opinions about their specialized educational program and about themselves.

Specific Areas of Interest

One important aspect of being involved in a gifted program that should be examined is the child's self-concept. Children who are identified as candidates for a gifted program are labeled "gifted children." Labels, whether they connote handicaps or talents, are known to have an adverse effect on children. Peer pressure and resentment occur, leaving the identified child feeling "different" and therefore disliking and hiding from the unwanted notoriety (Eby, 1989). Gifted children may also feel guilt and fear when they do not live up to their label. This could create an added pressure or undue burden on a child who is expected to be 'above all of that.' On the other hand, some gifted students may enjoy being singled out for their academic and intellectual achievements. Such recognition could then lead to an increase in self-esteem. Since there are contradictions in the literature (Coleman & Fults, 1982;

Karnes & Wherry, 1981; Kolloff & Feldhusen, 1984), this evaluation examined the students' self-concepts.

An additional area to explore when studying the gifted population, is differences between the genders. Throughout time girls have been taught to be more acquiescent and quiet than boys (Eby, 1989). Boys and girls in the classroom have also received different treatment based on their gender. Marland, as cited in Dembo (1991), feels the schools treat boys and girls differently, and foster greater differences between them than would normally occur. Dembo states that the general makeup of the school setting "makes most girls passive, shy, and dependent but provides male students with learning experiences that help them become self-assured, competitive and independent" (p. 133). Another area examined in most gender research is difficulty with academics. Just as with their non-gifted counterparts, gifted boys show more behavior problems than gifted girls throughout childhood (Janos & Robinson, 1985). It is therefore surprising that research in areas pertaining to gifted children, particularly their self-concept, has found conflicting differences (Coleman & Fults, 1982; Kolloff & Feldhusen, 1984; Loeb & Jay, 1987).

Still another area of interest to examine is differences between gifted students at different grade levels. Although past research in this area has not found any significant differences in self-concept among students in different grades (Karnes & Wherry, 1981; Kolloff & Feldhusen, 1984), the number of studies examining this particular area is scant. In order to further understand the differences between gifted students, these additional areas of interest are of importance to investigate.

## Programs of Focus

### Gifted Program

The gifted program evaluated in this study was implemented in a suburban school district. As is the case with all other classes for the gifted and talented, the program is idiosyncratic in nature. Within this program, students in grades three through six leave their regular classroom two times per week for two hours at a time to go to the gifted program, thereby denoting the label "pull-out" program. The purpose of the program is to meet the cognitive and affective needs of those identified students who have consistently demonstrated or possess the potential for superior academic performance. The curriculum was constructed around four strands: creativity-cognitive,

problem finding/solving-cognitive, scholarship/study-cognitive, and interpersonal relationships-affective. The gifted specialists in this school district stated their goals for the program as follows: to enhance the students' ability to demonstrate higher level thinking skills, acquire and produce original knowledge, and relate what is learned to personal growth.

The students chosen to participate in the pull-out program underwent a three-phase identification process. The first phase consisted of recommendations by their current and previous classroom teachers to be considered for screening. These teachers separately completed a teacher rating scale (see Appendix A). If the teachers felt the child possessed twelve out of the sixteen gifted behaviors (e.g advanced vocabulary) that child would move on to the next phase. A multi-disciplinary team would then meet to discuss the child. Attending that meeting were the members of the multi-disciplinary team (school psychologist, principal, teacher of the pull-out program, a classroom teacher, and a special area teacher), the two referring teachers, and any other teacher in the school who knew the child and wanted to attend. These meetings consisted of reviewing the child's portfolio, academic records and the

rating scales, and a discussion among all present about the child's strengths and needs. The portfolio consisted of representative samples of the student's recent work across subject areas, constructed by the classroom teacher when the referral was made. The team rated each piece of information on a scale of one to three, with three being the highest rating. If the student received two or three "3's" he/she would then move on to the next phase. This final phase began with parent notification to obtain consent for testing. The child was then given a Wechsler Intelligence Scale - III (Wechsler, 1991) and interviewed by the school psychologist. Students who received three "3's" in the previous phase had to obtain an IQ score of 130 to be considered for inclusion into the pull-out program. Those with two "3's" required an IQ score of 136. The multi-disciplinary team then met again to discuss the results and determine whether or not the child should be placed in the pull-out program.

Enrichment Program

The suburban school district studied also included an enrichment program to be implemented simultaneously with the gifted pull-out class for all other students in the district. The two programs provided a district-wide

enrichment whereby all children who were not selected for the pull-out program were also able to benefit from an enriched academic experience. The two gifted specialists trained a portion of the regular education teachers in Talents Unlimited (TU), the chosen enrichment model. This model was created by Dr. Carole Schlicter, Professor of special Education at the University of Alabama. It was developed in 1971 in Mobile, Alabama to be used with all students at all levels of elementary education. The purpose of Talents Unlimited is to help teachers recognize and nurture multiple talents in all children. These talents lie in the areas of productive thinking, communication, planning, forecasting and decision making. The inception of this program developed out of research done by Joyce and Showers (1980).

Joyce and Showers (1980) conducted a review of 200 studies on teacher training and found that teachers were able to successfully acquire new teaching strategies under certain conditions which were not common in most inservice settings. They then examined which components of teacher training contributed to a greater rate of learning. Their findings suggest that in order to have a maximally effective in-service program, a combination of theory presentation,

modeling, teaching skills, practice in simulated settings, feedback about performance and coaching would be needed (Schlicter, 1986). Schlicter stated the overall goals of Talents Unlimited as follows:

> To design and implement a developmental program of activities which would help teachers to gain and maintain the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes for successfully implementing the multiple talent approach to teaching in their classrooms...Three major objectives of the program include the training of teachers in the recognition and nurturing of students' multiple thinking abilities; the development of materials to support the interrogation of the thinking processes into the regular curriculum of the classroom; and the enhancement of student performance in the multiple talent skills, including academic achievement, in creative thinking, and in self-concept (Schlicter, 1986, p. 120).

Schlicter's initial research on Talents Unlimited focused on teacher training, since the teacher was seen as the person most involved in developing student talent. The major types of educational strategies utilized in Talent Unlimited approximated those stated by Joyce and Showers (1980) as necessary components of in-service teacher training; theory training, modeling, practice and small group planning. Schlicter reported that "the validation of the TU project and its membership in the National Diffusion Network are based on results from the initial research with students in grades one through six...There is ample evidence

that the thinking skills instruction based on the TU model is applicable with students K-12" (p. 122).

Although Schlicter's research has shown positive effects, other studies on TU instruction have seen conflicting results. One study which examined how TU affected students' creativity and productivity scores found inconsistencies regarding its statistical significance. Students who participated in TU gained statistically significant higher scores on seven out of nine scales and statistically significant lower scores on the other two scales (Gordon & Shaver, 1985). Gordon and Shaver therefore concluded that "TU instruction as implemented in this particular study, provided results of unclear educational significance" (p. 88). It would therefore be wise to individually examine the effectiveness of Talents Unlimited for each school district which employs this particular enrichment model of education.

The gifted specialists in the school district in this research study have stated that the rationale for utilizing Talents Unlimited is to provide all students the strategies for higher order thinking skills across all content areas. Their goals for the program are to: (1) enable students to develop higher level cognitive and affective behaviors, (2)

recognize that all children have abilities and talents in a variety of areas through the Talents Unlimited program, (3) develop the five talent areas of the TU program (productive thinking, communication, forecasting, planning and decision making), (4) provide teacher training and staff development in the TU program, and (5) provide support for already trained teachers to broaden their understandings and to integrate these strategies in their individual curriculum.

Statement of purpose

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the gifted and enrichment programs in the suburban school district under scrutiny. Prior to the implementation of the program, the district took one year to research the needs of gifted students and to hire two specialists in the area of gifted education in order to create programs that would cater to the students' special needs.

All educational programs for the gifted need to be evaluated as to their effectiveness and to discover the reverberations they place on the individuals involved. Pull-out programs have received much criticism in the literature. There have been a variety of findings on this type of program for the gifted in the literature. For example, Davis and Rimms (1985) found that this type of

program is seen as having a greater focus on 'fun and games' than on valuable theory-based training; Vaughn, Feldhusen and Asher (1991) stated that it may create a feeling of punishment by having the students make up missed classwork; and, Feldhusen (1989) reported that such programs can not possibly meet all the needs of the gifted students since they have fragmented curricula. It is clear that educators must be able to support their reasoning for utilizing a pull-out structure for gifted education. This may be accomplished by evaluating the perceived effectiveness and acceptance by all involved in the program.

As previously noted, the current educational program includes an enrichment piece in addition to the pull-out gifted program. Enrichment programs fit with the newly accepted inclusion model of education by offering a broader based curriculum to teach higher order thinking for all children. The addition of the enrichment model along with the pull-out class for the gifted gives a school district a well-rounded coverage of an enhanced curriculum for all students. Since this type of program has been found to have "unclear educational acceptance" (Gordon & Shaver, 1985, p. 85), it is important to examine its perceived effectiveness and acceptance in the school district.

It was deemed best to provide all information gleaned from the evaluation to the program implementers throughout the course of the year. This would insure that proper feedback is relayed to the involved parties, so the necessary changes could be made. It was additionally important to re-evaluate the programs at the end of the year after the necessary changes were made, to measure their perceived effectiveness.

Research Questions

Based on the past research cited and the specific programs enacted in this school district, the following research questions were formulated.

1) How do the teachers, parents, principals and students view the gifted and enrichment programs?

2) What changes need to be made in order to make the gifted and enrichment programs more accepted and more congruent with their goals and objectives?

3) Are there differences between males and females identified as gifted in their self-concept and attitudes about the gifted program?

4) Are there differences between students of different grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) in their self-concept and attitudes about the program?

5) Are there differences between parents of male and female students in their attitudes about the gifted and enrichment programs?

6) Are there differences between parents of students of different grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th) identified as gifted in their attitudes about the gifted program?

7) Are there any variables that have predictive value in placing students in the gifted program?

8) Are there any assessments of the gifted students, from the teachers, parents or children themselves, that are predictive of the students' perceptions of the gifted program?

9) What were the program benefits for the gifted and enrichment program students and the school?

# CHAPTER II

# METHOD

## Procedure Used in Evaluating the Programs

An evaluation of the gifted and enrichment programs was conducted over the 1993-94 school year. As part of the evaluation committee meetings were attended by the evaluator and relevant school personnel throughout the school year. In addition, the evaluator administered questionnaires to members of the school district involved in the gifted and enrichment programs. This occurred at the onset of the program and at the end of the year in order to ascertain any changes made over the course of the year (such changes could have resulted from the problems found during the first administration). Feedback was given to the gifted committee at both times of the survey administration.

### Participants

The participants who completed the first administration of the questionnaires included the following: the four principals of the elementary schools in the district, 26 of the 40 regular education teachers involved in the enrichment program, 48 of the 70 students in the gifted program (26 male, 22 female), their parents (n=40), and a stratified sample of the parents of the students in the enrichment program (n=105) who volunteered to complete the questionnaires. This sample matched proportionately the

gifted population in terms of gender and grade level. The 48 gifted students who responded to the questionnaires included 17 third-fourth graders, 11 fifth graders, and 20 sixth graders. Since there were so few third graders in the gifted program, they were combined with the fourth graders for purposes of statistical analyses.

The parent surveys included a question asking which parent completed the questionnaire, i.e., mother, father or both parents. Twenty-nine questionnaires were completed by mother only, one by father only, and 10 by both mother and father at the first administration.

At the second administration, the subject pool consisted of the four building principals, 27 teachers, 70 gifted students (male=37 female=33), their parents (n=58) and 81 parents of students in the enrichment program only. The gifted students responding at this time consisted of 28 third-fourth graders, 28 fifth graders, and 26 sixth graders. Parents completing the parent questionnaire for the gifted program consisted of 45 mothers only, three fathers only, and 10 mother and father for the second administration.

## Materials

### Parental Consent

Letters requesting parental consent were sent to all parents of participating children (See Appendix B). This

letter introduced the programs, explained their involvement in the evaluation and requested parental permission for their child's participation. Additionally, a letter explaining the evaluation procedure was sent to all participating regular education teachers (See Appendix C).

Measure of Self-Concept

The Me Scale, a measure of self-concept of gifted students, was used in the current study (See Appendix D). This test was created by Feldhusen and Kolloff (1981) to be utilized solely with gifted students. The authors of the Me Scale attempted to create items "which focused on gifted children's talents and abilities and associated or related behaviors" (p. 319) in order to examine those unique features which may affect their self-concepts. This measure consists of 40 items which are to be answered either Agree or Disagree by the students. This test was originally normed on 461 high ability children in grades three through six. In 1992 the Me Scale was renormed, using 931 gifted students in grades three through ten. It has an overall reliability, using the Kuder Richardson, of .79 and concurrent validity with the Piers-Harris Self-concept Scale (1964), a well known measure of self-concept, of .65.

For the current study, 4 items were added to the Me Scale to create a comparable measure of students' self-perceived ability in relation to teachers' perceptions of

the students' abilities. As will be explained in the results section, the analysis of the students' and teachers perceptions of the students' abilities could not take place due to certain difficulties with the Teacher Screening Form (see results section for further detail.) The Me Scale was separated into clusters for scoring and a more detailed analysis. The classifications are as follows: Overall Self-Esteem (total score on survey), Thinking Skills, Specific Abilities, Self Perception of How Others View the Child and Success in the Future. See Appendix D for the scoring guide, including which questions are in each cluster.

Teacher Screening Form

Teacher perceptions were measured by the initial Teacher Screening Form (See Appendix A), used for entrance screening. This rating scale was created by the school district's Gifted Committee and consists of sixteen items to be completed separately by two regular education teachers who are recommending a student for screening into the gifted program. The teacher marks whether a child possesses each of the sixteen gifted qualities mildly, moderately, exceptionally or not at all. Examples of the high ability categories are; unusually advanced vocabulary, logical

thinker, applies learning to new situations, and keen sense of humor.

Program Specific Measures

All other measures were created by the investigator in collaboration with the two gifted specialists with some input from the Superintendent of Schools. During the item development phase, the programs' goals and objectives were used as guides for all questionnaires. A portion of the initial item pool was discarded as per team agreement that they were not measuring the programs' goals. The final surveys consisted of items deemed goal-focused. All questionnaires contain face validity as well as content validity since they were created by a focus group of experts on gifted/enrichment programs.

The main focus areas and scoring clusters of the Gifted Program Questionnaire- Parent Version (GPQ-PV) are; communication with teachers and the gifted specialists about the program, their child's cognitive abilities, and their interest in the program (See Appendix E). The Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Parent Version (EPQ-PV) is identical to the GPQ-PV (See Appendix F). The scoring guides are included in Appendices E and F for those questionnaires. The Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Teacher

Version (EPQ-TV) consists of the following clusters; students' cognitive ability, communication, program satisfaction, involvement with Talents Unlimited has enhanced their teaching strategies, and whether the enrichment specialists confer with them on an on-going basis about the TU program. See Appendix G for the scoring guide for this questionnaire. For the Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Principal Version (See Appendix H), the questions cluster around their opinions of how the programs are operating, evidence of acceptance and integration of the enrichment program by the regular education teachers, evidence of acceptance by parents of the programs, and further needs of the programs. Appendix H includes the scoring guide for the G/EPQ-PV.

The Gifted Program Questionnaire- Student Version (GPQ-SV) focuses on their feelings about being in the program and about their perceptions of their own thinking skills (See Appendix I for the questionnaire and scoring guide). Open-ended questions were responded to by the gifted students to ascertain their opinions of the gifted program. A listing of these questions can be found in Appendix J.

Procedure

This evaluation was completed within one academic year

(1993-94), although preparation began during the summer of 1993. In August, the evaluator met with the Superintendent of Schools and the Committee on the Gifted Programs to formulate the preliminary evaluation procedure. The evaluator also met with the two gifted specialists, who would implement the pull-out and enrichment programs, in order to ascertain their goals and objectives of the programs. Beginning in September, the evaluator attended monthly meetings of the Committee on the Gifted/Enrichment Programs to discuss the programs and the evaluation process as it occurred. In September, item pools were created by the gifted specialists and program evaluator in conjunction with the program goals and objectives. Inappropriate items were discarded, and the resultant questionnaires were examined and approved by the Committee on the Gifted Programs. In November, all surveys were administered, after permission to participate was obtained for all students from their parents. All surveys presented an opportunity for any additional comments from the principals, teachers, parents and/or students. In December, open ended questions were once again asked to the students in the pull-out program.

At the Committee meeting in January, feedback was given by the evaluator on the obtained results of the administered surveys and interviews. The evaluator had analyzed the data

in order to identify program strengths and areas in need of improvement and then relayed these findings to the Committee. Committee members were encouraged to incorporate the findings in order to implement changes deemed necessary for greater approval of the programs by those involved. A request for any additional suggestions to the evaluation process was also presented at that time.

In June, the same questionnaires were distributed to all participants in order to obtain end-of-the-year data to compare with the initial data. The evaluator wanted to see whether the suggestions given were taken into account and would therefore be reflected in the results of the second administration of the surveys. Open ended questions were again asked of the students in the pull-out program. Their responses, as well as any comments received from parents, teachers and/or principals, were analyzed and presented to the Committee. Additionally, suggestions were given for the continuation of the programs to the Committee at the final meeting in June.

# CHAPTER III

# RESULTS

Description of the Sample

The current program evaluation consisted of two separate components: (1) An evaluation of the gifted program, including mid-year and end-year attitudes of the students in the program, their parents, the four principals in the school district, and initial teacher ratings for program entrance screening; and (2) an examination of the enrichment program (Talents Unlimited), including attitudes of two separate samples of the mainstream teachers (one mid-year and one end-year), two separate samples of parents of children who are not in the gifted program (one mid-year and one end-year), and the four school principals.

In regard to the gifted program evaluation, 48 of the participating 70 students responded at the mid-year evaluation and all 70 at the end-year evaluation. This difference in numbers occurred because students were continuously being referred and evaluated for program entrance throughout the school year. Since all inferential analyses were done over time, only the surveys of the 48 students who responded at both the mid-year and end-year were utilized in the study. Of those 48 students, 26 were male and 22 were female. Seventeen students were in the third and fourth grade group, 11 in fifth grade and 20 in

sixth grade. Since there were so few third graders who responded, they were combined with the fourth graders for all analyses. Additionally, two teachers completed screening surveys for each student in the gifted program.

Regarding the parents of these students, 40 participated at the mid-year evaluation and 58 at the end-year due to the continual influx of new students into the program. Again, since all inferential analyses were done over time, only those 40 who responded at the first evaluation were used in the analyses. Of those 40, 22 were parents of male students and 18 were parents of female students. At the first administration, 29 questionnaires were completed by mothers only, one by fathers only and 10 by both parents. Sixteen were parents of third-fourth graders, 10 were parents of fifth graders and 14 were parents of sixth graders.

In regard to the enrichment program, of the 24 mainstream teachers responding at the mid-year evaluation, 11 were teachers of third and fourth graders and 13 were teachers of fifth and sixth graders. Twenty-eight teachers responded at the end-year evaluation. Thirteen of them were teachers of third and fourth graders and fifteen were teachers of fifth and sixth graders. The four principals of

the schools in the district responded at both the mid and end-year evaluations.

At the mid-year evaluation, 105 parents of children in grades 3 through 6 responded and at the end-year evaluation, 81 parents of children in grades 3 through 6 participated in the study. See Table 1 for an overview of the program evaluation design.

Responses to Research Questions

Research Question 1. How do the teachers, parents, principals and students view the gifted and enrichment programs?

Gifted Program

The means and standard deviations for students' responses on the GPQ-SV are listed in Table 2. The highest possible score on the variable 'Overall Program Approval' was 70. At the mid-year evaluation, means for males and females were 56.36 and 55.24 respectively. At the end-year evaluation, means for males and females were 55.80 and 51.48 respectively. Additionally, the mid-year means for males and females on the Program Satisfaction cluster were 37.76 and 37.05 respectively and 37.88 and 34.10 at the end-year evaluation. For the Self Satisfaction cluster the mid-year means were 18.60 and 18.04 for males and females and 17.92

Table 1

Overview of Program Evaluation Research Design

| Program Type | Mid-Year | End-Year |
|---|---|---|
| Gifted Program | Me Scale (n=48) | Me Scale (n=70) |
| | Gifted Program Questionnaire-Student Version (GPQ-SV) (n=48) | GPQ-SV (n=70) |
| | Gifted Program Questionnaire-Parent Version (GPQ-SV) (n=40) | GPQ-SV (n=58) |
| | Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Principal Version (G/EPQ-PV) (n=4) | G/EPQ-PV (n=4) |
| Enrichment Program | Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Parent Version (EPQ-PV) (n=105) | EPQ-PV (n=81) |
| | Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Teacher Version (EPQ-TV) (n=24) | EPQ-TV (n=28) |
| | Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Principal Version (G/EPQ-PV) (n=4) | G/EPQ-PV (n=4) |

Note. For initial screening for the gifted program, two teachers completed the Teacher Screening Form for each gifted student (n=70)

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Gender and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | End-Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Overall Program Approval | Mean | 56.36 | 55.24 | 55.80 | 51.48 |
| | SD | 5.49 | 7.13 | 6.03 | 9.00 |
| Program Satisfaction | Mean | 37.76 | 37.05 | 37.88 | 34.10 |
| | SD | 4.51 | 6.10 | 4.86 | 6.41 |
| Self Satisfaction | Mean | 18.60 | 18.04 | 17.92 | 17.52 |
| | SD | 1.98 | 1.99 | 3.10 | 3.32 |

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on Gifted Program Questionnaire-Student Version (GPQ-SV)
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

and 17.52 at the end-year evaluation. These high means at both testings indicate a sustained high rate of approval for the program by all students. Given a ceiling of 70 for the variable 'Overall Program Approval', results were skewed in a positive direction with means in the 50's.

As Table 3 shows, there were no significant differences over time for the gifted students' attitudes about the program. As noted above, the means at both testings were high, so this lack of change is seen as a positive sign.

The means and standard deviations for the GPQ-PV are seen in Table 4 and the corresponding ANOVAs are shown in Table 5. The highest score on this survey was 70. Refer to Table 4 for the number of questions comprising each cluster. As this table shows, overall program approval means at the mid-year evaluation were 50.38 and 52.89 reported by parents of male and female students, respectively. At the end-year evaluation, the means were 58.57 and 58.06 for parents of male and female students, respectively. These results indicate a sustained high rate of approval for the program by the parents of the students involved and a significant change over time, $F(1,39) = 26.51$ $p < .001$. Again, given a ceiling of 70, results were skewed in a positive direction with means in the 50's. High means were also obtained for

Table 3

Time of Testing by Gender ANOVA Results for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Gender(G) | TxG |
| Overall Program Approval | 2.70 | 2.99 | 1.48 |
| Program Satisfaction | 2.22 | 2.97 | 2.61 |
| Self Satisfaction | 1.32 | .72 | .02 |

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Note. Time of Testing = Mid-year, End-year
Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Gender of Child and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | End-Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Male Students | Female Students | Male Students | Female Students |
| Overall Program Approval | Mean | 50.38 | 52.89 | 58.57 | 58.06 |
| | SD | 7.42 | 6.62 | 6.31 | 9.37 |
| Student's Cognitive Ability | Mean | 15.46 | 16.00 | 17.59 | 17.50 |
| | SD | 3.75 | 3.38 | 2.46 | 3.17 |
| Communication | Mean | 24.00 | 24.33 | 28.27 | 28.44 |
| | SD | 3.87 | 4.02 | 4.81 | 5.49 |
| Program Satisfaction | Mean | 11.19 | 12.56 | 12.29 | 12.11 |
| | SD | 1.70 | 1.69 | 1.52 | 1.75 |

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on Gifted Program Questionnaire- Parent Version (GPQ-PV)
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 5 items on GPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 2 items on GPQ-PV

Table 5

Time of Testing by Gender of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Gender(G) | TxG |
| Overall Program Approval | 26.51*** | .24 | 1.36 |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | 7.62** | .08 | .23 |
| Communication | 31.04*** | .04 | .01 |
| Program Satisfaction | .88 | 2.16 | 4.94* |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 5 items on GPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 2 items on GPQ-PV

the clusters which comprise the overall program approval by parents of gifted students. For Students' Cognitive Ability, the total mean for parents was 15.70 at the mid-year and 17.55 at the end-year, $F(1,39) = 7.62$ $p < .01$. Communication was rated highly at the end-year evaluation, with a total mean of 28.35, increasing from 24.15 at the mid-year, $F(1,39) = 31.04$ $p < .001$, indicating that the parents felt much more connected to the school in regard to the gifted program. The end-year mean for the Program Satisfaction cluster was 12.21.

Enrichment Program

Parent Attitudes

Parent attitudes about the enrichment program were ascertained through the Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Parent Version (EPQ-PV.) The items and clusters on this survey are identical to the GPQ-PV (See Appendix F for the questionnaire and its scoring system.) This survey was completed by two separate groups of parents of children in the enrichment program at two separate times (mid-year and end-year.) The means and standard deviations for the EPQ-PV are seen in Table 6. The means for the variable, 'overall program approval' for parents' completing the survey at the mid-year evaluation (group 1) and end-year evaluation,

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Parents' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program by Gender of Child and Time of Testing (Group)

| Variable | | Mid-Year (Group 1) | | | End-Year (Group 2) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Overall Group 1 | Male | Female | Overall Group 2 | Male | Female |
| Overall Program Approval | Mean | 40.33 | 40.86 | 39.82 | 44.84 | 43.67 | 45.89 |
| | SD | 9.04 | 8.97 | 9.17 | 12.07 | 11.40 | 12.68 |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | Mean | 15.13 | 15.09 | 15.16 | 16.45 | 16.49 | 16.41 |
| | SD | 3.99 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 4.19 | 4.05 | 4.35 |
| Communi-cation | Mean | 8.89 | 9.25 | 8.52 | 12.31 | 11.18 | 13.32 |
| | SD | 4.65 | 5.21 | 4.02 | 5.87 | 6.03 | 5.60 |
| Program Satis-faction | Mean | 16.15 | 16.10 | 16.20 | 16.08 | 16.00 | 16.16 |
| | SD | 4.09 | 3.47 | 4.68 | 4.57 | 4.69 | 4.51 |

Note. Group 1 = Parents responding to mid-year survey
Group 2 = Parents responding to end-year survey

Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on EPQ-PV
Student's Cogntive Abilities= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV

(group 2) are 40.33 and 44.84 respectively. Table 7 shows the ANOVA results comparing the two groups of parents in order to detect any differences over time. For the parents' 'overall program approval,' there is a significant increase in scores over time, $F(1,179)= 8.12$, $p<.01$. Parents in group 2 felt more involved with the school regarding the enrichment program than parents in group 1. In relation to their child's cognitive abilities, parents at the end-year evaluation had a significantly higher mean than those parents who responded at the mid-year evaluation, $F(1,179)= 5.36$, $p<.05$. Finally, for 'program satisfaction', there were no significant differences between the two groups. In sum, the parents of the students in the enrichment program have positive attitudes about the program and these feelings were significantly higher at the time of the end-year testing than at the mid-year evaluation.

Teacher Attitudes

Mainstream teachers completed the Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Teacher Version (EPQ-TV) to ascertain their attitudes about the enrichment program. This survey consists of 15 items and has a ceiling score of 105. This survey consists of 15 items with a ceiling score of 105. The six clusters used for statistical analysis were as

Table 7

Time of Testing by Gender of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Gender(G) | TxG |
| Overall Program Approval | 8.12** | .08 | 1.07 |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | 5.36* | .00 | .01 |
| Communication | 17.61*** | .37 | 3.92* |
| Program Satisfaction | .88 | .00 | .06 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on EPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-PV

follows: (1) Program having an effect on child's thinking abilities; (2) Program effectiveness; (3) Communication; (4) Teacher strategies improving as a result of training and usage of the program; (5) Conferring on an on-going basis with the Enrichment specialists; (6) Program receiving sufficient administrative support. In order to ascertain the teachers' attitudes about the program, all of these categories were examined both at mid-year and end-year evaluations. The means and standard deviations for all teachers are shown in Table 8, divided by grade taught (upper=fifth and sixth grade or lower=third and fourth grade) and group (time of year survey was completed). The teachers' overall means are also included in this table.

In regard to cognitive abilities of the students expanding as a result of involvement with the program, the mean for all teachers was 25.56. With a ceiling score of 35 for this category, it can be seen that the teachers are confident that the program lends itself to cognitive growth. For teachers' attitudes about program effectiveness, the total mean was 14.92 (with a ceiling of 21), showing another area of high acceptance. Communication between teachers and enrichment specialists is also viewed positively as seen with a total mean of 22.54 and a possible maximum of 28.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes about the Enrichment Program by Group and Grade

| Variable | | Lower Grades | | Upper Grades | | All Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 1 | Group 2 | |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | Mean | 23.73 | 22.08 | 27.54 | 28.20 | 25.56 |
| | SD | 4.92 | 7.17 | 5.55 | 5.97 | 6.38 |
| Program Effectiveness | Mean | 13.82 | 12.62 | 17.25 | 15.87 | 14.92 |
| | SD | 4.05 | 4.11 | 2.56 | 3.62 | 3.96 |
| Communication | Mean | 20.82 | 21.31 | 25.46 | 22.33 | 22.54 |
| | SD | 3.82 | 5.15 | 2.47 | 5.68 | 4.75 |
| Teaching Strategies in TU Have Improved | Mean | 3.36 | 4.00 | 5.92 | 5.40 | 4.75 |
| | SD | 2.20 | 2.04 | 1.12 | 1.72 | 2.02 |
| Have On-going Communication With Specialists | Mean | 5.27 | 4.31 | 5.69 | 5.93 | 5.33 |
| | SD | 2.61 | 2.14 | 1.89 | 1.62 | 2.09 |
| Sufficient Administrative Support Received | Mean | 6.27 | 5.62 | 4.69 | 5.07 | 5.37 |
| | SD | .79 | 1.12 | 1.80 | 1.67 | 1.51 |

Note. Group 1 = teachers responding to mid-year survey
Group 2 = teachers responding to end-year survey
Lower Grades= Grades 3 and 4
Upper Grades= Grades 5 and 6
Student's Cognitive Abilities= Sum of 5 items on EPQ-TV
Program Effectiveness= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-TV
Communication= Sum of 4 items on EPQ-TV
All other variables are single items on EPQ-TV

The teachers feel their teaching strategies in Talents Unlimited have expanded as a result of working with the enrichment specialists, as seen by a total mean of 4.75 out of a possible 7. A mean of 5.33 out of 7 was obtained when asking the teachers if they feel the enrichment specialists confer with them on an on-going basis about curriculum enhancement and materials of the program, indicating agreement. Finally, 5.37 was the mean obtained (out of 7) when the teachers were asked if the enrichment program received sufficient administrative support in their school, once again indicating that the teachers agree with this statement. (See Appendix G for the scoring guide for this questionnaire.)

Teacher Differences

The two groups of teachers responding to the survey at the two separate times were compared to check for any differences over time. Additionally, the teachers were divided into lower and upper grades (lower grades= third and fourth, upper grades= fifth and sixth), to examine whether there were any significant differences due to grade. The means and standard deviations for all teachers are shown in Table 8.

To ascertain any differences between the teachers'

attitudes about the program, a 2 X 2 analysis of variance was performed for each of the aforementioned variables, where the independent variables were group (mid-year testing and end-year testing time) and grade level taught (lower= third and fourth grades, upper=fifth and sixth grades.) None of the analyses for group differences were significant. In contrast, as noted below, all but one of the analyses between teachers of the different grades were found to be significant (see Table 9).

A significant difference found between groups of teachers indicated that children's cognitive abilities improved as a result of the enrichment program, $F(1,48) = 8.74$, $p < .01$. The teachers of the upper grades felt the program had a greater effect on the students' cognitive abilities than the teachers of the lower grades. In regard to program effectiveness, a significant difference was also seen, $F(1,48) = 10.65$, $p < .01$, with upper grade teachers once again viewing the program more favorably. In the area of communication, fifth and sixth grade teachers felt significantly more satisfied with the communication they had with the specialists, $F(1,48) = 4.00$, $p < .05$, than the third and fourth grade teachers. Upper grade teachers felt their teaching skills improved by working with the specialists

Table 9

Group by Grade ANOVA Results for Teachers' Attitudes About the Enrichment Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Group(G) | Grade(Gr) | GxGr |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | .05 | 8.74** | .51 |
| Program Effectiveness | 1.61 | 10.65** | .01 |
| Communication | 1.04 | 4.00* | 1.75 |
| Teaching Strategies in Talents Unlimited Have Improved | .00 | 14.97*** | 1.34 |
| Have On-going Communication with Specialists | .30 | 3.50 | 1.11 |
| Sufficient Administrative Support Received | .06 | 6.58** | 1.66 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Group= Mid-year, End-year
Grade= 3 and 4, 5 and 6
Student's Cognitive Abilities= Sum of 5 items on EPQ-TV
Program Effectiveness= Sum of 3 items on EPQ-TV
Communication= Sum of 4 items on EPQ-TV
All other variables are single items on EPQ-TV

significantly more than the lower grade teachers, $F(1,48) = 14.97$, $p < .001$. The final significant difference between teachers was seen in attitudes about sufficient administrative support, where upper grade teachers were more highly satisfied than the lower grade teachers, $F(1,48) = 6.58$, $p < .01$.

All four principals responded positively about all aspects of the two programs. As shown in Table 10, all four principals responded either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to all questions. Since these questions are descriptive in nature, an item by item review will follow in the Discussion section.

Research Question 2. What changes need to be made in order to make the gifted and enrichment programs more accepted and more congruent with their goals and objectives?

In response to this question, all parents of students in both the gifted and enrichment programs complained at first about the minimal communication they had about the programs. This was noted and emended, via parent workshops. The significant increase seen over time in parents' attitudes about the amount of communication they received regarding the programs showed that this change was related to their positive feelings about the programs.

Table 10

Proportion of Principals Who Agreed and Strongly Agreed to Questions Regarding the Gifted and/or Enrichment Programs

| Question | Mid-year | | End-year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree | Strongly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Programs are Operating Successfully in My School | .75 | .25 | .00 | 1.00 |
| Specialists Have Shown Effective Organization of the Two Programs | .25 | .75 | .75 | .25 |
| Specialists are Much Involved in Implementing the Programs | .00 | 1.00 | .25 | .75 |
| The Classroom Teachers Enjoy Participation in the Enrichment Program | .25 | .75 | .75 | .25 |
| The Classroom Teachers Have Integrated Talents Unlimited | 1.00 | .00 | .75 | .25 |
| Need for Regularly Scheduled Planning Time Between Classroom Teachers and Specialists | .25 | .50 | .50 | .50 |
| Need Additional Parent Workshops | .50 | .00 | .50 | .50 |
| Parents Favor Two Component Format of the Programs | .25 | .25 | .75 | .25 |
| Teachers Favor Two Component Format of the Programs | .25 | .25 | .50 | .25 |
| Programs are Operating With Minimal Supervision From My Office | .75 | .00 | 1.00 | .00 |

The questions assessing parents' attitudes about their child's abilities relates directly to the goal of increasing the gifted students' abilities in thinking skills. As a significant increase was seen over time for this variable for parents of gifted students, $F(1,39)= 7.62$, $p< .01$ (refer back to Table 5), it can be stated that, according to the parents of the students in the gifted program, this objective was met. An increase for this variable was also seen between means for parent groups 1 and 2 in the enrichment program evaluation, $F(1,179)= 5.36$, $p< .05$, thus indicating a more positive attitude about the children's cognitive abilities by group 2 than group 1.

Twenty-eight percent of the gifted students did not feel that any changes needed to be made at the mid-year evaluation while the other 72 percent had many ideas of what they would change. Fifty-two percent would add something, such as more time in the program, and the remaining 20 percent of the students would take something away, such as, having each grade level attend the program separately. At the end-year evaluation, 37 percent of the students think there should be changes in the scheduling of the program, e.g. spending more time in the program, 40 percent would add something, such as having the program in a larger room, and

the other 23 percent would not change any aspect of the program.

Research Questions 3. Are there differences between those males and females identified as gifted in their self-concept and attitudes about the gifted program?

Gender Differences:

Mixed model analyses of variance were computed to compare the male and female students in the gifted program at the mid-year and end-year times of testing in regard to the responses on the GPQ-SV (Appendix H) and the Me Scale (Appendix D).

Refer back to Table 2 for the means and standard deviations for students' responses on the Gifted Program Questionnaire- Student Version. This questionnaire was clustered into the child's overall program approval, program satisfaction and self satisfaction in relation to the program. As was shown in Table 3, which shows the time of testing by gender ANOVA results for the children's attitudes about the program, there were no significant differences between the genders.

In regard to the students' self esteem, as measured by the Me Scale, Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations for the clusters of overall self esteem, thinking

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Self-Esteem by Gender and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | End-Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Overall Self-Esteem | Mean | 33.96 | 33.91 | 34.81 | 34.46 |
| | SD | 5.68 | 4.36 | 5.24 | 5.06 |
| Thinking Skills | Mean | 13.27 | 13.32 | 14.15 | 13.77 |
| | SD | 2.77 | 1.86 | 1.99 | 2.29 |
| Specific Abilities | Mean | 6.58 | 7.77 | 6.69 | 7.73 |
| | SD | 1.86 | 1.66 | 1.89 | 1.49 |
| Self Perception of How Others View the Child | Mean | 2.62 | 1.86 | 2.58 | 1.86 |
| | SD | 1.10 | .64 | .99 | .89 |
| Success in the Future | Mean | 2.39 | 2.09 | 2.27 | 2.14 |
| | SD | .70 | .61 | .72 | .56 |

Note. Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of 44 items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of 15 items on Me Scale
Specific Abilities= Sum of 10 items on Me Scale
Self Perception How Others View the Child= Sum of 4 items on Me Scale
Success in the Future= Sum of 3 items on Me Scale

skills, specific abilities of how others view the child, and their feelings about their success in the future. The highest possible score on this survey was 44. The gifted students obtained means of 34, indicating high self esteem. The time of testing by gender ANOVA results for the students' self esteem are shown in Table 12. There were no significant changes over time, indicating that the children entered the program with high self esteem and maintained these feelings throughout the year. There were, however, significant gender differences in certain aspects of the students' self esteem. The female students felt better about their specific abilities, $F(1,47) = 5.80$, $p < .05$. The males, however, scored higher in regard to their perceptions about how others view them, $F(1,47) = 9.94$ $p < .01$.

Research Question 4. Are there differences between students of different grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th) in their self-concept and attitudes about the program?

Grade Level Differences:

A 3 x 2 analysis of variance was conducted to examine any differences seen between fourth, fifth and sixth graders on the two surveys just discussed, where the independent variables were grade (fourth, fifth, or sixth) and time of testing (mid-year or end-year). [Since there was only a

Table 12

Time of Testing by Gender ANOVA Results for Children's Self Esteem

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Gender(G) | TxG |
| Overall Self-Esteem | 1.09 | .02 | .05 |
| Thinking Skills | 3.75 | .09 | .39 |
| Specific Abilities | .03 | 5.80* | .16 |
| Self Perception of How Others View The Child | .02 | 9.94** | .02 |
| Success in the Future | .14 | 1.67 | .72 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Time of Testing = Mid-year, End-year
Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of 44 items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of 15 items on Me Scale
Specific Abilities= Sum of 10 items on Me Scale
Self Perception How Others View the Child= Sum of 4 items on Me Scale
Success in the Future= Sum of 3 items on Me Scale

small number of third graders in the program (n=6), they were combined with the fourth grade students, comprising the group of "fourth graders" in these analyses.]

Table 13 shows the means and standard deviations for the students in the gifted class, divided by grade, comparing their self esteem. The results for the students' self esteem for time of testing by grade level can be seen in Table 14. For all students, their feelings about their thinking skills increased significantly over time, $F(1,47) = 4.10$, $p < .05$.

There is a significant difference among the students of different grades in regard to their feelings about their specific abilities, $F(1,47) = 6.09$, $p < .01$. The youngest students felt best about their specific talents and these feelings increased over time. For the fifth graders, their positive feelings also increased over time, but were significantly lower than the younger students'. The sixth graders scores dropped slightly over time, but this dip was not significant. Their scores fell between the younger two grades.

Table 15 shows the means and standard deviations for the gifted students' attitudes about the program divided by grade. Table 16 shows that there were no significant

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Self-Esteem by Grade and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | | End-Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grade | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall Self-Esteem | Mean | 36.00 | 31.46 | 33.55 | 36.47 | 33.09 | 33.95 |
| | SD | 5.27 | 5.32 | 4.21 | 4.36 | 6.04 | 4.82 |
| Thinking Skills | Mean | 14.00 | 12.18 | 13.30 | 14.59 | 13.18 | 13.90 |
| | SD | 2.06 | 2.93 | 2.16 | 1.91 | 2.90 | 1.71 |
| Specific Abilities | Mean | 8.12 | 6.36 | 6.70 | 8.24 | 6.55 | 6.60 |
| | SD | 2.03 | 1.36 | 1.63 | 1.40 | 2.07 | 1.54 |
| Self Perceptions of How Others View the Child | Mean | 2.41 | 1.73 | 2.45 | 2.12 | 2.09 | 2.45 |
| | SD | .87 | .79 | 1.10 | .86 | .94 | 1.15 |
| Success in the Future | Mean | 2.41 | 2.18 | 2.15 | 2.29 | 2.27 | 2.10 |
| | SD | .62 | .75 | .67 | .59 | .65 | .72 |

Note. Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of 44 items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of 15 items on Me Scale
Specific Abilities= Sum of 10 items on Me Scale
Self Perception How Others View the Child= Sum of 4 items on Me Scale
Success in the Future= Sum of 3 items on Me Scale

Table 14

Time of Testing by Grade ANOVA Results for Children's Self Esteem

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Grade(G) | TxG |
| Overall Self-Esteem | 1.48 | 3.05 | .29 |
| Thinking Skills | 4.10* | 2.54 | .12 |
| Specific Abilities | .10 | 6.09** | .18 |
| Self Perception of How Others View The Child | .03 | 1.38 | 1.72 |
| Success in the Future | .07 | .72 | .34 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Time of Testing= Mid-year, End-year
Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of 44 items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of 15 items on Me Scale
Specific Abilities= Sum of 10 items on Me Scale
Self Perception How Others View the Child= Sum of 4 items on Me Scale
Success in the Future= Sum of 3 items on Me Scale

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Grade and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | | End-Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grade | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall Program Approval | Mean | 38.81 | 37.09 | 36.47 | 38.56 | 34.64 | 35.00 |
| | SD | 4.79 | 6.60 | 4.77 | 5.01 | 7.05 | 5.46 |
| Program Satisfaction | Mean | 57.50 | 55.55 | 54.63 | 56.75 | 52.64 | 52.05 |
| | SD | 5.90 | 7.92 | 5.43 | 6.88 | 9.80 | 6.76 |
| Self Satisfaction | Mean | 18.59 | 18.46 | 18.05 | 18.12 | 18.00 | 17.25 |
| | SD | 1.84 | 2.02 | 2.14 | 3.60 | 3.44 | 2.71 |

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

Table 16

Time of Testing by Grade ANOVA Results for Children's Attitudes About the Gifted Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Grade(G) | TxG |
| Overall Program Approval | 2.29 | 2.37 | .25 |
| Program Satisfaction | 1.93 | 2.30 | .37 |
| Self Satisfaction | 1.11 | .66 | .05 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

differences in attitudes between the grade levels about the gifted program.

Research Question 5. Are there differences between parents of male and female students in their attitudes about the gifted and enrichment programs?

As discussed earlier, (refer to Table 4), the parents of the gifted students completed the GPQ-PV and their responses were compared according to the gender of their child. As Table 5 shows, there were no main effect differences for parents' attitudes about the program for sons compared to daughters. However, a significant interaction was obtained, $F(1,39) = 4.94$, $p < .05$ (see Table 5.) Parents of male students were more satisfied at the end of the program and parents of female students were less satisfied at the end of the program than they were at the mid year evaluation.

The results for parents of children in the enrichment program were similar to those of the gifted students' parents. As seen in Table 7, there were no gender differences for parents of students in the enrichment program. There was a significant interaction obtained for their 'overall program approval,' $F(1,179)= 17.61$, $p<.001$. As this shows, all parents' program approval increased from

mid-year to end-year, but parents' with daughters approval increased significantly more than parents' with sons.

Research Question 6. Are there differences between the parents of gifted students of different grade levels (3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th) in their attitudes about the gifted program?

Means and standard deviations for parents' attitudes about the program are shown in Table 17. The analyses of the parent survey (compared by grades) reveal no significant differences between the parents as compared by the grade level of their child (see Table 18).

Research Question 7. Are there any variables that have predictive value in placing students in the gifted program?

As previously mentioned, one aspect of the screening process for entrance into the gifted program was the recommendations of two teachers who had some contact with the student. These teachers completed a teacher screening scale, created by the gifted program committee (see Appendix A). Table 19 shows the amount of inter-teacher agreement on all sixteen items on the scale for each child (n=70). The first column shows the proportion of agreement between the two teachers rating the child as mildly, moderately or exceptionally possessing the certain ability. There was a

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program by Grade of Child and Time of Testing

| Variable | | Mid-Year | | | End-Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grade | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Overall Program Approval | Mean | 52.25 | 51.60 | 50.62 | 58.44 | 57.30 | 59.00 |
| | SD | 6.22 | 6.11 | 9.00 | 7.28 | 9.13 | 7.80 |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | Mean | 15.63 | 16.70 | 15.07 | 16.94 | 18.20 | 17.79 |
| | SD | 3.05 | 2.41 | 4.69 | 3.40 | 2.35 | 2.23 |
| Communication | Mean | 25.00 | 23.00 | 24.00 | 29.31 | 26.80 | 28.36 |
| | SD | 3.92 | 4.14 | 3.72 | 4.32 | 6.34 | 4.96 |
| Program Satisfaction | Mean | 11.63 | 11.90 | 12.00 | 12.19 | 12.30 | 12.15 |
| | SD | 1.82 | 1.79 | 1.92 | 1.38 | 1.83 | 1.82 |

Note. Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 5 items on GPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 2 items on GPQ-PV

Table 18

Time of Testing by Grade of Child ANOVA Results for Parents' Attitudes About the Gifted Program

| | F Ratio | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Time of Testing(T) | Grade(G) | TxG |
| Overall Program Approval | 25.20*** | .06 | .37 |
| Child's Abilities | 7.54** | .77 | .47 |
| Communication | 29.27*** | 1.05 | .05 |
| Program Satisfaction | .97 | .09 | .11 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Time of Testing= Mid-year, End-year
Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-PV
Communication= Sum of 5 items on GPQ-PV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 2 items on GPQ-PV

Table 19

Proportion of Total Inter-Teacher Agreement and Proportion of Agreement on Rating of "Exceptional" for Gifted Students' Abilities

| Ability | Proportion of Total Agreement Between Teachers | Proportion of Total Agreement as "Exceptional" |
|---|---|---|
| Catches on Quickly | .77 | .75 |
| Unusually Advanced Vocabulary | .59 | .48 |
| High Verbal Ability | .62 | .59 |
| Reads Independently | .75 | .72 |
| Rapid Insight into Cause/Effect Relationships | .67 | .62 |
| Logical Thinker | .70 | .67 |
| Abstract Thinker | .56 | .43 |
| Curious; Asks Discerning Questions | .69 | .57 |
| Creative; Imaginative | .64 | .56 |
| Good Memory | .82 | .82 |
| Concentrates Well | .67 | .59 |
| Enjoys Challenges | .74 | .66 |
| Keen Sense of Humor | .54 | .33 |
| Thinks Fluently, Flexibly, Originally | .54 | .41 |
| Persistent; Follows Through on Tasks | .64 | .56 |
| Applies Learning to New Situations | .67 | .62 |

fairly high level of agreement for each ability. In the second column is the proportion of agreement between the teachers giving a rating of 'exceptional.' This is noteworthy since the second column is almost as high as the first. As originally constructed, the teacher rating scale could not be utilized in any other analysis, since it does not provide enough useful variation to use in any correlations or comparisons between any other measures of the students' abilities. This finding led to a reconstruction of the survey on a seven point scale to allow for more variability in responding by the teachers.

Research Question 8. Are there any assessments of the gifted students from the teachers, parents or children themselves, that are predictive of the students' perceptions of the gifted program?

In order to answer this question, numerous correlations were computed with: (1) the parents' of gifted children mid-year ratings and the gifted students' mid-year ratings of their satisfaction with the program; (2) the gifted students' mid-year ratings of program satisfaction with their mid-year self-esteem ratings. (As noted earlier, the teacher ratings could not be utilized for any further analyses due to range restriction problems; therefore, their

ratings could not be correlated with those of the students.)

In regard to the parents' and students' first responses about the program, the correlations are illustrated in Table 20. As this table shows, there was one significant predictor for the students' perceptions of the gifted program; parents' overall satisfaction with the gifted program at the mid-year evaluation correlated significantly with the students' mid-year overall satisfaction with the program, $r = .37$, $p < .05$. No other correlations between parents and students were significant.

Table 21 shows the correlations between the gifted students' first self-esteem scores with their attitudes of the program at the time of the first testing. As the table shows, there are many self assessments these children made that significantly correlate with, and are therefore predictive of, their perceptions of the program. These variables are as follows: The students' overall feelings of self-esteem, $r = .30$, $p < .05$; How the students feel about their thinking skills, $r = .31$, $p < .05$; and how the children feel about their specific abilities, $r = .31$, $p < .05$.

Since the attitude survey for the students was sub-divided into program perceptions and self perceptions as they relate to their attitudes about the program, these

Table 20

Correlations Between Gifted Students' and Their Parents' Program Satisfaction at Time of First Testing

| | Gifted Student Variables | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parent Variables | Overall Program Approval | Program Satisfaction | Self Satisfaction |
| Overall Program Approval | .37* | .34 | .29 |
| Student's Cognitive Abilities | .24 | .23 | .16 |
| Child is a Better Problem Solver This Year Than Last Year | .23 | .20 | .18 |
| Child Makes More Applications of Thinking Skills This Year in Subject Areas Than Last Year | .15 | .14 | .09 |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Parent Variables:
Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Ability= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-PV
All other variables are single items on the GPQ-PV
Gifted Student Variables:
Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

Table 21

Correlations Between Gifted Students' Self-Esteem and Program Satisfaction at Time of First Testing

| | Program Satisfaction Variables | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self-Esteem Variables | Overall Program Approval | Program Satisfaction | Self Satisfaction |
| Overall Self-Esteem | .30* | .24 | .31* |
| Thinking Skills | .31* | .27 | .27 |
| Specific Abilities | .31* | .25 | .30* |
| Self Perception of How Others View The Child | .13 | .16 | .04 |
| Success in the Future | .18 | .11 | .29* |

* $p<.05$ ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

Note. Program Satisfaction Variables

Overall Program Approval= Sum of 10 items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of 7 items on GPQ-SV
Self Satisfaction= Sum of 3 items on GPQ-SV

Self-Esteem Variables

Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of 44 items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of 15 items on Me Scale
Specific Abilities= Sum of 10 items on Me Scale
Self Perception How Others View the Child= Sum of 4 items on Me Scale
Success in the Future= Sum of 3 items on Me Scale

separate variables were also correlated with the self-esteem variables to ascertain whether there were any predictors of the students' attitudes about the program at the time of first testing. As Table 21 shows, the self satisfaction variable correlated significantly with the following self esteem variables: Overall self-esteem, $r = .31$, $p < .05$; Success in the future, $r = .29$, $p < .05$; And specific abilities, $r = .30$, $p < .05$. No self-esteem variables were found to be predictors for the program satisfaction variable on the students' program attitude survey.

Research Question 9. What were the program benefits for the gifted and enrichment program students and the school?

As can be seen in the time analyses for gifted students' self esteem (see Table 12), there was a significant improvement over time for their attitudes about their thinking skills, $F(1,47) = 4.10$, $p < .05$. Their parents also saw improvements in their children's thinking skills (see Table 5), $F(1,39) = 7.62$, $p < .01$. In regard to the enrichment program, analyses of the mainstream teachers feelings that student involvement in the enrichment program lent to improvement in their thinking abilities reveal an overall mean of 25.81 (with a ceiling score of 35), indicating their beliefs that the program led to an increase

in students' cognitive abilities. Parents of students in the enrichment program also indicated a belief that the program lent to an increase in their children's cognitive abilities, $F(1,179)= 5.36$, $p< .05$.

Summary

In general, all of the research questions formulated were adequately answered by this program evaluation. Many positive results were seen in regard to improved attitudes about the programs, particularly for the parents of students involved in the two programs.

# CHAPTER IV

# DISCUSSION

The gifted and enrichment programs investigated in this study were highly regarded by all involved. Additionally, some significant differences were found between various subjects regarding these multi-faceted programs. This chapter examines and discusses the findings of the research questions. Moreover, qualitative information gained from the gifted students' responses to the open ended questions will be integrated with the inferential results obtained (see appendix J for the list of questions.) Finally, open ended responses written by the parents, teachers and principals will also be discussed.

Evaluation of the Research Questions

The first research question asked how the participants viewed the programs. There was an overall liking of the programs by all involved. Mean scores on all questionnaires were high. As was seen in the analyses of the gifted students' attitudes about the program, all children felt positively, and both genders were equally satisfied, with the gifted program. In addition, their attitudes did not decrease over time. Since their opinions were fairly high at the mid-year evaluation time, it appears that their expectations were met by the end of the year. When the gifted students responded to the open ended questions, they

were asked if they would miss the program if they did not attend. At both times of testing, most said yes, indicating their high approval of the program.

Program participants were given an opportunity to share any additional comments the questionnaires did not address. Many participants took advantage of this opportunity by sharing their views. The parents of the students in both the gifted and enrichment programs felt much more connected to the school due to an increase in their communication about the program. One parent of a gifted student commented at the end-year evaluation that, "The only down side to this type of program is that it is no longer available to my son once he finishes elementary school," indicating a strong liking and approval of the program. In response to a question about regularly scheduled planning time between the gifted specialists and the classroom teachers, one teacher stated, "The specialists bend over backwards to meet. They are super about this!" Another teacher commented that, "The students in the pull-out program seem to benefit beautifully." A parent of a student involved in the enrichment program summed up her feelings about the program by simply writing, "Thanks- This was a great program."

As was previously noted in the Results section, the

four principals in this school district were pleased with the progress of both programs. At the end-year evaluation, all four felt that the programs were operating successfully with minimum supervision from their offices. They gave full support to the two specialists in regard to their effectiveness in organizing the program activities and felt they both went "beyond the call of duty" to implement the two programs. The principals were all in agreement that the classroom teachers generally indicated a liking for the enrichment program and that they had shown evidence of integrating their curricula with the Talents Unlimited Program material. All four principals stated that the more communication that occurred, the better the programs were for all involved. This was seen by their strong endorsement for regularly scheduled planning time between the teachers and specialists and additional parent workshops in order to familiarize parents with the activities of both programs. Finally, the principals all felt that parents and teachers in their school district were in favor of the two component format of the programs as they presently exist. One of the principals voiced his initial hesitancy about the nature of the pull-out program while also applauding the outcome; "While philosophically I find it difficult to accept the

concept of a pull-out G & T program operating within a heterogeneously grouped population, the program works extremely well."

This overwhelming administrative support for both programs exemplifies the positive attitudes and success of the current gifted and enrichment programs in this school district. With this support, there is only room for more growth and encouragement for these programs to continue and flourish, thereby benefitting the students involved as well as their parents, mainstream teachers and the entire school district.

Of course not all comments were as positive as the ones noted above. Most parents initially complained about the lack of sufficient communication about the programs. After the first administration of the parent survey, the point was shared with the gifted committee that parents basically felt in the dark about the programs. A suggestion for parent workshops was made and responded to by the gifted specialists. Once parents were more involved with the programs, simply by being made more aware of what was going on, their satisfaction with the programs increased.
At both testings, many students in the gifted class complained that they miss classwork and have to make it up

when they return to their mainstream class. This was obviously a major disadvantage the students felt applied to their being in the program. This issue was raised at the committee meetings and an additional question was added to the teacher questionnaire at the time of the second testing in order to assess their opinion of this problem. A majority of the teachers felt strongly about the children having to make up missed work. A few made comments that it depended on what work was missed. One teacher wrote, "The students in the gifted program need to have some responsibility for the material covered in their absence. Many students are able to keep up with the assistance from other students in the class." A minimal number of teachers strongly disagreed with the students having to make up missed classwork. Yet other teachers were unsure, stating that it depended on what was covered. This predicament was shared with the committee, but a decision was not reached while this evaluator was still in contact with the schools.

In response to the second research question, which asked what changes needed to be made in order to make the gifted and enrichment programs more accepted and more congruent with their goals and objectives, it was pointed out that the parents complained about the minimal

communication they had about the programs. This was noted and emended, via parent workshops. The significant increase seen over time for parents' attitudes about the amount of communication they had regarding the programs showed that this change allowed for their positive feelings about the programs. Another program objective for both programs was that the students show an increase in their abilities in thinking skills. The questions assessing parents attitudes about their child's abilities relates directly to this goal. As a significant increase was seen over time for this variable, it can be stated that, according to the all parents, this objective was met for both programs.

When the gifted students were asked how they would change the program if they could, some of the students said, "Nothing" at the mid-year evaluation while many others had many ideas of what they would change. A majority of the students would add something, such as more time in the program, field trips, more children in the program, and more mind benders/puzzles. Other students would take something away, such as, independent projects, having each grade level attend the program separately, or having the program either before school or during lunch so it would not interfere with other schoolwork. At the end-year evaluation, some

suggestions for changes were made regarding the scheduling of the program, i.e. making the time spent in the program longer. Others would add something, such as having the program in a larger room.

Research questions 3 through 6 addressed gender and grade level differences in program attitudes and students' self esteem. In regard to the program attitudes, there were no significant differences detected between male and female gifted students. However, differences were seen between their parents, depending on whether they were parents of boys or girls. As was previously discussed in response to research question 1, the parents of the gifted students showed an increase over time in their approval of the program.

As was seen in the analyses of the parents' attitudes as compared by gender, a significant interaction for parents of gifted students was obtained. Parents of male students were more satisfied at the end of the program and parents of female students were less satisfied with the program than they were at the mid year evaluation. It is unclear what these differences were due to, although it should be noted that all parents of gifted students were approximately equally satisfied with the program at the end of the year

evaluation. It is possible that parents of females had higher expectations at the onset of the program and then did not have their expectations fully met. This seems to be an area for future studies.

A significant interaction was also seen for parents' of students in the enrichment program attitudes about communication. Parents of both sons and daughters had positive attitudes about the amount of communication they had with school personnel at the mid-year evaluation. In addition, all parents' attitudes increased at the time of the second testing. However, parents of girls viewed the amount of communication in a much more positive light than did the parents of boys at the end-year evaluation. One might assume that parents of females became more involved with the enrichment program as the year progressed than did the parents of boys, but it is unclear why this occurred. Future studies might incorporate this question into their research design.

In relation to the goals and objectives of the gifted program, the statistical analyses, as used in responding to research question 2, indicate that they have all been met. To tie in one of the program's goals with the gender analyses, the interpersonal goal, relating what is learned

to personal growth, including developing confidence in self to accomplish intended goals, was addressed by the self-esteem analyses, showing that the qualities of these students concur with the idea that research in this area has stated; gifted children possess a firm sense of self-worth and are socially well adjusted (Leman & Erdwins, 1981).

The significant increase over time of gifted students' attitudes about their thinking skills indicates that students of all grade levels in the gifted program, by having more of an opportunity to utilize their cognitive skills, feel good about themselves. Research has found that intellectually gifted children are well adjusted in a social sense, based on self-report inventories as well as character ratings by teachers and parents. Leman and Erdwins (1981), as cited in Janos and Robinson (1985), narrowed the scope of superior psycho-social adjustment in gifted children to a firm sense of self worth.

As discovered by the gender comparisons, the majority of the participating boys and girls in the current study had high self-esteem, however, there were significant differences as to what aspects of their high self-worth they deemed positive. The girls felt better about their abilities but the boys were the ones who felt others view

them in a higher light. Marland, as cited in Dembo (1991), had pointed out that boys and girls are treated differently in the schools. As girls are taught to be passive and shy and boys learn to be self-assured, competitive and independent, the gender differences found in the current study do not seem to be so unusual.

There were also significant differences between the students in the different grade levels. From the results obtained in the analyses of the gifted students' self-esteem as compared by grade level, it appears that ten-year-old students (fifth graders), as can be seen on all clusters of the Me Scale, do not feel as good about themselves as students younger and older than themselves. This gives the flavor of the 'middle child' syndrome. As the youngest, when you feel good about yourself, you are in a type of 'ignorant bliss' and just know you are smart, good at a certain talent, or feel others view you in a positive light. As the child grows just one year, when the hormones start kicking in, she/he might start becoming somewhat self conscious about being smart and not necessarily feel it is such a great thing to be 'different.' Fifth grade seems to be the year of having to be 'normal' by being like everyone else. As the child grows another year, and realizes that

being smart is an asset and will be useful in life, he/she feels better about his/her abilities, but these feelings are tenuous. It is as if the child is struggling with accepting his/her differences as a positive asset or falling back into that self-conscious state of wanting to fit in.

Research question 7 inquired about predictors for placing the students in the gifted program. As reported in the Results chapter, the Teacher Rating Scale (see Appendix A) used for student screening into the gifted program was not found to be useful in any analyses due to the high scoring on all students by all teachers on all variables examined. These areas included an advanced vocabulary, keen sense of humor, and originality of thought. Although this form could not be used in the statistical analyses, it could be stated that since the committee that created this form felt these were the characteristics that would predict entrance into the gifted program, and all students chosen for the program were felt to possess all of these qualities by the teachers who completed the rating scale, these are characteristics that would predict placement of any student into the program. However, since the current evaluation was unable to obtain the rating scales for those students not placed in the program, this

statement is not backed by any empirical data.

Two areas were examined in an attempt to predict the gifted students' perceptions of the program as research question 8 addressed. For one, the students' attitudes about the program were correlated with the attitudes of their parents. Their parents' overall satisfaction with the program was found to be significantly correlated with the students' program approval. This relationship is an important one as parents are, first and foremost, the people who have the strongest influence on their children during their younger years. The parents' positive attitudes about the program, therefore can be said to be predictive of the students' positive feelings about the program. Additionally, if the parents see that their children are enjoying their education as well as learning new things, they would most likely be more satisfied with the program with which their children are involved.

The students' program attitudes at the first testing were also compared with their self-esteem. These correlations revealed that if the child had a high self regard, he/she would have positive attitudes about the gifted program. Additionally, the students' positive perceptions of their thinking skills and specific abilities

were found to be predictive of positive attitudes about the program. Therefore, in relation to the program objective of an increase in students' interpersonal growth, this was an obtained goal.

Benefits to the students in the programs and the school in general were examined by research question 9. It appears that involvement in the gifted program led to students learning new things about themselves as well as feeling that they have changed in some way from being in the gifted program. At the end of the program, most students learned that they are smarter than they were the previous year as well as being smarter than they originally thought they were. Some students commented that they feel "special." One student stated, "If you are smart you are not a geek, just different." Others learned that one can not give up on something and must, instead, "push yourself." Yet another student added that "You can really work hard to learn more." These types of responses indicate that the benefits of being exposed to a more challenging academic curriculum would help to accelerate the thinking process of these high potential students and enable them to achieve to their fullest capacity.

In summary, this program evaluation gained the feedback

necessary for the gifted and enrichment programs to be examined closely. This was needed not only to assess whether the goals and objectives were met, but also to gain more knowledge and insight into the workings of a cooperative school district and begin to understand the minds and personalities of gifted children. Ideas for program changes could thus be formulated from the information collected in this program evaluation.

Recommended Changes for the Gifted and Enrichment Programs

As this program evaluation shows, a few areas were found that were in need of improvement. The information gained from the mid-year evaluation led to some of these changes. For instance, at the mid-year evaluation, parents of students in both the gifted and enrichment programs complained that they did not have an adequate amount of communication with the school about the programs. After this data was shared with the gifted committee, the two gifted specialists created and implemented parent workshops to increase the amount of parent involvement. This led to an increase in positive feelings about the programs by all parents. These workshops should continue and be incorporated as an integral part of both programs. Additionally, the parents and students in both programs

should receive an orientation to the programs at the onset of the school year to insure their satisfaction with the amount of communication they have with school personnel.

Another area in need of improvement discovered at the mid-year evaluation was the gifted students feeling pressure to make up missed classwork while attending the pull-out program. This problem could not be mended quite as easily as the previously mentioned lack of communication, and required further inquiry. At the end-year evaluation, a question was added to the Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Teacher Version in order to ascertain the teachers' opinions of this dilemma. It was discovered that most of the teachers thought the students should not have to make up missed work, although it did depend on what was actually missed. Hopefully the addition of this question led to a discussion of the necessity to make up missed classwork and how this would occur. At the time this evaluation was completed, there was no change in this area. It is recommended that this should be an area of investigation by the committee so that necessary changes could be made.

Other logistical changes need to be made in order to have the gifted program become more acceptable by the students. These consist of having a larger room for

the program, or, in some cases, having a specific room assigned for the program. It is unclear whether this type of problem can be changed, although it is necessary to address.

Generally speaking, the gifted and enrichment programs examined in the current study enjoyed much success in their first year and did not require many changes. However, another reason why only a scant amount of changes was necessary may be due to the design of the current program evaluation.

Recommendations for Subsequent Program Evaluations

In general, educators must be aware that a program evaluation is a necessary component of any new program. Therefore, the first recommendation made is to always include an evaluation as part of any newly implemented program.

When completing a program evaluation in a school district, certain problems may be encountered. For example, in the current study, there was some difficulty getting all individuals in the district to participate. The individuals who did respond, therefore, may have been those who would present the programs in a more favorable light than others who decided not to be involved in the

evaluation. Those persons completing questionnaires were involved in a special program. Their responses may be biased towards a positive outlook so that the program, however it is structured, would continue to occur. It is important for program evaluators to be aware of this bias at the onset of the study. It is recommended that more aggressive measures should be used to engage all individuals in the school district in the evaluation procedure.

Another problem encountered with the program participants was that at the start of the evaluation, all gifted students were not yet in the program. As this was the first year of the new gifted program, the screening process was continuously occurring throughout the entire school year. Due to this, any comparisons over time could only be done with the original 48 students. This might be a problem for any program evaluator who starts their evaluation at the program's onset. A recommendation to those attempting future program evaluations is to wait, if possible, until all participants are fully integrated into the program before starting the evaluation.

A recommendation to any program researcher is to begin the evaluation by talking with the implementers of the program in order to ascertain what they would like to gain

from the program evaluation. Additionally, the research questions that are created should be related to the programs' goals and objectives. Constant feedback should be given to the program implementers and participants so they may benefit from the gained information. A program evaluation can only be as good as its evaluator. If the appropriate measures are taken, many benefits can be gained by the program implementers and participants.

Relevancy to School Psychology and Implications

It may appear obvious as to what the relevancy an evaluation such as this is to school psychology, however, it is important to point out the exact benefits such a project would lend to any school district. For one, it would help create open lines of communication between staff, parents, and students. Program participants would be able to continue discussing the programs' existing strengths and problems so that the appropriate changes could be made. It would be expected that, after gaining the helpful information this evaluation offered, an examination of the programs would be continued on an annual basis. As the needs of a school district and its students changes, the programs within it should also alter to meet the current needs of those children. Therefore, a bi-yearly, or even

yearly monitoring of the participants' attitudes would aid in the continuous restructuring needed to fulfill their current needs.

This type of program evaluation also allows for a thorough examination of the ins and outs of the school district and what types of internal obstacles outsiders may encounter. All personnel the evaluator encountered in this particular school district were extremely helpful and cooperative. This was due to their extreme interest in creating the best possible gifted and enrichment programs to best benefit their students. However, others may not encounter the same warm welcome.

This study also has the potential to show other school districts how to execute a formative and summative program evaluation. It would be important for any program evaluator to first understand all of the work it entails to execute a thorough evaluation. Knowing the specific procedural steps is pertinent to any examination of a program. The method followed in this study could be utilized as a guide for other potential program evaluators in order to complete a solid evaluation.

# References

## References

Beggs, D. L. , Mouw, J. T. , & Barton, J. A. (1989). Evaluating gifted programs: Documenting individual and programmatic outcomes. Roeper Review, 12, 73-76.

Benbow, C. P. , & Stanley, J. C. (Eds.) (1983). Academic Precocity: Aspects of its Development. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Callahan, C. M. (1983). Issues in evaluating programs for the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 27, 3-7.

Callahan, C. M. , & Hunsaker, S. L. (1991). Evaluation of acceleration programs. In W. T. Thomas and E. D. Jones (Eds.), The Academic Acceleration of Gifted Children (pp. 181-206). New York: Teachers College Press.

Carter, K. (1992). A model for evaluating programs for the gifted under non-experimental conditions. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 15, 266-283.

Coleman, J. M. , & Fults, B. A. (1982). Self-concept and the gifted classroom: The role of social comparisons. Gifted Child Quarterly, 26, 116-119.

Davis, G. , & Rimm, S. (1985). Education of the Gifted and Talented. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Deleon, P. H. , & Vandenbos, G. R. (1985). Public policy and advocacy on behalf of the gifted and talented. In

F. D. Horowitz & M. O'Brien (Eds.), The Gifted and Talented: Developmental Perspectives (pp. 409-435). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Dembo, M. H. (1991). Applying Educational Psychology in the Classroom (4th Edition). New York: Longman.

Eby, J. W. (1989). Risks to children related to school district gifted programs. In J. M. Lakebrink's (Ed.) Children at Risk. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Ellis, J. L. (1989). Evaluating idiosyncratic programs of education for the gifted. Canadian Journal of Education, 14, 93-101.

Feldhusen, J. F. (1989). Why the public schools will continue to neglect the gifted. Gifted Child Today, 12, 55-59.

Feldhusen, J. F. , & Kolloff, M. B. (1981). Me: A self-concept scale for gifted students. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 53, 319-323.

Fox, L. H. , & Washington, J. (1985). Programs for the gifted and talented: Past, present and future. In F. D. Horowitz & M. O'Brien (Eds.), The Gifted and Talented: Developmental Perspectives (pp. 197-222). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

French, C. , & French, F. (1991). Evaluating programs that claim to teach thinking skills: Critical issues and options. In R. F. Mulcahy, R. H. Short, and J. Andrews' (Eds.), Enhancing Learning and Thinking. New York: Praeger.

Gallagher, J. J. (1989). Curriculum development and evaluation in school programs for gifted students. In J. L. VanTassel-Baska & P. Olszewski-Kubilius (Eds.), Patterns of Influence on Gifted Learners: The Home, the Self, and the School (pp. 178-191). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gordon, H. J. , & Shaver, J. P. (1985). The effects of a multiple talent teaching program. Journal of Educational Research, 79, 85-90.

Janos, P. M., & Robinson, N. M. (1985). Psycho-social development in intellectually gifted children. In F. D. Horowitz and M. O'Brien's (Eds.), The Gifted and Talented: Developmental Perspectives, pp. 149-195. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving inservice training: The message of research. Educational Leadership, 37, 379-385.

Karnes, F. A. , & Collins, E. C. (1978). State definitions on the gifted and talented: A report and analysis. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 1, 44-62.

Karnes, F. A. , & Wherry, J. N. (1981). Self-concepts of gifted students as measured by the Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale. Psychological Reports, 49, 903-906.

Kolloff, P. , & Feldhusen, J. (1984). The effects of enrichment of self-concept and creative thinking. Gifted Child Quarterly, 28, 53-57.

Loeb, R. C. , & Jay, G. (1987). Self-concept in gifted children: Differential impact in boys and girls. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31, 9-13.

Marland, S. P., Jr. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Piers, E. , & Harris, D. (1964). Age and other correlates of self-concept in children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 55, 91-95.

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). The Enrichment Triad Model: A Guide for Developing Defensible Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 180-184, 261.

Schlicter, C. L. (1986). Talents unlimited: An inservice education model for teaching thinking skills. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30, 119-123.

Traxler, M. A. (1987). Gifted education program evaluation: A national review. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 10, 107-113.Vaughn, V. L. , Feldhusen, J. F. , & Asher, J. W. (1991).

Meta-analyses and review of research on pull-out programs in gifted education. Gifted Child Quarterly, 35, 92-98.

Wechsler, D. (1991). Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Third Edition. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Appendix A

Gifted Program - Teacher Screening Form

Child's Name_____ Date _____

Grade _____ School _____

Teacher completing this form _____
How long have you known this child? _____
In what capacity? _____

High ability children usually show superior ability in many of the areas listed below.

Directions: Teachers who have worked with a child on a regular basis are highly qualified to make observations about that child's abilities. For statements below, place a check mark on the line that best describes this child. If the behavior has not been noticed, leave the line blank.

| Statement is true for this child: | MILDLY | MODERATELY | EXCEPTIONALLY |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Catches on quickly; Learns at a faster rate than most others | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Unusually advanced Vocabulary | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Demonstrates high verbal ability; richness of expression; fluency | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Reads independently; tackles difficult material | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Rapid insight into cause/ effect relationships | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Logical thinker | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Abstract thinker | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Curious; asks discerning questions | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Creative; Imaginative | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Good Memory | _____ | _____ | _____ |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Concentrates Well; Becomes absorbed and involved | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 12. Enjoys Challenges | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 13. Keen Sense of Humor | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 14. Thinks fluently, flexibly, originally; Finds several solutions | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 15. Persistent; Follows through on tasks | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 16. Applies learning to new situations | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Appendix B

January 1994

Dear Parents:

As part of your child's participation in the new gifted program, an on-going evaluation will occur. We are interested in obtaining both parent and student feedback throughout the school year in order to create the best gifted program possible. Your child may be asked to engage in informal interviews and complete some questionnaires similar to the attached parent questionnaire for you to complete. All responses are anonymous and confidential as no names will appear on any documents.

In order for this evaluation to get underway, we would appreciate the speedy return of the parent questionnaire and your permission for your child's participation in the evaluation process. Please fill out the bottom section of this sheet and return it, along with your completed parent questionnaire, as soon as possible with your child to his/her gifted teacher or school psychologist's office or mailbox.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and cooperation. We are looking forward to a continued wonderful 1993-94 school year.

Benna Strober, M.S.Ed.

Benna Strober, M.S.Ed.
Pace University

---

January 1994

I, (please print) _____, give my child, _____ (please print) _____, permission to participate in the gifted program evaluation during the 1993-94 school year. I understand that all responses are anonymous and confidential.

_____
Your Signature

_____
Date

Appendix C
Letter to Mainstream Teachers

May/June, 1994

Dear Teacher:

Hello again. Once again I would like to ask for your help in the evaluation of the gifted/enrichment program. Now that the year is coming to a close, we would like to see how this first year has been for all involved in the two programs. Your participation and comments are important parts of this evaluation so that we may make the changes needed to have a well-working model of gifted and enriched education for your students.

At this time I would like to once again ask for you to complete a questionnaire. It may seem similar to the one you completed in January, and it is. In fact, it is necessary for the same questions to be asked of you to see if any opinions or attitudes have changed now that the year is ending. As you know, this survey is short and will not take up a great amount of time, as I know how busy a day can get.

If possible, when you receive these questionnaires, please fill them out as soon as possible and return them to your school psychologist or to the enrichment/Talents Unlimited specialist in your school. This will enable me to once again quickly gather together your ideas and then present them to the committee for the gifted/enrichment program, thereby creating the best services for the children.

Thank you for your time, cooperation, and consideration in this matter. I look forward to working with you and hearing your opinions of the gifted/enrichment program.

Sincerely,

Benna Strober, M.S.Ed.

Benna Strober, M.S.Ed.

Appendix D

THE ME SCALE

I am in _____ grade  I am a boy _____ girl _____

Directions: This questionnaire is intended for you to answer some questions about yourself. Read each statement. If you agree, write A on the line. If you disagree write D.

_____ 1. I am smart.
_____ 2. Other kids like me because I am smart.
_____ 3. I do good work in most of my classes.
_____ 4. My teachers like me because I am smart.
_____ 5. I try to do my best in all my classes.
_____ 6. I can think of new ideas.
_____ 7. I can think of many ideas.
_____ 8. I have a good imagination.
_____ 9. I can draw well.
_____ 10. I am a leader.
_____ 11. Other kids like to play (associate) with me.
_____ 12. I am a good reader.
_____ 13. I am good in math.
_____ 14. I do well on tests.
_____ 15. I usually get high grades.
_____ 16. I can think of very unusual ideas.
_____ 17. I am well liked by other students.
_____ 18. I enjoy reading.
_____ 19. I read many books.
_____ 20. I like to write stories.
_____ 21. I think I will become a great person.
_____ 22. I like to discuss things.
_____ 23. I like to play with kids who are smart.
_____ 24. I have good attitudes towards school.
_____ 25. I have high ability.
_____ 26. I learn fast.
_____ 27. I learn new things easily.
_____ 28. I like to study things that are hard to learn.
_____ 29. I am highly motivated.
_____ 30. I am open to new ideas.
_____ 31. I have a good memory.
_____ 32. I think I will do something great in life.
_____ 33. I will go to college.
_____ 34. I will become famous.
_____ 35. I have many hobbies.
_____ 36. I am different from other kids.
_____ 37. I like to read biographies.
_____ 38. I like to study mathematics.
_____ 39. I can solve problems quickly.
_____ 40. I like to read.
_____ 41. I learn at a faster rate than most others.
_____ 42. I have an advanced vocabulary.
_____ 43. I enjoy challenges.
_____ 44. I am creative.

Scoring Guide for Me Scale

Overall Self-Esteem= Sum of all items on Me Scale
Thinking Skills= Sum of items 6-8, 25-31, 39, 41-44
Specific Abilities= Sum of items 9, 12, 13, 18-20, 22, 37, 38 and 40
Self Perception of How Others View the Child= Sum of items 2, 4, 11 and 17
Success in the Future= Sum of items 21, 33 and 34

7= Strongly agree
6= Agree
5= Somewhat agree
4= Unsure
3= Somewhat disagree
2= Disagree
1= Strongly disagree

8) My child seems to be a better problem solver than she/he was one year ago.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

9) My child is making more applications of thinking skills in subject areas than he/she did last year.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

10) I would like to know more about the Gifted Program in my child's school.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

Please use the space below for any additional comments.

Scoring for Gifted Program Questionnaire- Parent Version

Overall Program Approval= Sum of all 10 items on GPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Abilities = Sum of items 1, 8 and 9
Communication= Sum of items 2, 3, 4, 6, and 10
Program Satisfaction= Sum of items 5 and 7

Appendix F

Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Parent Version

Directions: Please fill in the blanks below regarding your child(ren):

School _____ Grade ___ Age ____ Sex ___

My child is in the gifted pull-out program yes___ no___

Parent completing this survey ___ mother ___ father ___both

Please respond to the following questions on a scale of 1-7 by circling the response that best fits your opinion, 7 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

7= Strongly agree
6= Agree
5= Somewhat agree
4= Unsure
3= Somewhat disagree
2= Disagree
1= Strongly disagree

1) My child has been more interested in going to school this year than last year.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

2) My child tells me about the work he/she is doing in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

3) I have talked to my child's regular classroom teacher about the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

4) I have talked to the enrichment specialist about my child's progress in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

5) I would be interested in attending workshops so that I could be more involved in my child's activities in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

6) I would like the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program to continue next year.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7) My child seems to be a better problem solver than she/he was one year ago.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7= Strongly agree
6= Agree
5= Somewhat agree
4= Unsure
3= Somewhat disagree
2= Disagree
1= Strongly disagree

8) My child is making more applications of thinking skills in subject areas than he/she did last year.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

9) I would like to know more about the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program in my child's school.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

Please use the space below for any additional comments.

Scoring for Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Parent Version

Overall Program Approval= Sum of all 10 items on EPQ-PV
Student's Cognitive Abilities = Sum of items 1, 7 and 8
Communication= Sum of items 2, 3, and 4
Program Satisfaction= Sum of items 5 6 and 9

Appendix G

Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Teacher Version

Grade: _____ School: _____

Directions: Please respond to the following questions on a scale of 1-7 by circling the response that best fits your opinion, 7 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

7 = Strongly agree
6 = Agree
5 = Somewhat agree
4 = Unsure
3 = Somewhat disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly disagree

1) I feel that the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has contributed to student growth in their thinking skills.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

2) I do not believe my teaching strategies in enrichment have expanded as a result of working with the Enrichment specialists.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

3) I feel there is a need for staff development in enrichment strategies for classroom teachers participating in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

4) The Enrichment specialists do not confer with me on an on-going basis about curriculum enhancement and materials of the program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

5) I feel that articulation/planning time between the Enrichment specialists and the classroom teacher participants needs to be regularly scheduled.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

6) I feel the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has received sufficient administrative support in my school.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7) I feel there is a need for additional district training in regard to the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

8) I do not feel the materials used in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program are effective.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7 = Strongly agree
6 = Agree
5 = Somewhat agree
4 = Unsure
3 = Somewhat disagree
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly disagree

9) I feel the grade level meetings used in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has been effective.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

10) I feel the model lessons used in the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program are effective.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

11) I do not feel that the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has contributed to student growth in originality of thought.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

12) I feel that the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has contributed to student growth in flexibility of thought.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

13) I feel that the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has contributed to student growth in fluency of thought.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

14) I feel that the Enrichment/Talents Unlimited Program has contributed to student growth in elaboration of thought.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

15) There is a need for regularly scheduled articulation/common planning time between the gifted specialists and the classroom teachers.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

16) I feel that the students in the pull-out program should have to make up missed classwork.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

Please use the space below for any additional comments.

Scoring Guide for Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Teacher Version

Student's Cognitive Abilities= Sum of items 1, 11-14
Program Effectiveness= Sum of items 8, 9, and 10
Communication= 3, 5, 7 and 15
Items 2 and 4 will be examined individually

Appendix H

Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire- Principal Version

Directions: Please respond to the following questions on a scale of 1-7, 7 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

7= Strongly agree
6= Agree
5= Somewhat agree
4= Unsure
3= Somewhat disagree
2= Disagree
1= Strongly disagree

1) In my school, the Enrichment/Gifted Program is operating successfully with a minimum of supervision from my office.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

2) The enrichment/gifted specialists have shown effective organization with regard to the programs' activities.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

3) The gifted/enrichment specialists seem to be very much involved in the implementation of the programs, working beyond the usual "call of duty."
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

4) The classroom teachers, in general, have indicated that they enjoy participation in the enrichement program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

5) The classroom teachers have shown evidence of integrating their curriculum with the Talents Unlimited Thinking Skills Program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

6) There is a need for regularly scheduled articulation/common planning time between the gifted specialists and the classroom teachers.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7) I feel additional parent workshops are needed to familiarize parents with the activities of the Gifted/Enrichment Programs.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7= Strongly agree
6= Somewhat agree
5= Agree
4= Unsure
3= Disagree
2= Somewhat disagree
1= Strongly disagree

8) I feel the parents in my school favor the two component format of the Gifted/Enrichment programs as it presently exists.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

9) I feel the teachers in my school favor the two component format of the Gifted/Enrichment programs as it presently exists.

7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

Please use the space below for any additional comments.

Scoring Guide for Gifted/Enrichment Program Questionnaire-Principal Version

This questionnaire was examined by an item by item analysis and therefore has no scoring guide

Appendix I

Gifted Program Questionnaire- Student Version

I am in _____ grade  I am a ___ male ___ female

Directions: Please respond to the following questions on a scale of 1-7, by circling the response that best fits your opinion, 7 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

7= Strongly agree
6= Agree
5= Somewhat agree
4= Unsure
3= Somewhat disagree
2= Disagree
1= Strongly disagree

1) I am glad I am in the pull-out gifted program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

2) I do not like being with other students who have the same interests as me.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

3) I enjoy working on independent projects.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

4) I enjoy learning about things that interest me.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

5) I would not like to be in the gifted program next year.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

6) I should be expected to make up any classwork I miss in my regular classroom while I am in the gifted program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

7) I would like to spend more hours per week in the gifted program.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

8) I like being in the gifted class with students in grades 3-6 at the same time.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

9) I can think of many more ideas this year than I could last year.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

10) I can solve problems better this year than I could last year.
7.....6.....5.....4.....3.....2.....1

Please use this space for any additional ideas or comments for the gifted program.

Scoring Guide for Gifted Program Questionnaire- Student Version

Overall Program Approval= Sum of all items on GPQ-SV
Program Satisfaction= Sum of items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8
Self Satisfaction= Sum of items 4, 9 and 10

Appendix J

Open Ended Questions for Gifted Students

1) Can you tell me some of your favorite hobbies?

2) What is your favorite subject?

3) How is what you do in pull-out different from regular class activities?

4) What makes is special or important to you?

5) Would you miss it if you did not go?

6) Is there anything in particular that you've done or made that you really enjoyed the most? What is it?

7) If you could change the program in some way or add one thing to it, what would it be?

8) Have you learned something about yourself from going to pull-out? What is it?

9) Are there any disadvantages to going to pull-out? If so, what are they?

10) Have you changed in any way? How?