Diversity Education and Giftedness: Content, Challenge, and Culturally Consonant Instruction

Margie Kitano
San Diego State University

The increasing diversity of U.S. classrooms has generated interest in multicultural education at all levels of schooling. Teachers want to know how to maximize the learning of their students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Yet emerging data indicate that all students, not just students of color, benefit from diversity in subject matter and the student body. On May 18, 2001, the Boston Globe carried the headline “Diversity benefits whites, project finds” in reporting the results of Harvard’s Civil Right Project (Kurlaender & Yun, 2000) conducted with high school students in Louisville. Researchers found that the majority (90 percent) of high school students from all racial groups surveyed in the study reported that exposure in the curriculum to different racial and ethnic groups’ cultures and experiences helped them better understand perspectives different from their own. Similar percentages reported being comfortable discussing controversial issues related to race and working with peers from different racial and ethnic backgrounds. About half of the students indicated an increased interest in community service and participating in elections.

These findings have several implications for teachers of the gifted. First, diversity education benefits all students, not only students of color. Teachers who work primarily... (see KITANO, page 12)
FROM THE PRESIDENT

Tillie Hickman

In 1750, Robert Gray dared to test the literary conventions of his day in poems like “Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard.” Moving from the elevated prose and stylized poetry of Neo-classical literature, Gray examined the lives of common people, who “dwelt among the untrodden ways” as Wordsworth would say nearly 50 years later. These people, peasants and members of the lower classes, had long been considered too insignificant to merit the concern of any but their immediate families. Without education, they were denied “The applause of listening senates to command,” or the opportunity to “read their history in a nation’s eyes.” Yet, these insignificant ones were the multitudes who within their immediate families. Without education, they were denied services to maximize their potential and continued growth in an educational setting. But what about those other children? Dark-eyed geniuses from different cultures, who do not fit easily into our preconceived notions of giftedness, we fail not only those children but our society as well.

The State Plan for Gifted and Talented Education requires that we use multiple measures, both qualitative and quantitative, to identify students exhibiting high achievement or the potential for high achievement. Even as we celebrate that plan, we often fail in our mission to identify the children who may need our services the most. No one questions that intelligent, middle class children, who meet entrance criteria, need and deserve services to maximize their potential and assure continued growth in an educational setting. But what about those other children? Dark-eyed geniuses from different cultures struggle daily with a second language. Incredible children belong to families that discourage competition and reinforce passivity. Children from poverty do not know the hidden rules (see HICKMAN, page 21)
What Good Do Gifted Programs Do? (or, Why Do We Do What We Do?)

Jay McIntire

We have not done a good job in gifted education of documenting our results. There's one very good reason for this — it is extremely difficult to design, fund, and complete the rigorous experimental research that is necessary to quantify the benefits of gifted education. Experimental research designs in gifted education generally would require some students who were identified as needing services to be denied services for an extended period in order to compare their outcomes with those who received services. Such research is generally rejected on ethical grounds. Results from qualitative studies, which demonstrate their validity and generalizability in very different ways, have not proven to be convincing to decision-makers.

Given that experimental research in gifted education is very rare, how can we claim that gifted education warrants the human fiscal resources that are devoted to it? Anecdotal case studies, particularly of highly gifted students, provide fairly good evidence that gifted programs help alleviate loneliness among gifted students. Certain types of gifted programs, those that allow students to study their area of passion to extraordinary depths, have good anecdotal evidence that career choices and adult achievement correspond to the general fields students have plumbed in gifted programs. Other programs, especially those that do not match the content, processes, and products in which students are taught to the identified areas of their giftedness, have a particularly hard time demonstrating positive outcomes. In my opinion, it just comes down to quality — the best programs produce results. The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented has produced some research results that suggest benefits from gifted program participation. Given the resources devoted to gifted education across the country on the basis of scant evidence, no more important question could be addressed by this august group.

Sometimes in gifted education we make it difficult to defend our programs because we use such rare models for success. There are about 350,000 gifted students currently being served in Texas schools, but we continue to use outcome models such as Einstein, Marie Curie, and Duke Ellington. The models we use achieve at levels less than one in a million. In Texas about one student out of 10,000 of those we serve in gifted programs would be expected to achieve at such levels. Perhaps it's time to reexamine what constitutes a gift that has been fully developed in adulthood. It's not fair either to students, parents, or schools to hold our gifted students up to standards that are impossible for them, as a group, to achieve. If our standards were more basic, like expecting each student to learn something new every day in school, each student learning a year's worth of content for each year in school, or each student learning to great depths in areas which they love, we would be better able to assess our work. Better yet, we would be applying standards that clearly are appropriate for all children. By looking for Einsteins among the tens of thousands of students who graduate each year from gifted programs in Texas, we are looking for very fine needles in stupendous haystacks.

Texas needs a broad array of opportunities and models for meeting the needs of our diverse gifted kids. Just as some kids demonstrate remarkable potential by blowing the ceiling from IQ tests, some who score modestly on this measure and do not fair well in school grades demonstrate great potential through their projects, music, or other (see McIntire, page 20)
Using Self-Regulated Learning to Reverse Underachievement in Talented Students

Sally M. Reis
Meredith J. Greene

Underachievement has received considerable attention in research literature about gifted and talented students and educators must explore the various reasons for these students' underachievement if they hope to help reverse it (Fine & Pitts, 1980; Ford, 1992, 1996; Gallagher, 1991; Hall, 1983; Heacox, 1991; Mandel & Marcus, 1988; McCall, Evanh, & Kratzer, 1992; Reis, 1998; Reis & McCouch, 2000; Supplee, 1990). We should try to determine whether a student's underachievement stems from serious physical, cognitive, or emotional issues, or a mismatch between the student and the school environment, or a personal characteristic like low self-regulation, low self-efficacy, or low self-motivation (Siegle, 2000; Siegle & McCouch, 2002). Appropriate intervention strategies must also be developed to address the specific area of need exhibited by the student in question. When we differentiate treatments to meet the needs of underachievers, we will more effectively begin to solve the problem of underachievement in both our schools and society.

In this article, some of the reasons students underachieve will be examined and one specific intervention, the acquisition of self-regulated learning skills, will be explained.

Interventions Related to Underachievement

Interventions to reverse gifted underachievement usually fall into two general categories: counseling and instructional interventions (Baum, Renzulli, & Hebert, 1995; Rimm, Corinal, Manos, & Behrend, 1989). Most counseling interventions concentrate on changing the personal and / or family dynamics that contribute to a student's underachievement. These interventions may include individual, group, and / or family counseling. In most counseling situations, the counselor's goal is not to force the underachiever to become a more successful student, but rather to help the student decide whether success is valued as a desirable goal, and if so, to help change counterproductive habits.

The most well known instructional interventions for gifted and talented students have been their placement in part-time or full-time special classrooms for underachievers (Supplee, 1980; Whitmore, 1980). In these specially designated classrooms, educators strive to create a favorable environment for student achievement by altering the traditional classroom organization. Usually, a smaller student/teacher ratio exists in which teachers create less conventional types of teaching and learning activities and provide options for choice and freedom in exercising control over their environment. In these classroom settings, gifted students are encouraged to utilize different learning strategies and to take initiative for self-directed behavior (Reis & McCouch, 2000).

Factors Contributing to Underachievement and Its Reversal

No one factor causes academic underachievement. Family factors and school environment appear to contribute to underachievement according to most recent research. Biological, personal, and peer influences are also suggested as possible contributors. Although data are not uniform or complete, underachievers are generally believed to be from lower socioeconomic and larger families, and there are more males than females who underachieve in school. Overall, most researchers seem to agree that low self-esteem is a
common characteristic among this population, although reasons for this vary. Some researchers believe that low self-concept comes from inability to achieve in school while others regard negative self-image as a root of underachievement.

Some students are able to reverse their academic underachievement without the assistance of formal interventions (Emelick, 1992). Several common factors appeared to play a part in the students' reversal of their underachievement, including the development of interests and activities, parental support for independence, development of goals associated with grades, significant teachers, and changes in selves. Students who are more involved in extracurricular activities have also been found to be less likely to be underachievers. Other general findings include the impact that one teacher can have in reversing students' underachievement behavior. If stimulated in class and given the opportunity to pursue topics of interest, gifted underachievers have been found to develop achievement-oriented behaviors. Research has also found that the earlier underachievers are identified, the better the opportunity for concerned adults to reverse the patterns of underachievement.

In a multi-year research study conducted by researchers at the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (Reis, Hébert, Diaz, Ratley, Maxfield, 1995), researchers found that achievement and underachievement were not mutually exclusive concepts. In many cases, students who underachieved had been high achieving in the previous year or semester in school. Some of the high achieving students had experienced periods of underachievement in school and were supported in their achievement by a network of high achieving peers who refused to let their friends falter in school. High ability students who underachieved in high school acknowledged that their underachievement began in elementary school when they were not provided with appropriate levels of challenge. Students who underachieved in school did not demonstrate a strong belief in self, often came from families in which personal problems were evident, and were not resilient enough to overcome negative environmental factors such as gangs, drugs, and lack of access to resources.

Students who achieved in school acknowledged the importance of being grouped together in honors and advanced classes for academically talented students and participated in multiple extracurricular activities both after school and during the summer. Successful students also received support and encouragement from each other and from supportive adults including teachers, guidance counselors, coaches, and mentors.

Summary of Research on Underachievement

The following major findings on the underachievement of talented and gifted students can be summarized from recent reviews of research (Reis, 1999; Reis & McCoach, 2000):

• the beginnings of underachievement in many young people occur in elementary school—some students may underachieve as a direct result of an inappropriate, unchallenging, and/or unmotivating curriculum
• few interventions have been tried to reverse underachievement
• underachievement appears to be periodic and episodic, occurring in some years and not others and in some classes, but not others. However, eventually increasing episodes of underachievement will result in a more chronic pattern for many students
• parental issues may interact with the behaviors of some underachievers

The teaching of self-regulation strategies can be used to successfully increase students’ self-regulation and enhance academic achievement.
Loss of Self:
Questioning One’s Giftedness

Sandra N. Kaplan

When the question “Are you sure this student is really gifted?” is posed, it always arouses speculation. Most often the question is a way of approaching the recognized discrepancy between what is anticipated a gifted student has the potential to accomplish and what the learner is actually accomplishing. Reasons for the discrepancy are found traditionally in the areas of identification and social-emotional development. However, when the question “Are you sure this student is really gifted?” is directed toward an emergent English language learner or student with limited experiential background, the answer can be found by examining curriculum and instruction, or what is taught to students and how it is taught.

There was sufficient data to substantiate the identification of Eriberto as a gifted individual. However, two months after Eriberto began participating in the gifted program, there was insufficient data to discern that Eriberto was a gifted student. What happened to Eriberto is not uncommon and can be labeled as a loss of identity of self as a gifted individual. The withdrawal of the gifted student from the curriculum or instructional process occurs subtly and gradually. It manifests itself as the gifted student attempts to engage in the lesson and finds little or no reinforcement in the lesson to affirm one’s ability to be successful. The inability to sustain one’s perception of the self as gifted and as a legitimate participant with other gifted individuals is a consequence of several program and lesson factors.

This loss of self as a competent learner is not just relevant to young learners. Given a group of competent adults learning a new computer program, one can observe a few individuals in the group losing confidence, becoming hesitant in their involvement with activity, glancing at others to note what and how they are doing, and quietly questioning their own abilities. Many adults can recognize themselves in this example of the loss of one’s perception of the self as a competent individual. Many adults can remember the analogy of feeling that they began to “evaporate from the situation”, or physically remove themselves from the learning situation, when they began to believe they were unable to be successful.

Multiple factors contribute to this phenomenon of losing one’s identity as a competent or gifted individual in a teaching/learning situation. First, and perhaps foremost, is the lack of explanation given to students concerning their abilities and placement in a gifted program. Confirmation of one’s giftedness is elusive or distorted for most students and hidden behind generalized statements of “You’re so smart”, and “You easily can do this”, without concrete evidence to affirm one’s giftedness. The student enters the learning experience with a primary goal: to prove how smart one is or to valuate oneself as gifted. Effort toward proving one’s right to participate dissipates the energy needed to engage fully in the learning process. The underlying motivation in the lesson is to prove one belongs rather than to attain the lesson’s objective.
Eriberto was so preoccupied with his intellectual status during a lesson, he got “lost” in the lesson. The lesson progressed and he was still attempting to resolve the reason why he was a participant in the lesson and lists attentively as the lesson unfolds. When the pace of the lesson quickens, when the lesson becomes more demanding and the expectations are more clearly defined, Eriberto begins to shrink from the lesson, using the responses of others as benchmarks to assess his own abilities. He spends more effort to earn the right to participate than he does to learn the curriculum. By the end of the lesson, his perception of himself as a gifted individual and his achievement are both at a low level.

The identification and placement in a gifted program can become a deterrent toward the realization of potential when students are not appraised of the reason for their programmatic involvement. The need for a “transition curriculum” that serves as a bridge between the regular and differentiated curriculum of the gifted program could serve to develop the student’s self-efficacy as a gifted individual. Elements of the “transition curriculum” would include a discussion of ability, the role of scholarliness in learning, the differences between convergent and divergent responses, and explanations of how to participate in an inquiry versus didactic learning experiences. Developing students who are academically comfortable with the self as gifted could ameliorate the physical as well as intellectual attestation of emergent English language learners and limited experiential gifted students from the gifted program. If there is clarity as to why a student participates in a differentiated learning experience, it would enhance the level of participation rather than create a loss of self as a gifted individual.

More specifically, it is incumbent upon teachers to state clearly what types of intellectual behaviors are required to be successful in a lesson. Too frequently, the stress for successful participation in a lesson is dependent on “good social behavior”, such as focusing attention on the teacher and raising hands before speaking. Reference to the intellectual demands of a lesson would include the need to think globally, the importance of identifying the pattern and the requirement to tolerate ambiguity or the unknown without blaming oneself for not realizing the answer. Developing the predisposition necessary to maintain one’s involvement in the lesson could easily allow Eriberto and others like him to distinguish between the lesson’s needs and their own perceived inadequacies. The well-defined intellectual demands of a lesson facilitate one’s involvement in a lesson without casting blame on the self as an inadequate learner and causing learner to doubt his/her giftedness.

Sandra Kaplan is Associate Clinical Professor for Learning and Instruction at the University of Southern California. She has served as the lead consultant for the Carnegie Middle Schools Project, Texas Education Agency, from 1993 to present. Dr. Kaplan is a past president of the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) of which she has been a member of since 1982. She is also a past president of the California Association for the Gifted. One of the world’s foremost authorities in the field of gifted education, she has made presentations at the World Congress on Gifted, NAGC, and TAGT conferences. Recent honors include the Award of Achievement from the California Association for the Gifted and the Distinguished Service Award from NAGC.
An Empirical Method for Selecting Tests for the Identification of Gifted and Talented CLD Students

Ernesto Bernal

Since the 1980s, coordinators of gifted and talented (GT) programs have wanted to find "a test" for selecting or identifying minority students. Now, however, they want an instrument that "finds more minorities" but that also works with everybody else. Their focus, however, should be on settling upon a set of legally and professionally defensible tests that will both yield valid assessments and actually guide placement decisions.

The case study that follows presents a recent example of finding a test that works for a particular group of students. This experience readily generalizes to other settings, and explains hard-won lessons that will help practitioners avoid professionally embarrassing and—for the students—costly mistakes. This article argues for the reader to adopt an empirical attitude toward tests and other selection devices, a kind of critical thinking that is based on verifiable results, not opinions or impressions.

A Case History of Two Tests in Three Rural, Border Communities

Background

I was the external evaluator of a Javits grant that served three participating rural school districts along the U.S.-Mexico border. One of the project's objectives was to select a test to assess language-minority students who were nominated for the GT program during the early elementary years of schooling. The idea was to use a test that does not require English-language proficiency, yet that taps general intelligence (g) and has good predictive validity for selecting students who adapt well to the rigors of bilingual, pull-out, gifted programs. A follow up to earlier placement decisions is crucial for the selection of a "good" instrument, for a test that cannot detect who is more likely to succeed is predictively invalid and should not be used for placement.

Two "non-verbal" measures, the Raven's Progressive Matrices (RPM) and the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT), were compared against a criterion of GT-trained teachers' simple rating of the students' successful or unsuccessful adaptation to the GT program. Both the RPM and the NNAT consist of patterns that require "completion" by selecting the final section of the design from a set of several designs, and no written or spoken language beyond the directions to the general test are needed. These teachers did not know their students' RPM or NNAT scores at the time their ratings were made. The teachers' judgments were used by the GT coordinators to review the unsuccessful students for possible furloughs from the GT programs.

The percentile scores in which the test scores on the RPM and NNAT were originally reported (using national norms) were converted to an IQ scale with mean = 100 and standard deviation = 15 using the equipercentile method (based on the normal curve) in order to establish a common, equal-interval metric for analyzing the results. The two tests were correlated to each other using Pearson's r, a t test for correlated means was used to compare the means of the two tests, and the point-biserial correlation served to study the predictive relationship between each of the tests and the arbitrarily dichotomized criterion variable, successful-unsuccessful adaptation to the GT program.

Results

Cohort 1 had 43 students and Cohort 2 had 26 students for a total N = 69 in the three districts' GT programs in
grades two, three, and four. Nine of the limited-English proficient students (about 13 percent) were considered by their teachers to not be making satisfactory progress after the Javits program finished its second year. In sum, 13 percent of those admitted to the GT program may have been incorrectly identified or, alternatively, 87 percent appear to have been correctly placed.

The RPM and the NNAT scores of the selected students had similar variances. Neither test showed mean score differences across the two cohorts, which indicated consistency in placement from one year of the project to the next. The correlation between the two tests on the 69 students, however, was only $r = .36$ and the two tests yielded different means: The average RPM IQ was 118.7 ($s = 9.7$); the mean NNAT was 110.2 ($s = 11.0$), a difference of 8.5 points.

The data for the two cohorts were combined and point-biserial coefficients were calculated between the dichotomized (0, 1) criterion of successful-unsuccessful and the interval IQ scores on the RPM or NNAT. For the RPM, $rpb = .08$, which was not significantly different (probability or $p = .27$) from a regression coefficient of zero (although it must be said that the power of the statistic to detect a very small regression was low for the size of the sample). The NNAT score’s regression with the criterion was $.21$, which just reached significance ($p = .05$), although the corresponding effect size would be considered small to medium (Cohen, 1969), because the amount of variance accounted for, .212 or 4.4%, is low. The mean NNAT score for the students who made a satisfactory adjustment to the bilingual GT program was 112; for those who did not the mean was 105.

Interpretation

The Raven’s Progressive Matrices was the test of choice in the three districts at the time we initiated the comparison. Although the RPM is a test that is in popular use in many GT programs that serve larger percentages of minority students and language-minority students, it proved not to be predictively valid for the CLD students in this study. In other words, the three districts had been selecting CLD students for their elementary GT programs with a test that had essentially zero validity for them! It was the newer test, the NNAT, which proved to have some predictive validity ($rpb = .21$) with this rural population of CLD Mexican American children, although the effect size makes even this finding somewhat tenuous. The validity of the NNAT with a completely unrestricted sample would be about .40, using the tables provided by Kaufman (1972), but in the practical realm this is probably too optimistic. The real figure probably lies somewhere between .21 and .40, given the restriction in range that must necessarily occur as a result of the process of nomination itself. The recent experience of Naglieri and Ford (1999), also suggests that the NNAT holds promise in comparison to the RPM.

I recommended that the NNAT’s use be continued in the project on an experimental basis, even if it meant that students would likely get lower scores on the NNAT than on the RPM, and that other data be gathered from or about the students in any admissions decision. In the interest of improved validity, I was willing to trade off lower average scores for students who are predicted to do well in the program. (How’s that for a paradox?) Under no circumstance should a test with a small to medium validity effect size be used by itself in any high stakes decision! I also recommended that a particular portfolio instrument also be included in the next round of testing, so that a nontraditional source of achievement data might be entered into a multiple regression equation, and that a relatively new screening instrument be used to tap the personality characteristics of gifted CLD students as well. Thus additional variables, including guided professional judgment (using a structured rating form) could be used to supplement the new nonverbal IQ test and to study the successful adaptation of students over time.

Implications for Test Selection

The first implication for the modern GT practitioner is simply not to adopt a popular test—even one as well documented as the Raven—and presume that it has diagnostic or predictive validity for all of the populations of students in the district. Admissions-selection-identification decisions are high-stakes decisions, and one needs to know that the tests used can actually help project staff to do their work. In our current litigious atmosphere, it is imperative that the instruments and the ways they are used be able to stand up both to legal scrutiny and to professional standards of practice as well.

A second inference that one can make from this case study is that it is useful to conduct a validity study that compares the IQ test in use against an alternative, especially for CLD students. It is possible that the current instrument works to select the right subgroup of White students but does not tap the right group of CLD students. It is also possible that the first test or the new test will work fairly well with both groups. Do not be surprised, however, if two tests are indicated, not one, for different groups may have different cutoffs in terms of selection-identification. Regression analysis may indicate that different critical scores are required.
for the groups in question.

Some may get alarmed if this happens, given the legal argument against setting different scores for different folks. In this example, however, the two critical scores are eminently justified by the data, unlike cut scores that have been set to achieve quotas or set arbitrarily (like an IQ of 130), instead of being based on the demonstrated validity of the results. If CLD students are given the right opportunity to learn, they will do well in a GT program even though their initial scores are on average lower than the scores made by White, middle-class students. (See Valencia, 1992, for a discussion on cultural bias and opportunity to learn.) If valid, professionally and legally defensible decisions are what you want, a little "experimentation" followed by analysis is the way to go.

How to Figure it

The use of multiple selection criteria—so popular in "identification" strategies—can also employ a regression strategy for validation, a multiple regression study that can help us predict which students are most likely to succeed, given a fair opportunity to learn, of course. Multiple regression will yield a weight for each variable that is not redundant with other variables in the equation. Usually, a constant is also included. Simply take a student's scores on the battery of assessments that constitute the criteria for selection-admission to the GT program, multiply each by its respective weight, add the products together, and add or subtract (as indicated) the constant to get a total estimate of the likelihood of the student's success in the program. If the criterion variable is scored dichotomously, as in the case study above, the closer the student's total comes to 1, the more likely the student will succeed.

Do you want to optimize the percent of the selected students to do well in the GT program while feeling fairly sure that the ones you rejected would not have performed satisfactorily? If so, select students whose predicted composite score on the dichotomous criterion equals or exceeds .50. You can be more selective than this, of course, but unless the multiple regression coefficient is a "perfect" 1.0, there will always be error in your prediction, and the more selective you get the fewer students you will accept and the more students you will exclude who would have done well. What is more, if only one test is used districtwide, a disproportionate number of the students rejected will likely be minority students. The coordinator who decides to be very selective should look at the printout's figure for the standard error of estimate (the plus/minus factor in successful adaptation, the SEE) and add no more than one standard error's points to the score that represents the .50:.50 break and make that the cutscore for the group.

Of course, if the empirically derived evidence indicates that some groups need a different set of tests—i.e., a different set of predictors—then the regression equation of each group can be expected to yield a different constant, a different weight for each variable, and a different SEE. But the general way of determining the cutscore must be the same, say the score that has a probability (p) of at least .50 of selecting the "right" student for the program, since this score will positively affect the success rate of the program without compromising the number of students who should be included.

Alternatively, one can improve the chances of selecting the right students by creating a "talent pool" of students whose composites are close to the .50 mark—say from .46 to .54—to see if they can do well in a GT setting and defer the decision about the ones to include officially to a later time. There is nothing quite as reassuring as actually trying out the students to see how successful they might be in a GT setting.

Notice that in this recommended procedure there is no suggestion for using a "matrix" to combine test scores. Many programs use one or another of the commercially available matrices to summarize the results of the different instruments they use (including rating scales and portfolios), but these forms award points—weights, really—for different kinds of tests or for scoring on different parts of the scale. One matrix, for instance, awards 9 points if the score on an achievement test falls into the 95th–99th percentile bracket, 8 if the score is between the 90th and the 94th, etc. A little thought will make everyone realize that such systems make no critical sense. The distance (on the normal curve) between the 95th and the 99th percentile is much greater than the distance between the 90th and the 94th. And why the 90th percentile; why not the 89th or the 91st? I strongly suggest that GT coordinators and their selection-identification teams invest the time to work with an evaluator to make an empirical determination of the weights to use and follow these, not the weights implicit in matrices. One needs to realize that the matrix—especially the weights it uses—adds another layer of data manipulation, and therefore also has to be validated!

Finally, an important facet of the case study is that the CLD students were selected for the GT program long before they were academically proficient speakers of English. Indeed, one of the most regrettable features of many GT
programs is that they do not consider children who are still learning English for admission until after they can take all of the district's tests in English. Such a tacit or formal policy delays the admission of CLD children, and is certainly one of the major factors in their underrepresentation in GT programs (Bernal, 1999). It denies them an optimal opportunity to learn (Howley, Howley, & Pendarvis, 1995). To achieve equity the GT program must recruit and train bilingual teachers who can provide the CLD-GT students with an appropriate level of instruction bilingually, so that their academic progress can be estimated through the child's native language, either through achievement tests in that language or through alternative, performance assessments that utilize the children's stronger language as well as English (Bernal, 2000b). "There is no inherent need to delay the education of limited English proficient...gifted children if bilingually competent teachers of the gifted are available" (Barkan & Bernal, 1991, p. 144).

Conclusion
There are many ways to set up a selection-identification procedure, but only one way of doing so that allows you to select validly the students who will be most likely to do well in your program. All but one or two states give "flexibility" to districts to set up ways to find the GT-eligible students. Every GT program coordinator is responsible to set up a system that is both professionally and legally defensible. The way to do this is to make an empirical evaluation of the tests and instruments to see if they meet common professional standards of reliability and validity for each of the major ethnic populations in the district.

Of course, all predictive validity studies are predicated on the GT program's giving all students an equal opportunity to learn. To achieve this, programs will have to accommodate culturally and linguistically different learners who are very bright, and not just identify more of them. Talent pools as well as the empirical determination of which tests to use are recommended here.
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with white, middle class students can provide them with more complete and complex information through multicultural content, better prepare them for success in a global society, and support their growing self efficacy as agents of change. And teachers who serve increasing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students can address these same goals as well as enhance motivation through culturally relevant content and instructional practice. This article proposes that teachers of the gifted can enrich the education of gifted students from all backgrounds through content, challenge, and culturally consonant pedagogy.

CONTENT: Teaching and Learning a More Comprehensive Truth

Gifted students often demonstrate a thirst for knowledge and truth and are sensitive to dishonesty. They often show concern for moral and ethical issues. They have a high capacity for analytic, evaluative, and critical thinking. We try to challenge their thinking by requiring interaction with knowledge and ideas in deep and complex ways. Yet the textbooks we use often present only one interpretation of truth. A decade ago, Bigelow (1991) asked his secondary students to critique elementary textbooks’ treatment of Columbus’ interactions with Indians after reading other historical works that provide different perspectives, such as those of the “discovered” people. Students reacted with shock and outrage that their initial exposure to the Columbus story was incomplete: “If we can’t believe what our first grade teachers told us, why should we believe you? If they lied to us, why wouldn’t you? If one book is wrong, why isn’t another?” (p. 9).

We cannot guarantee to students that we expose them to complete information about every topic. However, we have an obligation to provide the most comprehensive information possible within the time that we have. And we can invite their individual pursuit of further knowledge. One goal of multicultural education is to offer students a broader, more comprehensive truth through the examination of topics from a variety of perspectives. There are others. In a comprehensive review of literature on multicultural education in K-12 education, Sleeter and Grant (1987) found several distinct approaches that included encouraging people to get along, teaching about specific groups, valuing diversity and equity in distribution of power, and preparing people to take social action against structural inequality. Three dimensions of multicultural education identified by the eminent multiculturalist, James Banks (1995) also can be conceived as curriculum goals: integrating examples and information from a variety of cultures and groups; understanding how race, gender, class, and other factors affect how knowledge is constructed in disciplines; and reducing prejudice.

In San Diego, we (Kitano & Pedersen, 2002) found that elementary teachers of the gifted most frequently identified valuing diversity; knowing literature, art, traditions, and history of diverse groups; and understanding contributions of people from diverse groups as multicultural content goals. Middle and high school teachers of the gifted also listed understanding issues of prejudice, racism, discrimination, and stereotyping as goals. High school teachers were more likely than elementary teachers to include analysis of issues of power and oppression in present day society and why diverse perspectives have been historically omitted from the curriculum (knowledge construction). The majority of teachers surveyed reported that their gifted students respond favorably to multicultural goals by appreciating multiple perspectives, displaying more accepting behavior in the classroom, having increased knowledge and awareness of social issues, showing greater appreciation for other cultures, valuing diversity, and, for diverse students, displaying increased self esteem.

In sum, teaching and learning of multicultural content remain of prime concern for all students and address a variety of goals. For the gifted, enabling students to acquire a more comprehensive truth through diverse perspectives is paramount. Teachers of the gifted who integrate multicultural goals generally find that their students reap both cognitive and affective benefits.

CHALLENGE: Integrating Depth, Complexity, and Critical Thinking

Given that multicultural content should be integrated for all learners, how might we differentiate for the gifted? General approaches to differentiating can readily be applied to multicultural content. Ford and Harris (1999) integrate Bloom’s taxonomy to encourage students’ development from awareness to social action. In San Diego, many teachers of the gifted incorporate Kaplan’s (2001) model for increasing depth and complexity in content combined with thematic instruction.

Consider the following multicultural objectives enhanced in ways that engage gifted students in more complex thinking:

1. Identifying patterns of social issues over time and place. A middle school teacher of the gifted addressed ancient civilizations by having small groups of students se-
lect different civilizations to study in depth. One element investigated by each group concerned social structures. Together, the class built a matrix of societies by elements of social structure (e.g., class distinctions, slavery, relevant laws, type of government) and derived hypotheses and generalizations concerning relationships among the elements.

2. **Reconciling inconsistencies between our democratic ideals and historical and current realities.** The College of William and Mary Center for Gifted Education’s (1998) language arts curriculum *The 1940’s: A Decade of Change* includes materials and activities that encourage students’ understanding of the internment of Japanese Americans in concentration camps in the United States during World War II. Students can analyze the evacuation and relocation of citizens within the context of the U.S. Constitution and the ideals upon which it was created. They can examine contemporary events as well, such as racial profiling in light of terrorist threats and predict how outcomes might be similar or different from the Japanese-American experience.

3. **Analyzing how knowledge is constructed.** A curriculum package designed by the Stanford Program on International and Cross-Cultural Education (Núñez, 1996) invites students (5th through 10th grades) to acquire a broader truth on the meeting of Montezuma and Cortez by providing primary source documents presenting a variety of perspectives within a variety of media. Students become historiographers to experience how one’s status, perspective, audience, and goals affect the reporting and recording of events. Adding Libura, Burr, and Urrutia’s (1997) colorful account of the Florentine Codex provides a stronger Aztec perspective.

4. **Managing multiple perspectives on a single event or issue.** Elementary age children familiar with the Three Little Pigs can read A. Wolf’s version (Scieszka’s *The True Story of the 3 Little Pigs*) to consider diverse perspectives and ponder what constitutes truth in a lighthearted way. Jane Yolen’s beautiful picture book, *Encounter*, provides a Taino Indian boy’s perspective on the Columbus expedition that will help broaden children’s knowledge about the age of discovery.

5. **Understanding oneself and what it might be like to be another.** Gifted children from families with long histories in the U.S. studied immigration by assuming the role of an immigrant and writing a personal journal or diary. They were asked to summarize whether the experience affected how they felt about immigrants and what specific actions they might take to support newcomers in their community.

6. **Understanding how individuals can change society:** building a sense of self efficacy and skills for social change. When aware of injustices, gifted students often have a strong desire to create positive change. Providing students with strategies for planning and implementing social change can enhance self efficacy—helping them perceive that they can influence their environment. Students can re-write sections of their history text to provide readers with missing perspectives. They can write to community leaders to offer insights and suggestions on local controversies (e.g., the sports team mascot). They can problem solve to create increased access to school activities for students with disabilities.

Addressing the above goals encourages gifted students to examine diversity in depth and to interact with complex issues. Teachers can also challenge gifted students by addressing multicultural content through strategies commonly used for acceleration (e.g., curriculum compacting) and supporting higher level thinking (e.g., problem-based learning, Socratic seminars, tiered instruction).

**Culturally Consonant Pedagogy**

In addition to providing multicultural content for all learners, enhancing the academic achievement of students from culturally, economically, and linguistically diverse backgrounds constitutes another important dimension of diversity education (Banks, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 1989). One avenue is culturally consonant pedagogy, the use of teaching and learning strategies matched to student needs and preferences. The challenge in implementing such strategies lies in identifying children’s preferred learning styles and needs, which may vary both within and between cultural groups. Broadly defined, culturally consonant pedagogy also includes effective strategies for working with English learners and students with disabilities.

A discussion of culturally-related learning styles is not possible here. Interested readers should consult Shade, Kelly, and Oberg (1997). A more general recommendation is to read for culture-specific knowledge and to interact with families to discover how teaching and learning occurs in a given student’s home and what motivates learning (see Cazden & Mehan, 1989). For example, I had the opportunity to observe an African American primary-age boy tested as highly gifted by the schools but considered a behavior problem by his teacher. During a discovery learning science lesson, he wandered about the classroom seeking direction from peers on how to assemble the equipment. When rebuffed by a peer (“Just do what the teacher said”), he proceeded to follow behind the teacher as she assisted at
other tables. He finally attempted to get her attention by tapping her on the shoulder while she was conversing with a pair of children. The teacher ignored the interruption. The child began disrupting his peers by singing loudly and was asked to move to the back of the classroom. The boy lived with his mother and two teen-age brothers who were quite direct in telling him what to do (and not to do), though their admonitions were punctuated with affectionate bantering. Consider this brief observation in light of literature emphasizing African American children’s need for affection and attention and questioning the efficacy of unstructured teaching methods for some. Could the teacher facilitate learning in this case by paying positive attention to the child, providing him with more explicit, step-by-step instruction and modeling at the beginning of the lesson, assuring him that he can accomplish the task, and giving him strategies to implement if he has questions?

The literature offers other examples that challenge our assumptions about students from specific cultural groups and show us that changing instruction in ways consistent with cultural values can enhance learning. Native American students are often described as passive in classrooms and as being more comfortable with nonverbal learning. However, Mehan, Lintz, Okamoto, and Wills (1995) cited an example in which a teacher using inquiry-based questioning generated enthusiastic responses when she incorporated materials that drew upon students’ prior knowledge to solve new problems. She showed students local scenes and asked them to identify community needs. Students then grouped the items, justified their choices, and develop an insightful generalization about the nature of their community, where people work together to solve mutual problems.

The above example came from a teacher working with Navajo students, and generalizations cannot be made across all Navajo students or across nations. Within-group diversity characterizes Asian American students as well (see Kitano & DiIiiosi, 2002, for additional information). Similarly, White students do not all learn the same way. Again, reading about a given group and interviewing and interacting with the specific family can help the teacher identify how a student might be accustomed to learning. Offering students choices in content, product, and process can also support their learning styles.

Gifted students who are English learners also have special instructional needs. I recently observed a Latino elementary teacher who worked primarily with Mexican American children in a bilingual/bicultural classroom. He indicated that providing different assignments to accommodate high performing children would be inconsistent with the culture’s valuing of community and equality. He accommodated diverse performance levels by giving the same assignment to all students (e.g., creating a fairy tale) and differentiating the amount of support or scaffolding he provided. He also considered their culture and English fluency in using Diego Rivera for biography study. He conducted a Socratic seminar using the artist’s painting, La Piñata, as “text.” His objective for the seminar was to encourage students’ thinking about the meaning of the painting within the context of Rivera’s life story. He began by inviting students to react to the painting based on their own experiences. When they felt comfortable, he asked them to discuss what the painter was trying to convey and to point to details in the painting as evidence.

This teacher illustrated several general strategies recommended for culturally and linguistically diverse students: linking new concepts to prior knowledge and experience, providing advance organizers, using visuals (graphic organizers, concept maps, matrixes) or multimedia (realia, art, pictures, video, field trips, manipulatives). Additional strategies include explaining verbally and through modeling and demonstration, showing completed examples before students begin a task, and matching pacing to the learners’ needs.

It is unrealistic to try to match approaches to each student all the time. While one objective is to facilitate learning through culturally consonant practice, another is to strategically expand children’s repertoires of learning styles and strategies to enable them to acquire information in a variety of contexts with a variety of teachers.

Putting It All Together

I conceptualize multicultural education for gifted students as integrating multicultural content, appropriate levels of challenge, and culturally consonant pedagogy. An example comes from a fifth grade teacher whose multicultural content goal was to broaden her gifted students’ knowledge of the Revolutionary War period. Using problem-based learning (challenge), students chose advisor roles to the Continental Congress as that body was considering war with England. An African American girl (sociologist) investigated how Blacks might respond to such a war. A white girl (domestic advisor) studied the roles women might assume. While some of the gifted students immediately started to work, others had difficulty organizing themselves for the task. The teacher provided these students with a matrix of resources (e.g., Internet, encyclopedia, text) by questions
(e.g., what role did slaves play?) that she helped the students identify. Students reported their findings at the Continental Congress. Students acknowledged their high level of enthusiasm for the task and for the organizing matrix as well as their appreciation for the opportunity (not typically offered) to explore personally meaningful questions. One student pronounced this the best history lesson she ever had, noting that the strategies she acquired would help her in subsequent grades.

Diversity education can benefit all gifted students. Integrating multicultural content with culturally consonant instruction in ways that challenge thinking appears to be one workable approach.
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Defining Self-regulated Learning

Self-regulation is an integrated learning process, consisting of the development of a set of constructive behaviors that affect one’s learning (Zimmerman, 1989). These processes are planned and adapted to support the pursuit of personal goals in changing learning environments. A common set of self-regulation strategies exist, as well as an individual set of skills that each student must develop personally to be successful in school and life. Self-regulation skills can be taught, learned, and controlled (Zimmerman, 1994; Zimmerman, Bonner, & Kovatch, 1996).


Personal strategies involve how a student organizes and interprets information and include:
• organizing and transforming information (outlining, summarizing, highlighting, using flashcards or index cards, drawing pictures, diagrams, or charts, using concept webs and mapping).
• goal setting / planning and standard setting (sequencing, timing, time management, pacing)
• keeping records and monitoring (note-taking, listing errors made, recording grades, keeping a all drafts of assignments, maintaining a portfolio)
• Written and/or verbal rehearsing and memorizing (using mnemonic devices, mental imagery, and/or repetition; teaching someone else the material; making sample questions).

Behavioral strategies occur when students check their own progress or quality of work by examining the actions they take during the learning process (Zimmerman, 1989, 1990, 1995). Students must learn to self-evaluate and self-consequate. In self-evaluation, students analyze the learning task to determine what is expected by the teacher and desired by themselves and reflect on their self-instructions, feedback, and attentiveness. When they self-consequate, students arrange their own rewards to motivate or punish themselves for failing to meet their goals. Then they use self-reinforcement and learn to delay gratification until they have achieved this specific goal.

Environmental strategies for self-regulated learning involve the use of external resources and the adaptation of the students’ environment (Zimmerman, 1989, 1990, 1995). This includes seeking information from nonsocial sources such as the library and Internet; seeking social assistance from peers, teachers, other adults; emulating exemplary models; reviewing records; rereading notes, tests, and textbooks; and structuring the study environment for optimal results (selecting or arranging the physical setting; isolating, eliminating, or minimizing distractions; breaking up study periods and spreading them over time).

Self-Regulation and Gifted Students

Current research indicates that some gifted students possess better self-regulated learning strategies than their peers, however gifted students may have done very well in school without using good self-regulation strategies because of a combination of their high abilities and/or an unchallenging curriculum (Reis, Hébert, Diaz, Maxfield, & Ratley, 1995). If learning is relatively easy for someone, less effort, organization and other self-regulated activities are expended. Social conditions or personal issues may prevent students from developing self-regulated learning strategies. Some students who already have some of these strategies encounter social or personal issues that may prevent them from using these strategies regularly. Encouragement to do so and support for using self-regulation strategies can be helpful for these students. Other gifted and talented students display perfectionism and need to learn to strive for excellence (their personal best) rather than perfection. Some talented students with high potential find it difficult to learn self-regulation when it is not taught, modeled, or rewarded by the adults in their home and family. Even if students interact regularly with adults who demonstrate self-regulation, they may fail to use these skills themselves due to peer pressure or refuse to use the strategies their parents or teachers regularly employ at home or school.

Compared with low achieving students, high achievers

...
set more specific learning goals, use a variety of learning strategies, self-monitor more often, and adapt their efforts more systematically (Ruban, 2000). The quality and quantity of self-regulation processes is crucial. We must recognize that one self-regulation strategy will not work for all students, and that the use of only a few strategies will not work optimally for a person on all tasks or occasions. It is important that students learn to use multiple self-regulatory learning skills rather than single strategies. They must also learn that their goals and their choice of self-regulation strategies have to be adjusted regularly as they experience different content areas and different teachers. Teachers should try to work with students to help them shift from performance goals and move towards mastery goals, focusing on understanding the material, persisting when they are challenged or their performance fails. This is especially critical for talented students who seldom experience high levels of challenge.

Self-regulation Skills
According to Zimmerman (1989), self-regulated learning involves the regulation of three general aspects of academic learning. First, self-regulation of behavior involves the active control of the various resources students have available to them, such as their time, their study environment (for example, the place in which they study), and their use of others such as peers and faculty members to help them. Second, self-regulation of motivation and affect involves controlling and changing motivational beliefs such as self-efficacy and goal orientation, so that students can adapt to the demands of a course. In addition, students can learn how to control their emotions and affect (such as anxiety) in ways that improve their learning. Finally, self-regulation of cognition involves the control of various cognitive strategies for learning, such as the use of deep processing strategies that result in better learning and performance than students showed previously (Garcia & Pintrich, 1994; Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, & McKeachie, 1993).

In many classrooms, teachers assume most of the responsibility for the learning process and students may begin to depend on this model of learning. Talented students can be taught to become more self-regulated learners by acquiring specific strategies that are both successful for them and that enable them to increase their control over their own behavior and environment. The development of good self-regulation usually involves the systematic use of the following: self-observation (monitoring and recording own performance); self-judgment (comparing performance with a standard or goal, e.g. re-examining answers, checking procedures; rating answers in relation to answer sheet, another person’s); and self-reaction (personal processes such as goal-setting and metacognitive planning, self-administered praise or criticism, rehearsing, memorizing, structuring the environment or task, and asking for help.

Most researchers agree that the best learning occurs when someone carefully observes and considers his/her own behaviors and acts upon what one has learned. This means that students learn to decrease negative behaviors and increase positive behaviors. Therefore, students who are self-regulated must learn to continually ask themselves “Does this strategy work for me in this situation?” In order to self-regulate, students must shift their focus from comparing their performance to peers to self-comparisons, and from being reactive to being proactive learners. Self-regulated behavior usually decreases the discrepancy between ideal and desired goals. Goals direct activities, and students must learn not only that there are different ways to attain goals, but also how to select the best way to complete a specific task. Learners with high levels of self-regulation have good control over the attainment of their goals.

Teaching Self-regulation Strategies
A teacher’s role in helping talented students gain self-regulation will be challenging and initial attempts to teach self-regulation strategies are seldom successful. Why? First, it takes time and practice to gain effective habits. Preliminary efforts must be refined based on student’s feedback, performance, and their own reflection. Adopting principles of a learning academy model (Zimmerman, Bonner, & Kovatch, 1996) can make teaching self-regulated learning less difficult. This model encourages teachers to shift responsibility for learning to students, giving them more choice and control over their learning tasks. Teachers should also model the use of effective self-regulatory techniques. When we consider gifted education programs and practices, these learning academies may resemble enrichment opportunities like self-selected Type III investigations (Renzulli, 1977) or enrichment clusters (Renzulli & Reis, 1997).

Some common instructional practices are effective in helping students learn self-regulation. The regular use of the following practices is recommended:

1) Guide learners’ self-beliefs, goal setting, and expectations

- help students frame new information or feedback in a positive rather than a negative manner (e.g. “keeping
Alaina is an eighth grade student who was identified as gifted in first grade. She read at the seventh grade level by the time she finished second grade and has always scored at the 99% across all areas on standardized achievement tests. She excels in language arts, but has extremely high scores across all areas. Although Alaina does not like math, she had coasted through the math curriculum from first through seventh grade, doing minimal homework and getting top grades. Because of her scores on achievement tests and previous grades, she is recommended for an advanced algebra class in eighth grade and encounters, for her first time in school, some challenge in mathematics. She struggles with a few concepts and begins to tell her parents that she is really not smart in math. She quits whenever she finds a homework problem she cannot solve and tells her parents she will ask the teacher the next day for help. She continues to do her homework each time it is assigned but completes only the problems that she can easily do and gets help from her friends and teacher the next day if she cannot quickly and correctly solve a problem. The answers to problems are in the back of the book so that after a few minutes of work, if she has not solved the problem, she looks it up but fails to learn how to solve the problem. She fails two tests, becomes convinced she is terrible at math and considers dropping out of the algebra class. How can she gain the self-regulation skills she needs to succeed in a more challenging class?

Through the use of some simple questions, teachers can guide students through the three cyclical phases that seem to emerge in the acquisition of self-regulation skills. Once these skills are learned, students must practice them with less and less teacher guidance.

The first phase precedes the actual performance and sets the stage for action. In this preaction phase, students map out their tasks, thereby minimizing the unknown which can help develop a positive mindset. Realistic expectations can make the task more appealing. Goals must be set as specific outcomes, arranged in order from short-term.

Teachers can ask talented students to consider the following: When will I start? Where will I do the work? How will I get started? What conditions will help or hinder my learning activities?

Alaina, for example, must be helped to think about her algebra homework and reflect on what she can do to be more successful. Is there a better time or place to do her homework? Should she begin it in school with her friends who are doing better than she is in algebra? Should she plan to spend at least five minutes on a problem before giving up and moving on? Should she have a friend standing by to help either in person or on the phone (a study buddy)? Should she ask for a tutor?

The second phase of self-regulated learning involves processes during learning and the active attempt to utilize specific strategies to become more successful. Talented students should be asked to consider the following during the performance of a specific task: Am I accomplishing what I hoped to do? Am I being distracted? Is this taking more time than I thought? Under what conditions do I accomplish the most? What questions can I ask while I am working? How can I encourage myself to keep working (including self-talk—come on, get your work done so you can watch...
that television show or read your magazine!

Alaina, for example, has to consider her performance in math as opposed to other content areas. When frustration increases, should Alaina stop and take a break? Should she do her math homework first in the afternoon, rather than putting it off until later in the evening? Should she have background music or work in silence? She should learn to use and consider the success of some of the strategies she has thought about in the preaction phase.

The final phase of self-regulated learning involves self-reflection after the performance for a self-evaluation of outcomes compared to goals. Talented students should learn to ask themselves the following: Did I accomplish what I planned to do? Was I distracted and how did I get back to work? Did I plan enough time or did I need more time than I thought? Under what conditions did I accomplish the most work?

Alaina might ask, “What did I do differently?” “Did it work?” Was a change in time or work habits effective at helping me to solve more algebra problems? Did calling a friend who was doing algebra homework at the same time (by prearranged planning) make a difference? Did setting minimum time frame help? Did praising herself aloud during this time have a positive impact (All right, I did it!! Yes, I solved that problem!!)

The teaching of self-regulation strategies can be used to successfully increase students’ self-regulation and enhance academic achievement. It is hoped that some of the suggestions in this article will be helpful to teachers interested in trying to help students gain self-regulation skills. During this academic year, researchers at the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (NRC/GT) will continue to study self-regulation. In particular, researchers will be implementing various interventions related to the use of self-regulation strategies to reverse underachievement in gifted and talented students. If you are interested in knowing more about this or other NRC/GT studies, check our website at www.gifted.uconn.edu.
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endeavors. Einstein was fortunate to find his own gifted education program among his scientific friends as a young adult. An advanced placement course in calculus in high school probably would not have taxed him or markedly improved his adult achievement.

One reason it is difficult to measure the success of our work is that appropriately individualized programs addressing highly complex human beings having unique life experiences yield such a wide variety of results that determining the specific impact of gifted education is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Perhaps the best we can do is to ask adults about their best experiences in school. As Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi has found across cultures around the world, people remember and value experiences that provide them with real challenges. To the extent gifted programs provide students with real challenges in the areas these students love and in which they excel, the programs will produce more than their share of Einsteins and will produce hundreds of thousands of productive citizens who owe part of their success and happiness to the challenges they tackled as children and youth.
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or have the role models (Payne, p. 21) that enable them to compete successfully with their middle class peers. Children with learning disabilities are frequently screened from programs because we fail to see past the disability to the ability beyond.

What then shall we, advocates for all gifted children, do so that the gifts and talents of these children are not lost? Can we as a state afford to lose the talents of unidentified gifted children or survive the negative impact of their misdirected gifts?

Gray suggests that people who fail to achieve their full potential also have “their crimes confined.” In that simpler time, the small world limited the problems created by the negatively focused gifted. Today our prisons are full of them, gifted individuals who did not have appropriate education offered and so chose to educate themselves in the rules of the street and to rise to leadership positions in that nether world.

I’ll never forget David, an African-American charmer who could talk his friends and many of his teachers into almost anything. As a 13-year old, he was the strongest leader in a class of nearly 300 students, but his leadership usually translated to leading a group of boys through after-school shenanigans that attracted police attention. David had never been identified for the gifted program because he did not look like most gifted children, and he did not come to school with the skills most often associated with giftedness. As a pre-kindergarten student, David entertained himself without the books and games that middle class children take for granted. He did not read early because he had no books and no audience to appreciate his curiosity or his energy. No teacher, trained in identifying and educating gifted children, rescued him from his lack of intellectual stimulation. He was also handicapped because he had no parent to serve as his champion, demanding that he be given a chance to shine. As he grew older, he saw no purpose in school, and unwillingness to perform “boring” routine tasks made him an unlikely candidate for a gifted program. Stuck in regular classes with the boys who looked to him for leadership, David had missed such huge pieces of academic learning that he struggled even to pass TAAS.

Frequently in trouble because he had little patience for busy work or teachers who failed to appreciate either his humor or his charm, David chanced into the lives of three teachers of the gifted. Rather than seeing his behavior as a problem, they recognized the potential and asked that David be placed in their classes. Suddenly a totally different child emerged. Gone was the sullen troublemaker. David discovered historical research and reenactments and then science and its open-ended questions and experimentation. Discipline problems disappeared, at least for the time that three mentors pushed him relentlessly. David had an audience among the high achieving students and no longer sought to entertain the underachievers who had served as his peer group.

Is this a gifted student? Absolutely! Will he pass an objective assessment to identify him as a gifted child? Probably not. Although one-on-one tutoring with someone who understands his strengths and weaknesses allows him to take giant steps, that tutoring will probably not be available. After all, he is passing state assessments, now. At 14, as he enters the anonymity of a large high school, David will slip back into the peer group that supports him unless other teachers see the potential and help this unlikely gifted child realize what could lie ahead for him.

The implications for each of us who work with gifted children are clear but not easy. Each of us must become the champion for those children who have no champions. Few of our quantitative identification measures identify children who are defined not by their high achievements but by their potential for high achievement. We must actively search for that potential and then nurture it in every way possible. We must understand the cultures that value giftedness differently, helping both children and their parents to claim an appropriate education. Thomas Gray said that “full many a flower is born to blush unseen. And waste its sweetness on the desert air.” It is our responsibility to make sure they don’t!


Diversity has been a topic of discussion in gifted education for over thirty years. Professionals have talked about diverse talents, classes, cultures, ethnicities, races, languages, and/or sexual orientations. In spite of the promising practices that have been recognized through the Javits grants and other national efforts, continuing and significant underrepresentation of specific groups in gifted and talented education persists. With the U.S. Census Bureau’s projection of rapidly increasing percentages of Hispanic, Asian American, African American, Native American, and multiracial citizens, the need for collaboration between researchers, policy makers, and educators is critical in moving the field toward a diversity and excellence agenda (Council for Exceptional Children, 2001). Unfortunately, national data from the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) show little evidence of positive change. Therefore, this summary of research will focus on those OCR groups that are particularly underrepresented in programs for gifted and talented children and youth—economically disadvantaged and minorities.

This review examined articles published since 1992 in Gifted Child Quarterly, Gifted Education International, Journal for the Education of the Gifted and Roeper Review. To be included, the article needed to focus on identifying or serving gifted and talented students from ethnic minorities or those from lower income backgrounds. They also needed to be empirical or databased. Articles were excluded if they were merely descriptive or conducted outside the United States. These selection criteria identified 46 studies. Of these 21 (46%) primarily related to assessment, 1 (2%) to policy, 19 (41%) to characteristics, and 5 (11%) to program effectiveness.

Coleman and Gallagher (1995) found that most states have policies that address the identification of gifted students from special populations; however, underrepresentation still occurs. To remedy this problem, researchers have examined various methods and specific instruments that might be used in identifying underrepresented groups. Effective assessments include drawing and problem solving (Clasen, Middleton, & Connell, 1994; Jatko, 1995; Maker, Rogers, Nielson, & Bauerle, 1996), open-ended tasks (Scott, Deuel, Jean-Francois, & Urbano, 1996), performance tasks (VanTassel-Baska, Johnson, & Avery, 2002), nonverbal tests (Tyler-Wood & Carri, 1993; Johnsen & Ryser), readiness tests (Mantzicopoulous, 2000), and parent and teacher nominations (Johnsen & Ryser, 1994). On the other hand, Fernandez, Gay, Lucky and Gavilan (1998) found that teachers tended to view language as important in identification and rated Hispanics highly on non-academic characteristics such as artistic, musical and kinesthetic abilities. Plata and Masten (1998) also found that teachers rated Anglos higher than Hispanics with Hispanic females receiving the fewest nominations. Unfortunately, Scott, Perou, Urbano, Hogan, and Gold (1992) found that fewer minority parents requested an evaluation of their child for possible placement in the gifted and talented program, leaving the effectiveness...
of using parent and teacher nominations for identification mixed. While the WISC appeared to be effective when used with the SOMPA (Matthew, Golin, Moore, & Baker, 1992), it had a different factor structure with Mexican American students (Masten, Morse, & Wenglar, 1995). The DISCOVER assessment, which is based on Gardner’s multiple intelligences and emphasizes the observation of problem solving, appears to identify more bilingual students, but has mixed validity results when related to the Raven Progressive Matrices (Sarouphim, 1999; Sarouphim, 2001). Both Gardner’s theory (Plucker, Callahan and Tomchin, 1996) and the Raven’s validity (Mills & Tissot, 1995) are also questioned, leaving areas for future research of specific instruments and methods. Frustrated with the inconsistency of gifted programs, Awaya (2001) suggests that screening be completely abolished and that all students be served in advanced programs in high school. Despite the mixed results with identification instruments, two of the articles emphasize the importance of identifying diverse students early (Feiring, Louis, Ukeje, Lewis, & Leong, 1997; Johnsen & Ryser, 1994). Without this early identification, gifted and talented children are less likely to recognize their potential in general education classrooms.

Case studies have been conducted with African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and those who live in poverty to identify specific characteristics that appear to support success or lead to underachievement in school or adulthood (Diaz, 1998; Grantham & Ford, 1998; Harmon, 2002; Hébert, 1996, 1998a, 1998b; Hébert & Beardsley, 2001; Kitano, 1997a, 1997b, 1998; Tomlinson, Callahan, & Lelli, 1997). All of these case studies show the importance of support from family and the school environment, including extracurricular activities and friends. Particularly important characteristics were a determination to succeed, a belief in self, and positive coping strategies since as adults they experienced racism and sexism. Those who experienced difficulty lacked family and community support, found a mismatch with teachers and the school social or academic norms, and/or had personal shortcomings in perseverance, self-efficacy, and coping strategies (Diaz, 1998; Grantham & Ford, 1998). Some of these characteristics were corroborated by larger studies. For example, Ford and Harris (1997) found that a greater percentage of underachieving Black males and females had less positive racial identities and felt isolated in gifted programs. Coping strategies appear to vary for different groups. Plucker (1998) found that African American and Hispanic students seek spiritual support whereas Caucasians tend to blame self and Hispanics tend to worry. Native Americans and Hispanics appear particularly vulnerable to low achievement with Hispanic women facing greater sex-role traditional behaviors in their homes (Thorne, 1995). Challenging courses and effort appear to be important factors in achievement among minority students (Ford, 1992; Garrison, 1993). Freeman and Walberg (1999) found that eminent African American women were independent, competent, and confident. They suggested that educators should focus on nurturing these traits.

When underrepresented groups attend schools and classes for gifted and talented students, they tend to perform better and have higher achievement than minority students who are placed in regular classrooms (Borland, Schnur, & Wright, 2000; Cornell, Delcourt, Goldberg, & Bland, 1995). In fact, minority students were more likely to attend college as a result of a single summer program that focused on financing higher education (Olszewski-Kubilius, & Laubscher, 1996). Given the importance of minorities’ representation in classrooms for gifted and talented students, professionals must continue to recognize diversity and plan effective programs for them.

Awaya, A. (2001). Equitable access to excellence: Opportunities for gifted education to an underrepresented population through open enrollment. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 25, 177-197. The author describes the effect of abolishing screening for GT programs on a school located in Hawaii serving students in 7-12 grades. The rationale for the shift to open enrollment was the inconsistency of the students’ previous elementary programs and a new view of the program as one of providing opportunity. The author describes how the program compared well to the Richardson Study’s criteria for a “substantial gifted program” (p. 183). The program offered AP courses in math and science and in all the core areas. All students who enter the program stay for the year. AP exam pass rates are about 70% for English and so-
cial studies exams and somewhat less for calculus and biology. A coordinator and an executive board oversee the program. The budget is supplemented with school funding and the GT Handbook articulates the philosophy, program, and policies. In addition, more Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian students participation increased by 10 percent. The author also found that students who had had no elementary school experience with GT were dismissed or were dropping out of the program at the same rate as those who had previous experience. Success rates were similar. The author concludes that gifted education can serve a wider population.

**Borland, J. H., Schnur, R., & Wright, L. (2000). Economically disadvantaged students in a school for the academically gifted: A postpositivist inquiry into individual and family adjustment. Gifted Child Quarterly, 44, 13-32.** This follow-up study reports the effects of the placement in a school for gifted students of five economically disadvantaged minority students from central Harlem who were identified in kindergarten as potentially academically gifted. Initial screening consisted of qualitative assessment (observations, teacher and parent referrals, draw-a-person tests, and curriculum-based assessment activities) and quantitative assessment (Peabody Picture vocabulary Test, the Test of Early Mathematical Ability, and the Test of Early Reading Ability). A research team collected grade two follow up data from classroom observations, student focus groups, sociograms, the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, the Stanford Binet IV, the Children’s Personality Questionnaire, the Pictorial Scale of Perceived Competence and Social Acceptance for Young Children, the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale for Children, and interviews with students, parents and teachers. The authors concluded that the students made better academic progress than could have been expected, were integrated socially, and appeared to be experiencing no adverse emotional reaction. The authors believe that their success was dependent upon the students, the families, and the school setting. They also assert that the identification of economically disadvantaged students as potentially gifted is valid. They suggest that “real damage [is] done to bright children who depend on publicly funded education where there is not response to their special needs” (p. 31).

**Clasen, D. R., Middleton, J. A., & Connell, T. J. (1994). Assessing artistic and problem-solving performance in minority and nonminority students using a nontraditional multidimensional approach. Gifted Child Quarterly, 38, 27-31.** This study investigated nontraditional assessments—drawing and problem solving tasks—and their use in identifying both minority and nonminority students in a major Midwestern city. Peer and teacher nominations were also used. The drawing and problem solving tasks were inversely related (p ≤.01). The authors conclude that these assessment tasks appeared to identify a number of minority and nonminority students with potential in art or problem solving.

**Coleman, M. R., & Gallagher, J. J. (1995). State identification policies: Gifted students from special populations. Roeper Review, 17, 268-275.** The authors report the results of two studies of state policies related to the identification of gifted students from special populations. The majority of states have addressed the identification of gifted students from special populations through the development of written policies. Underrepresentation may be the result of a gap between the intent of state policies and local districts’ interpretations, district’s concern about the increase in numbers of students included in the gifted program, and a lack of resources, and tenuous relationships with culturally diverse populations. A closer examination of three states, including Texas, revealed that state mandates, economic support, flexible policies, and broader educational context, i.e., association with school reform, support gifted students from special populations.

**Cornell, D.G., Decourt, M. A. B., Goldberg, M. D., & Bland, L. C. (1995). Achievement and self-concept of minority students in elementary school gifted programs. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18, 189-209.** This study examined the standardized achievement scores and self-concept levels of African-American (N=299), Hispanic (N=52), and white (N=595) second and third grade students placed in gifted or regular school programs. Although white students performed better than both African-American and Hispanic gifted program students, results indicate that minority students identified for gifted programs scored sig-
nificantly higher on achievement measures than minority students placed in regular classrooms. No significant differences among groups were reported for self-concept.

Diaz, E. I. (1998). Perceived factors influencing the academic underachievement of talented students of Puerto Rican descent. Gifted Child Quarterly, 42, 105-122. This qualitative investigation explored the self and environmental perceptions of six talented students of Puerto Rican descent who were underachieving in an urban high school in the northeastern section of the United States. Four factors were identified as influencing underachievement: family (strained relationships, unhappy home, inappropriate parental expectations, minimal academic guidance, inconsistency), school (inappropriate early curricula experiences, non-inspiring teachers, unrewarding curriculum, questionable counseling), community (hostile environment, gangs, prejudice, few constructive entertainment options), and personal (insufficient perseverance, low self efficacy, inappropriate coping strategies). The absence of early appropriate academic experiences appeared to be a major factor in the students’ future success.

Feiring, C., Louis, B., Ukeje, I., Lewis, M., & Leong, P. (1997). Early identification of gifted minority kindergarten students in Newark, N.J. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41, 76-82. This report presents data on a screening and assessment procedure used to identify gifted inner city minority kindergarten students. Instruments included the sequential administration of the Brigance K & 1, a locally developed Gifted Screening, and the McCarthy Scales of Children’s Abilities. Before the project began, only 0.2% of the children entering first grade were identified as gifted in contrast to the 2% found in this sample.

Fernández, A. T., Gay, L. R., Lucky, L F., Gavilan, M. R. (1998). Teacher perceptions of gifted Hispanic limited English proficient students. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21, 335-351. This study examined the relationship between teachers’ ethnicities and the way they rated characteristics for gifted Hispanic LEP students and any gifted student. There were 373 teachers from Dade County, Florida who participated. Of this sample of teachers, 162 were Hispanic, 137 were White, and 74 were African American. Using the Survey on Characteristics of Gifted and Talented Hispanic Students (Marquez et al., 1992) and an adapted form that removed all of the characteristics that related specifically to Hispanic students, the researcher found similarities and differences in teacher perceptions. Teachers perceived the characteristics “is curious” as important across both groups; however, teachers rated “has a large vocabulary” and expresses himself/herself well orally” differently for the two groups. While teachers do not view artistic, musical, and kinesthetic abilities as important characteristics of giftedness, they view these as more favorably for gifted Hispanic LEP students. Stereotypic impressions may influence ratings of students. Some variation was found in ratings by African American and Hispanics who viewed “likes to study” and “does well in school” as more important characteristics of giftedness than Whites. The authors conclude that teachers tend to perceive language abilities as important characteristics of giftedness which may have negative implications for gifted Hispanic LEP students.

Ford, D. Y. (1992). Support for the achievement ideology and determinants of under achievements as perceived by gifted, above average, and average black students. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16, 280-298. This study was designed to assess the perceptions held by African American students regarding social, cultural, and psychological determinants of underachievement motivation. The research was conducted at an urban school district in Ohio where 75 African American fifth grade students and 73 African American sixth grade students participated as subjects. Out of this sample, 48 students were identified as gifted, 50 students attended an above-average program, and 50 attended regular classes in school. The research instrument contained three scales for social, cultural, and psychological characteristics. Two subscales measured the students’ ideology and underachievement levels. The students were questioned regarding their level of effort in school and the importance they give school. While the results indicated that gifted students were more optimistic and more supportive of achievement ideology than average students, all students did consider school...
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to be important or very important, and achievement ideology was strongly supported. However, there was a great discrepancy between self-reported level of effort in school and the importance students place on school. The author concludes that this ambivalence may contribute to low achievement of very capable African American students. She suggests that achievement not be solely defined by GPA, but should include the level of effort portrayed by the student.

Ford, D. Y., & Harris III, J. (1997). A study of the racial identity and achievement of Black males and females. Roeper Review, 20, 105-110. This study examined the racial identity and achievement of 152 Black males and females. Sixty-two students were underachieving with the greatest percentage being male. Students were administered the Racial Identity Scale for Black Students. Underachievers had less positive racial identities than achieving students. The authors conclude that counseling strategies may have to focus on helping some Black students cope with the difficulties inherent in attending gifted programs that are often predominantly white—negative peer pressures, poor peer relations, feelings of isolation, and sensitivity about feeling different.

Freeman, K. A., & Walberg, H. J. (1999). Childhood traits and conditions of eminent African American women. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 22, 402-419. The researchers analyzed biographies of 256 eminent women who lived between the years of 1863-1974. The 20 African American women were inspired through a variety of events and were prominent in more than one field. They shared traits similar to other eminent women that included independence, competence, and confidence. They were significantly more persevering, single-minded, apt to take joy in their work, independent, alert to novelty, and religious than other eminent women were. Joy in their work was founded on early accomplishments that were supported by parents, teachers, and others. The authors conclude that educators should focus on nurturing these traits.

Garrison, L. (1993). Professionals of the future: will they be female? Will they be ethnically diverse? Roeper Review, 15, 161-164. The sample in this study consisted of 454 gifted students in the ninth through eleventh grades. Gifted females enrolled in advanced level classes more often than gifted males. Enrollment patterns in advanced level classes also varied widely across ethnic groups with Asian American and European American students enrolling in over half of the advanced level classes and Hispanic and Native Americans enrolling in the fewest number of advanced classes. While there were no differences in ability among all of the ethnic groups, Hispanic and Native Americans had the lowest GPAs. The authors conclude that support needs to be provided to these minority groups throughout their education to encourage them to take challenging courses and be successful.

Grantham, T., & Ford, D. (1998). A case study of the social needs of Danisha: An underachieving gifted African-American female. Roeper Review, 21, 96-101. This case study of a 15-year-old underachieving gifted African-American female was conducted to identify social and emotional needs of gifted students. Data were collected through interviews, field observations, and school data. The authors found that Danisha struggled to accept Caucasian students' social norms and felt isolated in her gifted and talented classes. She wanted to integrate into the gifted classes, yet she didn’t want to forfeit her relations with her African-American friends. They suggested that counseling needed to focus on issues related to racial identity; teachers needed multicultural training; and coordinators needed to identify more minority students in classes.

Harmon, D. (2002). They won’t teach me: The voices of gifted African American inner-city students. Roeper Review, 24, 68-75. This study examined the effects of bussing from a lower income, predominantly minority, elementary school to a middle to upper income, predominantly majority elementary school. African American students who were bussed were asked questions about their relationships with their classmates, their classroom environment, and their relationships with their teacher. Students were angry about attending another school and receiving harassment and were rejected by their white peers. They mostly stayed with their own minority group. To the contrary in their other school, they felt more comfortable and did not experience the
harassment. They viewed ineffective teachers (i.e., those who won’t teach them) as having low expectations, lacking an understanding, and providing unfair and unequal treatment. On the other hand, effective teachers had high expectations, understood the culture, and provided fair and equal treatment. Three of the effective teachers were interviewed and spent considerable time developing activities an lessons which presented knowledge from multiple perspectives, required respect in their classrooms and provided community role models.

Hébert, T. P. (1998a). DeShea’s dream deferred: A case study of a talented urban artist. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 22*, 56-79. The author studied DeShea, an African American male attending high school, using classroom observations, field notes; individual interviews with DeShea, his former art teacher, current high school teachers, and guidance counselor; and a document review of his school records. Although his achievement test scores indicated superior ability, he was failing English, US History, and chemistry. All of these courses were general track classes. Results indicated that these factors contributed to his poor performance: a mismatch between his high school art teacher’s approach and his learning style, inappropriate counseling, serious personal problems at home, and his connection to other underachieving students. The author provides suggestions to urban high schools: maintain strong art courses, have mentors from the community work with students, support parents in advocating for their children, provide a talent development specialist, and educate counselors about gifted and talented students.

Hébert, T. P. (1998b). Gifted Black males in an urban high school: Factors that influence achievement and underachievement. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21*, 385-414. The case studies reported in this article describe the experiences of two gifted African American males in an urban high school. Factors that influenced achievement appeared to be belief in self, family support, multicultural appreciation, sensitivity, and high aspirations. Factors that influenced underachievement appeared to be an inappropriate match with the curricular activities and learning style, inappropriate counseling and class placement, inconsistent family role models. The authors suggest the importance of training counselors for diversity, working closely with families, and providing enrichment activities outside the school days.

Hébert, T. P. (1996). Portraits of resilience: The urban life experience of gifted Latino young men. *Roeper Review, 19*, 82-91. The focus of this article is the life experiences of three gifted Latino young men who were students at south Central High School in a large city in the Northeast. Semi-structured interviews and participant observation were sources of data. Resilience seemed strongly connected to a strong belief in self, religious beliefs, and a positive outlook on life. All three of the young men had strong family support and extrafamilial support from a coach and a guidance counselor. All three also were involved in extra-curricular programs during the academic year and special summer enrichment opportunities on college campuses. Finally, all three had personal goals in their lives—to graduate from college and pursue a professional career.

Hébert, T. P., & Beardsley, T. M. (2001). Jermaine: A critical case study of a gifted Black child living in rural poverty. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 45*, 85-103. A classroom teacher and a university researcher collaborated in examining the life of a gifted Black child living in rural poverty. Hébert reviewed a portfolio and entry into the community, spent three weeks in participant observation, spent one-year corresponding with the child and his teacher, and made a final visit to the community, conducting in-depth interview with the child. Jermaine found support from his uncles, his teacher, the school’s lunchroom chef, and the football coach. Along with his quiet surroundings, watching television and reading appeared to help his creative writing. “Jermaine saw himself as a combination of the following: scholar, creative thinker, athlete, and ethical young man” (p. 99). The author concludes that gifted and talented children are present in every segment of society and need to be nurtured.

Gifted and Talented International, 19, 83-105. This author, a teacher for an inner-city talented and gifted (TAG) program, was concerned that gifted economically disadvantaged children were being overlooked. As a result, she conducted research that aimed at addressing the identification and selection of economically disadvantaged gifted students for participation in the TAG Future Problem Solving program. An action research, whole-classroom approach was used to evaluate fourth grade students at three elementary schools (one affluent community, one lower-middle income community, and one extremely low income community) who had no previous experience with the Future Problem Solving program. Data were collected on student teams in the program to chart progress for each individual team, compare team performances from all schools, and compare the teams as a competitive sample. The author reflects that using the whole-classroom tryout technique allowed her to observe and include gifted children in the program who otherwise would not have been recognized and would not have had access to the TAG program. In conclusion, the author states that this technique can be an effective tool for educators in increasing the number of economically disadvantaged children in a TAG program, but ultimately, the students are the major beneficiaries of the services.

Johnsen, S., & Ryser, G. (1994). Identification of young gifted children from lower income families. Gifted and Talented International, 9, 62-68. This study examined the relationship among measures used in the identification for a summer program of 50 gifted and talented four to seven-year-old children from lower income families. Approximately 38% were Hispanic. Identification procedures included parent nomination, teacher nomination, products, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking, the Screening Assessment for Gifted Elementary Students—Primary Version. The three best predictors of future achievement were the SAGES-P Reasoning, the parent checklist, and the teacher checklist. However, three years later, all of the students' scores on the ITBS dropped significantly with the identified children's scores decreasing at twice the rate as those who were not identified as gifted.

Kitano, M. (1997a). Gifted African American women. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21, 254-287. This study explored the personal, socialization, and structural factors affecting the life-span achievement of 15 gifted African American women, ages 31 to 59 years. The primary data-collection method for this study was an in-person, semi-structured interview with each subject and a telephone interview with a parent or other person familiar with the subject's life. Results indicated that these gifted women displayed high achievement during the K-12 years and were supported by their schools and families. All reported racism as significant challenges in adulthood. In response to racism, sexism, poverty, parental death, and other obstacles, the participants manifested positive coping strategies such as ignoring, reframing, affirming oneself, finding alternative paths, and seeking support from the environment. The author recommends that the number of African American teachers need to be increased, that all teachers must support African American girls' self-confidence and self-esteem, that educators and families must collaborate to help these women recognize hardships, that the schools must provide guidance, and that society should work to recognize and remove social and institutional obstacles.

Kitano, M. (1997b). Gifted Asian American women. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21, 3-37. This study explored the personal, socialization, and structural factors affecting the life-span achievement of 15 gifted Asian American women, ages 31 to 54 years. The primary data-collection method for this study was an in-person, semi-structured interview with each subject and a telephone interview with a parent or other person familiar with the subject's life. Results indicated that these gifted women displayed a wide range of characteristics with most being voracious readers and achievers. Most of the women's academic efforts were supported by their families and teachers. The majority also reported racism, sexism, or both as significant challenges in adulthood. The author recommends that "subject matter curricula might include opportunities to discuss social issues, practice critical thinking and demonstrate talent through problem solving applied to significant human concerns" (p. 33).
Kitano, M. (1998). Gifted Latina women. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 21, 131-159. The researcher examined the personal characteristics that Latina women displayed during their school years to indicate high potential, factors that contributed to these gifted women’s adult achievements, and strategies used in attaining achievement. Interviews were conducted with 15 gifted Latinas who were drawn from a larger national retrospective study of 60 prominent women. The author found that more than half received average grades during the K-12 years or inconsistently displayed their academic potential. The schools formally recognized few. In spite of the lack of support encountered in school, the women had a strong determination to succeed. More than half cited discrimination as the major barrier to achievement during the adult years. The findings also revealed wide variations in patterns within the small group. She recommends that Latina students would benefit from early recognition and nurturing of abilities, the communication of high expectations for achievement, and continuous advising.

Kitano, M. K., & DiJiosia, M. (2002). Are Asian and Pacific Americans overrepresented in programs for the gifted. Roeper Review, 24, 76-90. This study examined the question: Are all Asian and Pacific Americans (APA) overrepresented in programs for the gifted? Using a large, diverse urban school district, the researchers examined disaggregated data and reported differences among different APA groups. They reported a wide range in percentages of children who qualified with 50.47 percent of the Chinese represented (above the mean for the district), and 7.32 percent of Samoan represented (below the mean for the district). Differences may result from socioeconomic status, family education, immigration histories and linguistic diversity. Certain Asian groups have cultural values that support education and perceive education as the major avenue for upper mobility.

Maker, C. J., Rogers, J. A., Nielson, A. B., & Bauerle, P. R. (1996). Multiple intelligences, problem solving, and diversity in the general classroom. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 437-460. The DISCOVER project used in America’s public schools has as one of its goals to develop curriculum and teaching strategies based on Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences and culturally relevant content. This study focused on the identification of gifted students by two teachers at different levels of implementation of the DISCOVER project. Two classrooms in Arizona were selected for the study. Latino students who were either English speaking or bilingual represented the majority of both of the classrooms. However, a teacher in one classroom was considered a high-level implementer and the other teacher was considered a middle-level implementer, based on criteria such as the number of years teaching in the DISCOVER project and the results. Results showed a relationship between the teachers’ level of implementation and the positive changes in math problem solving and in the number of students identified as gifted. The authors concluded that the results indicated the value of the DISCOVER project in classrooms, specifically those with bilingual students.

Mantzicopoulos, P. Y. (2000). Can the Brigance K&I Screen detect cognitive/academic giftedness when used with preschoolers from economically disadvantaged backgrounds? Roeper Review, 22, 185-191. The author administered the Kaufman Assessment Battery for children, Teachers’ Ratings of Academic Competence, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised, and the Brigance K&I Screen to 134 children who attended a Head Start preschool program in a Midwestern school district. The authors found that potentially gifted Head Start children (IQ = 115 to 130) performed significantly better on the K&I Screen than their average-ability peers (IQ = 75 to 114). Teacher ratings were not as predictive of high potential as the other instruments.

Masten, W. G., Morse, D. T., & Wenglar, K. E. (1995). Factor structure of the WISC-R for Mexican-American students referred for intellectually gifted assessment. Roeper Review, 18, 130-131. School psychologists administered the WISC-R to 68 Mexican-American students who were referred for evaluation for an intellectually gifted program. They found that the factor structure was different from previous research by Kaufman for this sample of students. They suggest that different interpretations of WISC-R scores may be needed with various samples.
Matthew, J. L., Golin, A. K., Moore, M. W., & Baker, C. (1992). Use of SOMPA in identification of gifted African-American children. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 15*, 344-356. Using the System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA), the researchers were able to increase the number of minority students who were identified for the gifted program in a large urban school district. The SOMPA was used with the WISC-R. Prior to the SOMPA procedure, the mean IQ score for 55 students was 119.02; after the adjustment, it was 135.72. Mean test achievement scores for SOMPA and non-SOMPA students were the same.

McLaughlin, S. C., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (1997) Ethnic and gender differences in locus of control in children referred for gifted programs: The effects of vulnerability factors. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 20*, 268-284. This study investigated gifted and non-gifted students and the correlation among ethnicity, gender, vulnerability factors, and locus of control (the relationship between one's behavior and the outcome of those actions). Over 800 fifth through seventh grade students with diverse backgrounds and characteristics were evaluated for intellectual ability, vulnerability factors, and locus of control. The results showed a significant relationship between ethnicity and vulnerability. In addition, a higher internal locus of control was associated with not at risk, female, Caucasian students. The authors believed the findings lead to two conclusions. There is more internal locus of control in gifted children. Gifted minority students' vulnerability is associated with a greater internal locus of control.

Mills, C. J., & Tissot, S. L. (1995). Identifying academic potential in students from underrepresented populations: Is using the Ravens Progressive Matrices a good idea? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 39*, 209-217. Participants in the study included all students enrolled in ninth-grade English classes in a large urban high school in New York State. The sample was composed of 347 students and included 154 Hispanic (45%) students. The students were administered the School and College Ability Test (SCAT) and the Ravens Advanced Progressive Matrices (APM). The students performed well on the APM, but did not perform as well on the SCAT. The mathematics grades for students identified by the SCAT were significantly higher than those identified by the APM. The SCAT was more correlated with school grades than the APM. The authors have concerns about using the APM because of normative information and its limited relationship to school performance.

Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Laubsercher, L. (1996). The impact of a college-counseling program on economically disadvantaged gifted students and their subsequent college adjustment. *Roeper Review, 18*, 202-208. Fifty-five students from public high schools in a major urban school district were compared to a group of economically advantaged students who participated in a special summer program for high school students. Most of the students were Black or Hispanic (61%). The economically disadvantaged students changed their plans to finance college as a result of the summer program. The researchers found that in the pre-college phase, economically advantaged and disadvantaged gifted students differ only slightly in their aspirations, dreams, expectations and perceptions about college. However, once at college, the economically advantaged and disadvantaged groups become more polarized with respect to the perceptions and views they hold about college and each other. The economically disadvantaged were more likely to have been employed during their freshman year, perceived a declining level of support from teachers, and a lonely feeling on campus.

Pluta, M., & Masten, W. (1998). Teacher ratings of Hispanic and Anglo students on a behavior rating scale. *Roeper Review, 21*, 139-144. This study examined the 12 teachers' nomination rates of Hispanic and Anglo students to gifted and talented programs using the Scales for Rating Behavior Characteristics of Superior Students. Results indicated that ethnicity was a factor in teachers' nomination rate with Anglos receiving higher ratings across all scales. Hispanic females were nominated fewer times than any other group.

tial summer enrichment programs. The ethnic breakdown was 56.0% Caucasian, 20.5% African American, 10.5% Latino American, 9.7% Asian American, and 1.8% Native American. Coping strategies were assessed by using the Adolescent Coping Scale, a self-report instrument. Differences were found across race. African American and Hispanic students had the highest scores on Seeking Spiritual Support scale, Caucasians, on Self-Blame scale, and Hispanics on Worry scale.

Plucker, J. A., Callahan, C. M., & Tomchin, E. M. (1996). Wherefore art thou, multiple intelligences? Alternative assessments for identifying talent in ethnically diverse and low-income students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 40, 81-92. The authors evaluated an assessment instrument based on the MI theory, the Multiple Intelligences Assessment Technique. The sample for this study consisted of 1,813 children enrolled in kindergarten and first grade in a large school district. They found that the internal consistency reliability fell within an acceptable range for each of the subscales (.72 to .87). The results from the factor analysis, however, revealed only two subscales that were consistent with the hypothesized factors of verbal and mathematical. Other validity issues were raised by the inconsistent results across schools, across ethnic groups, and in the subscales’ relationships with achievement tests. The authors conclude that much work remains before the instrument can be used in high-stakes testing such as identification.

Reyes, E. I., Fletcher, R., & Paez, D. (1996). Developing local multidimensional screening procedures for identifying giftedness among Mexican American border population. Roeper Review, 18, 208-211. This article describes a project that successfully identified Mexican American students for the gifted program. The process included the training of local personnel in specific characteristics; parent, teacher, and community inventories in Spanish and English; student portfolios; the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking; and the Matrix Analogies Test. Using a holistic process; the ID teams selected students using local norms.

Sarouphim, K. M. (1999). DISCOVER: A promising alternative assessment for the identification of gifted minorities. Gifted Child Quarterly, 43, 244-251. This article presents the DISCOVER process, which is based on the general framework of Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences and Maker’s definition of giftedness. The DISCOVER procedure consists of five activities that incorporates linguistic, logical-mathematical, and spatial intelligences. The author reports an inter-observer reliability of .81 with percentage of agreements ranging from 75 to 100 percent and a range of intercorrelations with the Raven from .09 to .58. The author concludes that further research is needed on the effective use of DISCOVER and other performance-based assessments.

Sarouphim, K. M. (2001). DISCOVER: Concurrent validity, gender differences, and identification of minority students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 45, 130-138. The purpose of this study was to examine the concurrent validity between the DISCOVER instrument and the Raven Progressive Matrices. The author administered these instruments to a sample of 257 participants who were predominantly Navajo Indians and Mexican Americans. The correlations ranged between low and nonsignificant (for Storytelling and Storywriting) to high and statistically significant for Math, Tangrams, and Pablo. No significant gender differences were found.

Scott, M. S., Deuel, L. S., Jean-Francois, B., & Urbano, R. C. (1996). Identifying cognitively gifted ethnic minority children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 40, 147-153. The authors administered nine different cognitive tasks to 400 kindergarten children in regular education and 31 kindergarten children identified as gifted. Five measures, particularly those that were open-ended and verbal, discriminated between gifted and the normal sample. Other tasks appeared to have a ceiling effect. Some of the highest performers in the regular education sample were minority. The authors suggest that such performance measures may be useful in identifying gifted minority children.

about their children. More similarities than differences were found across the three groups. The authors found that fewer minority parents request an evaluation of their child for possible placement in the gifted and talented program. The authors conclude that this reluctance might contribute to the underrepresentation of minority students in gifted programs.

Slanina, A. M. (1996). Factors that impact transitions between a regular educational program and a gifted program: the perceptions of four African-American males. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 20*, 54-83. This study examined four high school African American perceptions of transitions they experienced in a gifted program in Ohio. The method of data collection were in-depth interviews with each student; interviews with coordinator, current and former teachers; reviews of permanent record; observations of performance; and observations of schools. Factors that influenced transitions included family support, goals for the future, peer relationships and socialization factors. Perfectionism appeared to hinder successful transitions.

Thorne, Y. M. (1995). Achievement motivation in high achieving Latina women. *Roeper Review, 18*, 44-49. Sixty-three Latina women (43 doctoral graduates, 20 completers of doctoral courses) were selected for this investigation that examined achievement motivation. They were administered the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, the Sex-Role Traditionalism Scale, Fear-of-Success Scale, and a demographic questionnaire. These women were found to be intrinsically and extrinsically motivated with various internal and external psychosocial factors. Intrinsic motives of mastery, work competitiveness, and personal unconcern were associated with successful achievement. The extrinsic motive of generativity was related to achievements in Latino and professional communities. The Latina women in this sample were less sex-role traditional in their attitudes across achievement settings. On the other hand, they demonstrated greater sex-role traditional behaviors in their homes. Professionals need to recognize the importance of family and institutional supports in meeting the goals of these women.

Tomlinson, C. A., Callahan, C.M., & Lelli, K. M. (1997). Challenging expectations: Case studies of high-potential, culturally diverse young children. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 41*, 5-17. Data from eight case studies of primary age children who participated in START (Support to Affirm Rising Talent) were reported in this study. These children were previously identified using procedures based upon Howard Gardner's multiple intelligence theory. Teachers nominated four of the children as “successful” and four as “unsuccessful.” Data were collected through three sets of classroom observations and interviews with students, parents and teachers. In general, a child was more likely to be judged successful if he or she demonstrated outstanding ability in core subject areas and did not exhibit behavior problems. A child was likely to be judged unsuccessful if he demonstrated talent in nontraditional areas or required interventions for behavior. In three cases, students deemed unsuccessful in one classroom were deemed successful in another classroom or vice versa. In these cases, judgment was more a product of teacher differences than changes in the children. Factors that worked included mentorships, family outreach, and classroom modifications.

Tyler-Wood, T., & Carri, L. (1993). Verbal measures of cognitive ability: The gifted low SES student’s albatross. *Roeper Review, 16*, 102-105. The Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT), Otis-Lennon School Abilities Test, Stanford-Binet, Slosson Intelligence Test-Revised, and Matrix Analogies Test (MAT) were administered to 20 elementary students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and 20 who were not from such backgrounds. The low SES students performed significantly lower than the control group on the verbal portion of the CogAT, the verbal portion of the Stanford-Binet, and the Slosson Intelligence Test-Revised.

and accompanying rubrics with six items per grade cluster for primary (grades 2-3) and intermediate levels (grades 4-5). The performance tasks were administered in small groups, included verbal and nonverbal components, and required pencil and paper responses from students. At the field test stage Project STAR assessment instruments were used with 1,792 students across 28 districts. Twenty-eight percent of the students who met a screening threshold met the criterion cutoff of 80% or higher on either the verbal or the nonverbal component. Out of these 518 students, 60 were African American, representing 11.6% of the sample, and 77 students were economically disadvantaged or 14.9% of the sample. The authors conclude that carefully constructed and tested performance assessment instruments may be a way of locating underrepresented populations. They also note that lowering the screening criterion to the 90th percentile in either reading or math also is effective in including more minorities.

Worrell, F. C. (2002). Global and domain-specific self-concepts in academically talented Asian American and White adolescents. Gifted Child Quarterly, 46, 90-97. This study examined differences in self-concept among ethnic groups and the contributions of domain-specific self-concepts to global self-concepts. The 233 participants from a summer enrichment program completed these questionnaires: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and Harter’s Self Perception Profile for Adolescents. Seventy-one percent of the participants were Asian American, 29 percent were White. White students had significantly higher scholastic and job self-concepts than Asian American students did. Physical self-concept was a substantive contributor to global self-concept for White students only.

Susan Johnsen is Associate Dean of Scholarship and Professional Development at Baylor University. Editor of Gifted Child Today, she was the principal investigator of Project Mustard Seed. She is author of four tests that are used in identifying gifted students: Test of Nonverbal Intelligence (TONI-2), Screening Assessment for Gifted Students (SAGES), Screening Assessment for Gifted Students—Primary Version (SAGES-P), and Test of Mathematical Abilities for Gifted Students. She is a past President of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented.

Sarah Feuerbacher, M.S.W., is a graduate assistant and doctoral student in the Department of Educational Psychology at Baylor University.
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**Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented**

**Mission Statement**

To promote awareness of the unique social, emotional, and intellectual needs of gifted and talented students and to impact the development of appropriate services to meet these needs.

**TAGT Executive Board Long Range Goals**

- Advocate appropriate services and accountability standards for all gifted and talented students.
- Support quality professional development for educators of gifted and talented students.
- Provide current information, research, and training about gifted and talented learners and the field of gifted education to the TAGT membership, parents of the gifted, and general public.
- Increase and diversify membership.
- Increase and diversify revenue sources.

Adopted by the TAGT Executive Board: 2.3.02
When at last I came to the painting, I had to sit down. The gallery was almost empty, so I had the bench to myself, just me and Renoir's *Luncheon of the Boating Party*. I had noticed this before, this feeling of being completely and unexpectedly overwhelmed when I found myself in front of the original of a work of art that I had seen in reproductions for years, whether it was Seurat's *A Sunday on La Grande Jatte*, a Greek vase, or a row of Monet's paintings of haystacks. The colors, texture, brush work, and often sheer size just cannot be recreated on paper on an art book or poster. There is an additional urgency to see and absorb everything possible from these works of art because, in all likelihood, this will be my only chance to see them.

In the preface to his translation of John Ruskin's *Bible of Amiens*, Marcel Proust, author of *Remembrance of Things Past*, speaking about the sculptures in the Amiens Cathedral, admonishes the potential visitor: "Love that which you will never see twice." In other words, don't miss a chance to experience something profound.

There was another reason to pause in front of Renoir's *Luncheon of the Boating Party*. This painting is important in the recent French film, *Amélie*. In this charming, often hilarious, and thought provoking movie, one of the characters paints copy after copy of Renoir's original. This artist, who suffers from severely brittle bones, never leaves his apartment. The main characters in the film are each a combination of sometimes outstanding abilities and almost insurmountable and debilitating weaknesses. The title character, Amélie, who is beautiful, intelligent and kind, who devises elaborate strategies to make others, even complete strangers happy, is so painfully shy that she is unable to have a relationship herself. The artist who lives in the same apartment building, is insightful, creative and wise, but is imprisoned in his apartment by his illness. The grocer's delivery boy, with artistic ability and great empathy, is emotionally and intellectually limited.

For the characters, salvation comes in doing not what is expected of them, but in doing what pleases themselves. As Proust also notes in his Preface, “When we work in order to please others, we may fail to succeed, but the things we have done to satisfy ourselves always have a chance of interesting someone else.”

Gifted children must, at times, work to please others, including parents and teachers. And when they do things to satisfy themselves, our guidance is often still needed to help them accomplish their goals.

These film characters are also something like the gifted children that we teach and for whom we advocate in that each has a very different and specific combinations of abilities and needs. It seems sometimes that one of the most difficult tasks we face is to give them the encouragement they need to find ways to do things that will satisfy their interests, continue to develop their abilities, and to address their needs.

So think of these gifted children like the great works of art about which Proust spoke, for you will never again see that idiosyncratic juxtaposition of strengths and weaknesses that need our support and guidance.


Call for Articles

Articles are solicited that address the theme of the issue from both the practical and theoretical points of view.

Summer 2003
STANDARDS IN GIFTED EDUCATION
Articles are requested that address the relationship of gifted education to standards (state and national), the impact of the Texas G/T Standards on programs and instruction, and other issues related to the topic of standards.

Fall 2003
CONFERENCE ISSUE
Deadline: June 1, 2003.

Winter 2004
ISSUES IN DIFFERENTIATION
Deadline: September 1, 2003

Guidelines for Article Submissions

Tempo welcomes manuscripts from educators, parents, and other advocates of gifted education. Tempo is a juried publication and manuscripts are evaluated by members of the editorial board and/or other reviewers. Please keep the following in mind when submitting manuscripts:
1. Manuscripts should be between 1000 and 2500 words on an upcoming topic.
2. Use APA style for references and documentation.
3. Submit three copies of your typed, double-spaced manuscript. Use a 1 1/2 inch margin on all sides.
4. Attach a 100—150 word abstract of the article.
5. Include a cover sheet with your name, address, telephone and FAX number and/or e-mail address.

Send all submissions or requests for more information to:
Michael Cannon, TAGT Editorial Office, 5521 Martin Lane, El Paso, TX 79903

Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented
Membership Application

See www.txgifted.org for additional information

Name__________________________ Mailing Address__________________________
Business/School District____________ City__________________________ State____ Zip____
Telephone (home) _______/_______ (work) _______/_______ Fax_________/_________
Email address:__________________________

PLEASE CHECK ONE: THAT BEST APPLIES:
☐ Teacher ☐ Administrator ☐ Business/Community Member ☐ Counselor ☐ Parent ☐ Student

___ LIFETIME $400 (individuals only)
MEMBER BENEFITS: • Tempo Quarterly Journal • TAGT Newsletter • Insights, Directory of Scholarships and Awards • Reduced Fees at Professional Development Conferences.

___ SCHOOL/BUSINESS $150
MEMBER BENEFITS: • The school or business receives the benefit of a full membership (see below) plus three additional copies of Tempo Quarterly Journal mailed to the school/business address, and member conference fees for the contact person, or his/her designee, named on the school/business membership.

___ FULL $55
MEMBER BENEFITS: • Tempo Quarterly Journal • TAGT Newsletter • Juried Annual Directory of Scholarships and Awards • Reduced Fees at Professional Development Conferences

___ BASIC $35
MEMBER BENEFITS: • TAGT Newsletter (online) • Reduced Fees at Professional Development Conferences

In addition to your regular membership, you are invited to join a TAGT Division for a small additional fee.
___ G/T Coordinators Division $10
___ Research & Development Division $10

___ SUBSCRIPTION OPTION: One-year subscription to Tempo Quarterly Journal. $25

PARENT AFFILIATE GROUP MEMBERSHIP: Information and benefits available upon request. Call 512/499-8248, ext. 205

$________ TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED

METHOD OF PAYMENT:
☐ Check/money order #______________ ☐ Credit Card (complete section below)
Please attach check or money order to this application

Card Card Payments: (A 2.5% Processing fee will be added to your total) ☐ Visa ☐ Master Card
Card Number _______________ Exp. Date __________
Card Holder Name_____________ Signature________________
Cardholder Address__________________________ City__________________________ State____ Zip____

Return form and dues to: Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented, P. O. Box 200338, Houston, TX 77216-0338.
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