

1991

Designing an effective identification model for preschool gifted and talented students

Jeanne Schoeller
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1991 Jeanne Schoeller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schoeller, Jeanne, "Designing an effective identification model for preschool gifted and talented students" (1991). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3251.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3251>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Designing an effective identification model for preschool gifted and talented students

Abstract

Even though a case for the early identification of the gifted has been discussed for many years, little progress has been made in the development of a model to accomplish such a goal. In the 1950s professionals were still holding to the concept that intelligence was fixed. Hunt (1961) challenged the thinking of these professionals by stating that perhaps 50 percent of intelligence is due to genes and 50 percent to experience. He stressed the importance of providing young children with experiences that would foster their optimal development. It was made clear that if children were not provided with nurturing experiences in the first few years of life, they would never actualize their potential. While Hunt was not concentrating on the gifted, what he had to say makes a strong case for early identification and programming for the gifted.

**DESIGNING AN EFFECTIVE
IDENTIFICATION MODEL
FOR PRESCHOOL GIFTED
AND TALENTED STUDENTS**

A Graduate Project

Submitted to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Jeanne Schoeller

December 9, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study	2
Procedures of this Study	3
Definitions	3
2. The Literature Review	4
Standardized Intelligence Tests	4
Tests of Creativity	11
Parent/ Teacher Questionnaires	13
Summary of Findings	16
3. A Proposed Model for the Effective Identification of Gifted Preschoolers	18
Characteristics of an Effective Model	19
Major Goals of the Program	19
Elements of the Proposed Model	20
Special Considerations of the Proposed Model	21
Evaluation of Procedure and Strategies	22
4. Summary, Conclusions, and Implications for Future Research	24
Summary	24
Conclusions	25
Implications for Future Research	27
References	28
Appendix A	32
Appendix B	34
Appendix C	37

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Even though a case for the early identification of the gifted has been discussed for many years, little progress has been made in the development of a model to accomplish such a goal. In the 1950s professionals were still holding to the concept that intelligence was fixed. Hunt (1961) challenged the thinking of these professionals by stating that perhaps 50 percent of intelligence is due to genes and 50 percent to experience. He stressed the importance of providing young children with experiences that would foster their optimal development. It was made clear that if children were not provided with nurturing experiences in the first few years of life, they would never actualize their potential. While Hunt was not concentrating on the gifted, what he had to say makes a strong case for early identification and programming for the gifted.

Later, Feldman (1986) published books that also endorsed these concepts. The books dealt with case studies of six prodigies whose development was traced back to early childhood. These studies clearly demonstrated that children were strongly influenced by the significant adults in their lives during their early years.

Barbara Clark (1988) focussed on the importance of early learning to the the development of giftedness. She examined the influences on cognitive development during early childhood periods. In her work she addressed the concept of sensitive periods and their importance to optimal development and made suggestions for providing a nurturing environment for optimal growth of children from birth to five years. Such data raises a serious question. How does one account for the apparent delay in better serving young gifted children when expert opinion and research have clearly indicated that the early years are perhaps the most important years in which to develop fully a child's potential?

Probably no topic in educating the gifted has received more attention than that of identification. However, educators hold widely different opinions about what giftedness is and how it should be identified; and, interestingly enough, the gifted preschooler is usually the last of the age groups to receive the benefits of educational services. This appears to be inconsistent with research showing that the earlier gifted children are identified and provided with appropriate programming, the better their chances of fully actualizing their potential. Karnes, Schwedal, and Kemp (1985) state it well when they comment: "By the time a child turns six, the entrenchment of attitudes and behaviors make them difficult to modify".

Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

The identification of gifted preschoolers poses special problems to educators. A major problem is the types of available identification instruments. McFarland (1980) states, "Although various tests and questionnaires have been developed to assess children's ability in all areas of giftedness, many of these instruments include tasks of items that are either not appropriate for or should not be expected of the younger child" (p. 20).

It has been recognized that a single measure, such as an I.Q. test, provides limited information about a child's intellectual capacity and may not be useful at all in identifying artistic and other kinds of abilities. An alternative is multiple testing. According to Cox and Daniel (1983), "Care must be taken, however, lest the use of multiple measures become progressive screening and so exclude children who do not score in the superior range on several tests" (p. 54). These stated problems in identification indicate that there is a need to develop methods for the identification of the gifted young child. The purpose of this study was to review the current literature on procedures and strategies for identifying gifted and talented preschool children. Characteristics of selected effective procedures and strategies were then examined and integrated into a proposed identification model for this population.

Procedures of This Study

In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, a survey of the literature concerning the processes for identifying preschool gifted was initiated. By means of an ERIC search, all listed articles concerning gifted preschoolers and their identification were located and examined.

These articles were organized into three components: standardized tests, creativity tests, and questionnaires. On the basis of a careful review of these sources, a proposed integrated model for the identification of gifted preschoolers was developed.

Definitions of Preschool Gifted and Talented

The National Report on Identification (Richert et al., 1982) analyzed a strong trend in the United States toward broadening of definitions to include multiple abilities and factors of giftedness. It was stated that schools should use broad, pluralistic definitions that include diverse abilities. Based on this report, preschool gifted and talented children, for the purpose of this paper, will be defined as children, ages 2-5, who function significantly above age level in language development, cognitive and social skills, physical adaptability, creativity, or leadership.

CHAPTER 2

THE LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the current literature concerning procedures and strategies for identifying talented and gifted preschoolers. The following topic areas are discussed: (a) standardized tests, (b) tests of creativity, and (c) parent-teacher questionnaires.

Standardized Intelligence Tests

The literature yields some information and research concerning the measurement instruments for identification of preschool children. In a study by Kitano and DeLeon (1988), the use of the Stanford-Binet Fourth Edition was investigated. This Fourth Edition contains significant changes from the Stanford-Binet L-M in that the latter emphasizes verbal reasoning skills. The Fourth Edition groups items into fifteen subtests designed to measure cognitive abilities in four areas: verbal reasoning, abstract/visual reasoning, quantitative reasoning, and short term memory. As a result, children whose strengths lie in verbal reasoning would be expected to perform less well on the Fourth Edition than on the the L-M. The study describes the comparative impact of the two editions on the identification of children for a university affiliated preschool for the gifted. Specifically, the question was whether children would be eligible for the preschool when the Fourth Edition was used, as compared to previous years when the L-M was used.

All children were administered the Stanford-Binet L-M. Only children who showed potential on one of three other measures (PIAT, TCAM, and RAVENS) were given the Fourth Edition. Results suggested that the Fourth Edition test composite identifies fewer preschool age children as scoring in the gifted range than does the L-M when the criterion is set at 1.5 standard deviations above the mean. The conclusion reached from the study was that use of a partial composite derived from Verbal Reasoning and

Short-Term Memory subtests, combined with a screening procedure, offers a more viable alternative to the test composite of the Fourth Edition and can contribute to a total assessment battery.

A study by Bracken (1983) compared the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities and the Stanford-Binet as instruments for identifying and assessing intellectually gifted preschool and primary children. Thirty-two white preschool and primary aged children (13 males and 19 females) from a large metropolitan Midwestern area participated in this study. The children ranged in age from 34-76 months and averaged approximately four and one-half years of age. They were selected for the study if they obtained a Stanford Binet I.Q. or a GCI on the McCarthy Scales in excess of 120. This is approximately one and one-half standard deviations above the mean and is ranked at the 89th percentile.

Twenty children were first administered the Stanford-Binet, followed by the McCarthy Scales; and 12 children were administered the McCarthy followed by the Binet. All of the children were evaluated with the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, Form L-M, and the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities. In this study the McCarthy Scales consistently produced lower scores than the Binet, resulting in an overall 10 point GCI-IQ discrepancy. Low to moderate correlations existed between the two scales. It was concluded that, for gifted preschool and primary aged children, the two tests do not have a great deal in common in what they measure. It was recommended that the McCarthy Scales not be used for educational placement purposes because fewer children may be correctly identified.

Hollinger and Kosek (1985) studied the predictive validity of the STAR (Screening Test for Academic Readiness) as well as decision-making accuracy that could be expected if the STAR were used as one screening tool in the identification process. Of the 74 students referred for assessment, 28 were placed in the gifted and talented program. The remaining 46 were referred for a diversity of reasons, including consideration for gifted placement but not qualifying. Of the 74 students, ranging from 6-15 years, 31 were female and 43 were male. STAR derived I.Q. scores obtained by the sample in kindergarten ranged from 96-153 while Full Scale WISC-R scores obtained at the time of referral ranged from 89-144. Each

child had been given the STAR in the spring prior to entrance into kindergarten in order to identify "high-risk" children.

Following referral, the WISC-R was administered to each student. A two-way distribution of STAR and WISC-R Full Scale I.Q. scores was constructed to determine probability of valid acceptances and rejections with respect to gifted placement. Results indicated that prekindergarten STAR scores significantly predicted WISC-R scores obtained several years later. A 72% accuracy rate would have resulted had later placement of students been placed upon prekindergarten STAR scores alone. It was concluded that the STAR compares favorably with group administered tests and serves to reduce substantially the number of students referred for comprehensive individual assessment. However, it was not known whether the STAR, when used in conjunction with other measures, would give additional predictive information. The researchers concluded that further research is needed in this area.

The studies of Robinson (1987) and Isaacs (1987) dealt with the problems of the measures themselves. They discussed how intelligence tests have limited reliability for individual children during the early years, especially in the upper ranges of ability. Isaacs (1987) indicated that a test score for a preschool child is a measure of the least the individual can do and is not ever to be taken as the ultimate level of achievement. He stated that, when environmental factors are adequate, the subsequent testing of preschool children shows a gradual increment in I.Q. scores until the child reaches a leveling out at about C.S. nine. According to his study children who test out under 120 I.Q. at a C.A. (chronological age) of 18 months subsequently may be as high as I.Q. 170. He found that the inverse also applies. He also reached the conclusion that, I.Q. scores may show a similar decline when there is difficulty in the home or at school.

According to the research of Sattler (1988), the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI) has many assets. It was published for use with children between the ages of 4 and 6 1/2 years. It is separate and distinct from, although similar in form and content to, the WISC-R.

In Sattler's study the WPPSI was given to 1,200 children, 100 boys and 100 girls in each of six age groups, ranging by half-years from 4-6 1/2 years. U.S. census data were used to select representative children for the normative sample. Whites and nonwhites were included in the sample, based on the ratios found in the census for four geographic regions in the United States. He concluded that the WPPSI has excellent reliability. Internal consistency reliabilities for each of the three IQs ranged from .90 to .96 over the range covered by the scale. Average internal consistency reliability coefficients, across the six age groups, were as follows: .96 for the Full Scale IQ, .94 for the Verbal Scale IQ, and .93 for the Performance Scale IQ.

Besides its excellent reliability, according to Sattler, the WPPSI provides useful diagnostic information. It furnishes data helpful in planning special school programs, perhaps tapping important developmental or maturational factors needed for school success in the lower grades. He also stated that the test has a high interest level. Children enjoy taking the test; the mixture of verbal and performance items maintains their interest. However, he did identify some limitations. For example, the test takes a long time to administer. It also has a limited floor and ceiling, and the scoring of responses is difficult. Finally, no information is provided about cutoff criteria.

In summary, Sattler's study seems to reveal that the WPPSI has excellent reliability and excellent to adequate validity. It has a few limitations, but it appears to be a viable instrument in evaluating preschoolers for giftedness.

Wolfe (1989) described an evaluation process used on children of high ability who met the gifted definition. Of the children discussed in this study, 14 (10 boys and 4 girls) were tested individually using a battery of instruments based on referral questions. A typical battery involved two testing sessions of approximately one hour each. Instruments used included the Stanford-Binet Form L-M, the Bender Visual Gestalt Test, a Goodenough Draw-A-Person Test, and selected measures of academic functioning such as the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development,

Key/Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, and/or Woodcock Reading Test. A comprehensive parent questionnaire also was completed in order to gather history. In addition, telephone interviews with any professionals involved were completed as needed.

The children evaluated by Wolfe ranged from 3 to 6 years of age. Intelligence scores on the Stanford-Binet ranged from 124-169. Achievement testing on PIAT or Keymath yielded scores ranging from beginning skills to mid-second grade. In reading, based on PIAT, most youngsters tested at mid-second grade.

The results from this study suggest that the evaluative process used had a positive impact on teachers, children identified, and children not identified. The study also examined the benefits of private consultation and the role of the school in meeting the needs of young gifted children in regard to parents. Wolfe concluded that the parent involvement is an important component of the program and that there is a need for good statewide preschool programs with suitable identification methods.

McFarland (1980) analyzed identification instruments and techniques according to stated guidelines. Six individualized tests were discussed, including the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) for ages 6-15, the Wechsler Preschool Scale for ages 2-6, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale for ages 3-16, the Slosson Intelligence Test for ages 3 to adult, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test for ages 3-16, and the Culture Fair Intelligence Test Scale for ages 3-8. All the tests were administered individually so as to assess more adequately the child's ability than would group tests. The Slosson was identified as being easy to administer and not as lengthy as the Stanford-Binet or the Wechsler and, in addition, teachers can be trained to administer it. The Wechsler and Binet were described as inadequate procedures for identifying the gifted child.

Three group intelligence tests were discussed in the McFarland study: the California Test of Academic Aptitude for ages 5-14, the Otis-Lenon Mental Ability for grades K-12, and the Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT) for grades K-3. According to his findings, the only advantage of group tests seemed

to be the easy administration.

In addition, McFarland evaluated four standardized achievement tests: the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, The Stanford Achievement Tests, and the Peabody Individual Achievement Test. These instruments are gauged to give an estimate of children's academic achievement relative to normal testing norms. He concluded that these tests are easy to administer and score, but they may not accurately assess the young child's academic achievement because of the use of paper and pencil tasks to assess achievement.

McFarland also examined two scales for determining giftedness: Scales for the Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (Renzulli) and the teacher developed questionnaires. These procedures yield scores that can be used to compare children against their own school population. He concluded that the questionnaires need to be chosen so as not to be too limited in the range of giftedness characteristics and that they should be evaluated to determine their appropriateness for the younger child.

The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking for ages 5-adult was recognized by McFarland as being very effective with children who can draw and represent symbols. However, young children who do not have well developed small muscle coordination may not do well. He also found the test difficult to score.

The major conclusion drawn from this exhaustive study was that identification instruments and techniques used to identify young gifted and talented children should reflect individual differences. They also should be directly related to the program objectives.

A paper by Karnes and Johnson (1986) examined procedures for identifying young gifted/talented handicapped children. A program at the University of Illinois, RAPHYHT (Retrieval and Acceleration of Promising Young Handicapped and Talented) formed a model for identifying young handicapped gifted and talented children. Based on guidelines for six areas of giftedness, screening instruments for teachers and a questionnaire for parents were developed. Lists of characteristics of older gifted children served as

a resource, as did the observations of teachers of gifted students and characteristics of gifted published by experts.

Once the parent questionnaire and teacher checklist were completed, the scores were tabulated on a talent identification summary. Each talent area had a cutoff score. If an average of the parent and teacher scores equaled or exceeded the cutoff, the child was eligible for the next step. The cutoff scores identified approximately 10% in each talent area. A multidisciplinary team made the final determination. After children were identified through this team, a curriculum-based assessment was completed for each child. The instrument used was the RAPHYHT Talent Assessment for Preschool Programming (TAPP). Abilities within areas of potential or functional talent were examined in detail.

Karnes and Johnson concluded that the RAPHYHT can be incorporated into any good preschool program, especially for handicapped children. It seems to have a positive influence on the children's self-concept by making them aware of their strengths and has a positive effect on parents and teachers.

Mathews and Burns (1987) investigated different identification procedures for preschool gifted children. Numerous literature reviews were investigated; and most were found to be small research projects at large universities or private schools. These screening and identification designs were found to be unacceptable in a public school setting. The researchers then developed an assessment model which used parents and teachers as part of the screening process. Instruments included in this study were the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery. These were selected to assess the intellectual and educational levels of each subject for qualification purposes. In addition, the Hess Readiness Scale was selected as a potential screening instrument because it was simple to administer and its use of items was similar to those found on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale.

The conclusion reached was that a defensible assessment schema which utilizes input from parents and teachers as part of the identification process can be developed and used with some success.

Adoption of this methodology was encouraged by others working with large numbers of preschool students within the public school setting.

Tests of Creativity

It has been stated that the assessment of creativity is a pervasive problem in the identification of giftedness (Lewis & Louis, 1991). The following studies investigated some instruments in relationship to this problem.

Research shows that, in some cases, identification techniques involving creativity or creative thinking are not consistent with the expressed purposes of the gifted program. An example is the use of creativity test scores to identify gifted students when there is no program goal related to the development of creativity. However, Torrance argues that creativity should almost always be one of the criteria used to select students for any gifted program (Torrance, 1984). The validity of creativity was based on Torrance's own study in which the group labeled "highly creative" excelled over the "highly intelligent" group in number and quality of recognized creative achievements (Torrance & Wu, 1981). In this study Torrance argued for the inclusion of program goals designed to foster the number and quality of creative accomplishments. The use of creativity measures then would be an appropriate method for the intended purpose.

Fuqua, Bartsch, and Phye (1975) investigated the relationship between cognitive tempo and creativity in preschool age children. Seventy preschool children were administered a modified version of the Matching Familiar Figures test as well as a modified version of the Picture Completion Task from the TTCT (Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking). Sex of subject and cognitive tempo were combined factorially with type of creativity measure in a 2 by 2 by 4 repeated measures design.

The subjects were selected from a large urban nursery school in the Midwest, with a range in age from 48 to 67 months. There were 41 males and 29 females. The MFF was administered to each child individually, using standard instructions. The TTCT was administered to children in small groups of six to

eight by one or two experimentors and a teacher.

Their findings supported the contention that the relationship between creativity and cognitive tempo is in part a function of the type of measurement used. They also concluded that an assessment of the relationship between cognitive tempo and a skills dimension of the creative variety should be undertaken in a comprehensive manner rather than in a piecemeal fashion.

Fuqua and his colleagues also discovered a significant effect for cognitive tempo which showed reflective subjects scoring higher than impulsive subjects on each measure of creativity. Torrance (1984) would not find this surprising from a process form of reference, since he maintains that "the most essential characteristic of self-motivating learning experiences is incompleteness or openness" (p. 73). In order to promote creative performance, Torrance has emphasized the need for deliberate and systematic exploration of missing elements and possibilities. Such emphasis on deliberate and systematic exploration is more descriptive of the reflective child than the free-wheeling impulsive child who makes quick decisions with high error rate.

In conclusion, the findings of the Fuqua study suggest that the modified MFF and TTCT are useful research instruments for preschool-age children and that the cognitive processes underlying creative ability and certain cognitive style are not fundamentally different. However, he and his fellow researchers recommend further research before any firm conclusions are reached.

In the McFarland study (1980), which was previously discussed, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking for ages 5-adult was recognized as being very effective with children who can draw and represent symbols. However, young children who do not have well developed small muscle coordination may not do well. It was also shown to be difficult to score.

Frazier (1988) stated in his study that creativity was considered when screening children in his Seattle project. The Torrance Tests were discussed once again, but a different version of the test was recommended for preschool children. The test was called Thinking Creatively in Action and Movement. It

was shown to be effective at early ages.

According to Sattler (1980), measures of creativity that emphasize divergent thinking correlate modestly with tests of intelligence (between .25 and .30). He states that tests of creativity correlate with each other, but not enough to be considered valid. What little common variance they may have, he feels, may be accounted for by *g*, the general intelligence factor.

Sattler (1980) also states that construct validity is difficult to attain for tests of creativity. They often assess a narrow range of abilities. He suggests teacher nominations and creative achievements for identifying creativity. Examples given included exhibiting or performing a work of art, inventing a device, and acting in plays. A checklist for rating creative traits in children was presented. Some items included were the ability to concentrate, above average intelligence, adaptability, curiosity, flexibility, good memory, independence, and commitment to task, among others. These traits were rated from one to five, with five being the strongest. The checklist was not specifically designed for young gifted children, however.

Parent/Teacher Questionnaires

Parents have definite beliefs about giftedness in their preschoolers according to Lewis and Louis (1990). Their study involved 276 parents who believed their preschool child to be gifted. The parents responded to the open-ended question: "Describe the kinds of things your child can do that you think are indicative of giftedness. Please be as specific as possible." The responses to the questionnaire were grouped into 26 categories. Across this sample of parents, the abilities mentioned as reflecting giftedness were expressive language, exceptional memory, abstract thinking, development ahead of peers, curiosity, receptive language, and superior motor ability. These results would seem to indicate

that parents tend to adhere to a specific skills theory of intelligence.

Lewis and Louis pointed out that it is important to notice that parents separate expression from comprehension in language. Thus it would appear that it is easier for parents to attend to early production rather than comprehension because production is more obvious, while comprehension is a subtle ability. It was concluded from these observations that parental beliefs about giftedness tend to follow a specific skills structure that is consistent with research.

Hanson (1984) stressed the use of parents as sources of information about their children's abilities and interests. In this study a questionnaire developed by the University of Washington was recommended for use in screening preschool children for giftedness. It asked parents to provide a short description of their child's precocious behavior and to respond to a series of yes/no questions regarding specific attainments. After being accepted into the program on parent recommendation, the children were tested by using the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery and Raven's Progressive Matrices. The test scores correlated with the parents' recommendations. Hanson concluded that parent recommendations were accurate and that the relationship between questionnaire scores and standardized test performance was strong for children four and five years old, but not as strong for two and three-year-olds.

Frazier (1988) pointed out that the research shows that test scores are not the only tools for identifying students. He recommended the multiple-criteria approach, using parent and teacher checklists. He argued that parents and teachers are excellent identifiers of gifted children and are usually aware of their characteristics. He recommended a parent/teacher checklist to be used at home as well as at school to ascertain if the child displays gifted characteristics (see Appendix A).

Koopmans-Dayton and Feldhusen (1987) indicate in their studies that parents are fairly accurate identifiers of gifted preschoolers. Jacobs (1971) found that parents who were not given a list of characteristics of the gifted were nevertheless 61 percent accurate in identifying their children as gifted.

When Ciha, Harris, and Hoffman (1974) provided a list of characteristics, they found parents to be 67 percent correct. It may be concluded from these studies that parents are very good evaluators, but that it is inappropriate to consider parental judgment as the only indicator.

A list of characteristics and traits of possible gifted preschoolers were developed as a part of Koopmans-Dayton and Feldhusen's research. These characteristics and traits were to be used for parental identification (see Appendix B). The characteristics and traits included language and learning traits, psychomotor development and motivation, and personal-social characteristics, among others. The researchers emphasized that a child does not have to exhibit all, or even a majority, of these characteristics to be identified as gifted. Seeing a number of these traits in one child, however, indicates a need to take a closer look at the extent of that child's giftedness.

Many identification systems involve teachers in making nominations and/or providing feedback about children who have been nominated. Alvino, et al. (1981), Yarborough & Johnson (1983), and Hoge & Cudmore (1986) found in their reviews that studies employing nomination procedures show variability in the way in which the nomination category is defined for the teacher. Although instruction can increase accuracy, teachers have been criticized for their inability to identify gifted students (Gear, 1978). In most of these studies researchers determined the accuracy of teachers' identification of gifted students by comparing them to the students' IQ scores. Renzulli and Delcourt (1986) noted that "giftedness is dependent upon traits that include but are not restricted to traditional intelligence measures" (p. 21), thus suggesting that most previous research studies about teacher accuracy are flawed because of their reliance on IQ scores as the criterion for accuracy. It was concluded from these studies that more research is needed on teacher nomination in the identification process.

According to the reviewed literature, teacher nomination need not be considered as inadequate. When provided with guidelines and in-service work on the characteristics and behaviors of gifted individuals, teachers become much more accurate in their perceptions according to Tuttle & Becker

(1978). In-service training concerning characteristics of gifted individuals is valuable not only for the identification of students for a gifted program, but also as an aid for the individual classroom teacher. An increased sensitivity to the characteristics and behaviors of gifted individuals enables the teacher to become more aware of the potential for all students.

Summary of Findings

This review of the literature, while limited in scope, has revealed some specific guidelines upon which a method for identifying the gifted preschooler should be based. They are as follows:

1. Use of a partial composite of the Stanford-Binet L-M, the Verbal reasoning and Short-Term Memory subtests, combined with a screening procedure, offers a viable alternative to the test composite of the Fourth Edition and can contribute to a total assessment battery (Kitano & DeLeon, 1988).
2. The McCarthy Scales produce lower scores than the Binet, resulting in a 10 point discrepancy. The two tests do not have a great deal in common in what they measure. The McCarthy Scales are not recommended for educational placement purposes because fewer children may be correctly identified (Bracken, 1983).
3. The Screening Test for Academic Readiness (STAR) compares favorably with group administered tests and serves to reduce substantially the number of students referred for individual assessment (Hollinger & Kosek, 1985).
4. Intelligence tests have limited reliability for individual children during the early years, especially in the upper ranges of ability (Isaacs & Robinson, 1987).
5. The WPPSI test is an individualized intelligence test that some research studies show to be a viable instrument to use as one facet of the identification process (Sattler, 1980).
6. Parental involvement is an important component of a program, and there is a need for good statewide identification methods (Wolfe, 1989).

7. Identification instruments and techniques used to identify young gifted and talented children should reflect individual differences and be directly related to the program objectives (McFarland, 1980).

8. The RAPHYHT can be incorporated into any good preschool program, especially for handicapped children. It has a positive influence on the children's self-concept by making them aware of their strengths and has a positive effect on parents and teachers (Karnes & Johnson, 1986).

9. A defensible assessment schema which utilizes input from parents and teachers as part of the identification can be developed with some success (Mathews & Burns, 1987).

10. The use of standardized tests as the only means of identification is not recommended (Cox & Daniel, 1983; Mathews & Burns, 1987).

11. Standardized tests of intelligence do not provide a means of detecting high levels of creativity (Lewis & Louis, 1991).

12. The relationship between creativity and cognitive tempo is, in part, a function of the type of measurement used (Fuqua, Bartsch, & Phye, 1975).

13. The modified MFF and TTCT are useful research instruments with preschool children (Fuqua, Bartsch, & Phye, 1975).

14. The use of Torrance's Thinking Creatively in Action and Movement is a measure of creativity which some research shows to be a viable instrument to use as one facet of the identification process (Frazier, 1988).

15. The use of parent/teacher questionnaires is a measure recommended by researchers as viable instruments to use as facets of the identification process (Lewis & Louis, 1990).

16. Parent recommendations are fairly accurate and comparable to standardized test performance (Hanson, 1984; Lewis & Louis, 1990).

17. Teacher nomination is effective if the teachers are first trained in the process (Tuttle & Becker 1978).

CHAPTER 3

A PROPOSED MODEL FOR THE EFFECTIVE IDENTIFICATION OF GIFTED PRESCHOOLERS

Chapter 2 contained a review of the literature which focused on procedures and strategies for identifying talented and gifted preschoolers. This chapter will present a proposed model which reflects the characteristics of an effective model as identified in the literature review.

Programs for gifted and talented children tend to fall into two main categories: acceleration programs and enrichment programs. The major goal of acceleration programs is to expand the content and skill knowledge of the children. Enrichment programs are usually implemented to provide experiences which may not be a part of the regular school program or to provide experiences that facilitate development of a child's special area of exceptionality.

Whether the selected program is accelerative or enriching in character, it is necessary to collect information about each child's learning characteristics and behaviors. Such data collected throughout the identification process can be the major source of this information. For this reason, it is important to choose identification techniques that contribute to the information known about each child, as well as to provide the needed information to determine if a child will be appropriately placed in a program.

For example, it may be desirable to evaluate the child's ability to think creatively if that behavior is needed to function successfully in the gifted and talented program. If, on the other hand, the program has been developed for the sole purpose of accelerating the reading level of academically gifted children, a test of creative thinking might not be necessary. Since the identification of gifted and talented children takes both professional time and money, it is wise to determine the types and goals of the program before

choosing the identification techniques. In that way, the educator can be assured that the chosen techniques will provide the needed data for identification purposes as well as serve as the data base for planning initial program activities.

Characteristics of an Effective Identification Model

The characteristics of this proposed effective model of identification have been selected on the basis of those identified in the National Report on Identification (Richert et al., 1982). They are as follows:

1. **Defensibility.** Procedures should be based on the best available research and recommendations.
2. **Advocacy.** Identification should be designed in the best interests of all students. Students should not be harmed by procedures.
3. **Equity:**
 - .Procedures should guarantee that no one is overlooked.
 - .The civil rights of students should be protected.
 - .Strategies should be specified for identifying the disadvantaged gifted.
 - .Cut off scores should be avoided since they are the most common way that disadvantaged students are discriminated against.
4. **Pluralism.** The broadest defensible definition of giftedness should be used.
5. **Comprehensiveness.** As many gifted learners as possible should be identified and served.
6. **Pragmatism.** Whenever possible, procedures should allow for modification and use instruments and resources on hand.

Major Goals of the Program

It was determined from the literature review that a gifted education program needs stated goals and objectives before the identification process can begin (McFarland, 1980). Those goals and objectives

should match those of the program. In the proposed model, the primary goal of the gifted education program will be to help preschool children develop interests, skills, and personal traits upon which to build during subsequent years of schooling. These interests, skills, and traits are interrelated and will form the basis for a set of further goals.

Elements of the Proposed Model of Identification

Conclusions from the literature review indicated that identification procedures and strategies for gifted preschoolers must be objective enough to be considered by parents and teachers as flexible. Thus, although teachers might be a part of the selection process, objective measures also will be included. The combination of objective and subjective measures hopefully will result in both the required objectivity and flexibility. This covers the characteristics of advocacy, equity, and comprehensiveness as stated in Richert's report (1982). The identification process should be in the best interest of all students, guarantee no one is overlooked, and identify as many children as possible.

Another of the generalizations drawn from the literature review is that a multiple-criteria procedure is essential when identifying gifted preschoolers. This proposed identification model will use such a multiple-criteria procedure, including a parent questionnaire, teacher checklist, the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI), and the Torrance Test of Creative Action and Movement. All of these instruments are included in order to identify intellectual, academic, and creative individuals as stated in the program goals. They also reflect the characteristics of advocacy, equity, pluralism and comprehensiveness as stated in Richert's report (1982).

After examining several questionnaires, the writer selected the Koopmans-Dayton (1987) Resource Guide for the parent questionnaire [see Appendix A]. This questionnaire covers different characteristics and traits of a preschooler who might be considered gifted. These characteristics and traits include a large vocabulary, early reading, and understanding of abstract concepts. Richert's (1982) characteristic of

comprehensiveness is covered here; that is, as many gifted learners as possible should be identified.

For the same reason, the teacher checklist taken from the work of Frazier (1988) was selected because it was not overly detailed, yet very inclusive [see Appendix B]. Since part of the program definition includes the identification of creativity, the writer concluded that a test of creative thinking should be included in the initial screening. The reviewed literature seemed to indicate that the Torrance Test of Thinking Creatively in Action and Movement was very effective for children who can draw and represent symbols (McFarland, 1980). This measure will be used for enrolled preschoolers in an effort to identify creativity at a young age. This covers comprehensiveness, advocacy, and defensibility as stated in Richert's report (1982). The procedures are based on available research and recommendations. Equity also is addressed since preschoolers can be considered at risk in the field of giftedness.

In assessing intellectual ability, all enrolled preschoolers will be given the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI). This was chosen due to the excellent reliability and validity as presented in the literature review (Sattler, 1980). It also fulfills Richert's requirement of defensibility.

The characteristics of an effective model, as identified in the National Report on Identification Procedures, are based on identification procedures which guarantee that no one is overlooked. For this reason, strategies for identifying special populations also will be included. It should be noted that, when using standardized tests, cutoff scores will be avoided since, as Richert has stated, they can be a form of discrimination. High test scores will be used to include students; but if children meet other criteria as determined in parent or teacher nominations, then a lower test score will not exclude them. This model will be an attempt to identify as many learners as possible and serve them as the National Report suggests.

Special Considerations of the Proposed Model

Every group of children is different. They have had different experiences, cultural backgrounds, and learning opportunities. Some have lived in the city and some in suburban and rural areas. They come

from poor, moderate, or wealthy homes.

Since all of these factors can influence a child's behavior and performance, identification procedures should reflect the fact that children do differ. Whenever possible, procedures should allow for modification (pragmatism) as stated in the National Report. McFarland (1980) stated some suggestions to help educators accommodate such pupil differences. They included the recognition that children from all social and economic backgrounds can be gifted or talented and the use of identification techniques that compare children against their specific populations rather than national norms. Teacher and parent checklists can serve this purpose. Adding points to a "disadvantaged" child's test score also is a way to adjust for the cultural bias of the test. It very well may be necessary to reevaluate those children who score extremely high on one or more identification techniques but very poorly on others. It may be that some techniques are biased against a certain group of children.

These suggestions will be followed in the proposed model of identification. It should be noted here that any set of identification procedures will probably fail to identify every gifted and talented child. Adjusting the procedure to meet the needs of certain groups of children can help to minimize this possibility.

Evaluation of Procedures and Strategies

The last stage of identification is evaluation. If the program for the gifted offers trained staff, an appropriate curriculum, and enough time within each program option, then identification should be an ongoing process. Students should be assessed annually to determine whether they should remain in a particular program option or in the regular classroom. The data gathered to evaluate individuals also can be used for program evaluation and improvement.

Richert et al. (1982) pointed out that criteria used to place students into programs are not necessarily appropriate for exiting them. The challenge in evaluating student progress in a program for the gifted is

the development of standards for evaluation that correlate with research so that more students will be able to develop their gifted potential.

The tests used in the proposed model may provide some assessment of progress. However, teacher and parent evaluations also will be indicators of progress. Product evaluations will include assessments of creativity. Process evaluation will be accomplished by teachers. Both process and product evaluation will be implemented through the use of checklists (Hanson & Linden, 1990) which address the goals of the program [see Appendix C].

CHAPTER 4

Summary, Conclusions, and Implications for Further Research

Summary

The purpose of this study was to review the current literature on procedures and strategies for identifying gifted and talented preschool children. Characteristics of selected procedures and strategies were then examined and integrated into a proposed identification model for their population.

The literature revealed that the basis for identification of gifted and talented preschool children was primarily based on the results of standardized tests, the results of creativity, and parent/teacher questionnaires. An analysis of each of these strategies resulted in the establishment of the following specific guidelines upon which a method of identification could be built:

1. Identification data should relate to program development.
2. It is necessary to collect information about each child's learning characteristics and behaviors.
3. The data which has been collected will provide information to determine if a child will be appropriately placed in a program, as well as serving as a data base for planning initial program activities.
4. The characteristics will be used to help form definitions and major goals of the program.

A proposed model was then developed which was based upon the characteristics of effective identification procedures as outlined by Susanne Richert and colleagues in the National Report on Identification (1982). These characteristics include defensibility, advocacy, equity, pluralism, comprehensiveness, and pragmatism. The model was built upon the premise that the primary goal of the gifted program is developmental. That is, its major purpose is to help preschool children to develop those interests, skills, and personal attributes which may benefit them during subsequent years of schooling.

In its final form, the proposed model reflected the use of multi-criteria procedures, both objective and subjective. They included the Weschler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI), the Torrance Test of Creative Action and Movement, the Koopman's-Dayton's(1987) parent questionnaire,

and a teacher checklist taken from Frazier (1988). The model also suggested provisions for the identification of special populations. Each of the procedures was defended on the basis of its relationship to one or more of the Richert characteristics. An overview of processes for evaluation of these procedures and strategies also was presented.

Conclusions

The literature review has led the writer to make the following specific conclusions concerning identification procedures for preschool gifted and talented children:

1. Standardized tests are not recommended as the only means of identification (McFarland, 1980; Cox & Daniel, 1983; Mathews & Burns, 1987).
2. Some viable standardized tests to use in the identification of gifted preschool children might be a partial composite of the Stanford-Binet L-M, the McCarthy Scales, the STAR, and the WPPSI (Kitano & DeLeon, 1988; Bracken, 1983; Hollinger & Kosek, 1985; Sattler, 1980).
3. Standardized tests of intelligence do not provide a means of detecting high levels of creativity (Lewis & Louis, 1991).
4. Some possible viable measurements of creativity might be the modified MFF, TCVT, and Torrance's Thinking Creatively in Action and Movement (Fuqua, Bartsch, & Phye, 1975; Frazier, 1988).
5. A defensible assessment schema which utilizes input from parents and teachers as part of the identification process can be developed with some success (Mathews & Burns, 1987; Lewis & Louis, 1990).
6. Parent recommendations are fairly accurate and comparable to standardized test performance (Hanson, 1984; Lewis & Louis, 1990).
7. Teacher nomination is effective if the teachers are first trained in the process (Tuttle & Becker,

1978).

From these specific statements, the writer has reached some general conclusions concerning the problems inherent in the identification of preschool gifted and talented children. The process of developing a viable model for such identification also has provided additional insights.

One might conclude, first of all, that the use of multi-criteria in the identification of preschool gifted and talented children is an unconditional requirement. None of the studies cited in the literature review suggested the use of a single criterion. Rather, they suggested a combination of tests and the use of such strategies as parent/teacher questionnaires. Especially evident was the caveat that standardized tests should not be used as the sole means for identification. Also evident was observed limitations of such tests in the process of student nomination and screening.

A second conclusion which might be drawn is related to the various attempts to measure creativity and creative thinking. While the literature review seemed to indicate that the characteristics of creativity and creative thinking should be an integral component in the process of identifying preschool gifted and talented children, it also led this writer to conclude that all aspects of creativity cannot be identified through the sole use of those standardized tests which some researchers believe to be viable measures of creativity. In fact, at the preschool level, it might be well also to use such strategies as observations of behavior and evaluation of creative products.

A third conclusion is that, at the preschool level, the importance of parent/teacher observation cannot be underestimated in the identification. However, the validity of their observations will be dependent upon their knowledge and understanding of such gifted behaviors. This can be best developed through organized educational programs and inservice.

Finally, the writer feels that the characteristics of effective identification procedures as outlined in the National Report on Identification (1982) should be used with more frequency as a means for evaluating the accuracy and cultural fairness of any identification model. Such use will help to insure that the process

of nomination and screening will contain the needed elements of equity, pluralism , and comprehensiveness.

Implications for Further Research

The literature review and subsequent development of an identification model have revealed some possibilities for further research in this area of study. A list of possible additional research follows:

1. The development of a qualitative study to ascertain whether it is more advantageous to identify and program for gifted children at an earlier age versus an older age level.
2. The implementation of case studies of different groups of preschool children to determine the possible effects of different identification procedures upon their failure to be selected for participation in the gifted program.
3. The implementation of a longitudinal study of children to determine evidence of developed skills, special interests, and personal attributes that could be traced to a developmental approach of identification used during preschool.

REFERENCES

- Alvino, J., McDonnel, R., & Richert, S. (1981). National survey of identification practises in gifted and talented education. Exceptional Children, 48, 124-132.
- Baum, S. (1986). The gifted preschooler: an awesome delight. Gifted Child Today, 42-45.
- Bracken, B.A. (1983). Comparison of the performance of gifted children on the McCarthy Scales of children's abilities and the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 6(4), 289-93.
- Burke, L. (1989). Identifying and serving the young gifted: a program for reaching classroom teachers. Gifted Child Today, 12(4), 10-12.
- Ciha, T.E., Harris, R., & Hoffman, C. (1974). Parents as identifiers of giftedness, ignored but accurate. Gifted Child Quarterly, 18(2), 191-195.
- Clark, B. (1988). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Cox, J., & Daniel, N. (1983). Special problems and special populations. Gifted Child Today, 54-61.
- Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B.O. (1985). Educating able learners. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Feldman, D. (1986). Nature's gambit: Child prodigies and the development of human potential. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Frazier, K. (1988). Identifying gifted preschool and kindergarten children. Challenge, Good Apple Inc., 32, 12-17.
- Gear, G. (1978). Effects of training on teachers' accuracy in the identification of gifted persons. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30, 20-23.
- Hansen, I. (1984). A comparison between parent identification of young bright children and subsequent testing. Roeper Review, 7(1), 44-45.

- Hanson, J.B., Linden, K.W. (1990). Selecting instruments for identifying gifted and talented Students, Roeper Review, 13(1), 10-15.
- Hoge, R., & Cudmore, L. (1986). The use of teacher-judgment measures in the identification of gifted pupils. Teaching and Teache Education, 2, 181-196.
- Hollinger, C. L., & Kosek, S. (1985). Early identification of the gifted and talented. Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(4), 168-71.
- Hunt, J., & McVicher (1961). Intelligence and experience. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Isaacs, A.F. (1987). Identifying and parenting the gifted-talented - creative child beginning with preschool. Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, 12(1), 21-30.
- Jacobs, J.C. (1971). Effectiveness of teacher and parent identification of gifted children as a function of school level. Psychology in the Schools, 8(2), 140-142.
- Karnes, M.B. (1984). A demonstration/outreach model for young gifted/ talented handicapped. Roeper Review, 7(1), 23-26.
- Karnes, M.B., & Johnson, L.J. (1986). Early identification and programming for young gifted/talented handicapped. Topics in Early Childhood-Special Education, 6(1), 50-61.
- Karnes, M.B., & Johnson, L.J. (1987). Bringing out head start talents: findings from the field. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(4), 174-79.
- Karnes, M.B., Shwedel, A.M., & Kemp, P.B. (1985). Preschool: programming for the young gifted child. Roeper Review, 7(4), 67-71.
- Kitano, M.K. (1985). Ethnography of a preschool for the gifted: what gifted young children actually do. Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(2), 67-71.
- Kitano, M.K., & DeLeon, J. (1988). Use of the Stanford-Binet Fourth Edition in identifying young gifted children. Roeper Review, 10(3), 156-59.
- Koopmans-Dayton, J.D., & Feldhusen, J.F. (1987). A resource guide for parents of gifted.

Gifted Child Today, 2-7.

Lewis, M., & Louis, B. (1991). Young gifted children, Handbook of Gifted Education, 354-381.

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

Mathews, F.N., & Burns, J.M. (1987). An assessment challenge: developing screening procedures for the preschool gifted child. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 10(3), 215-25.

McFarland, S. L. (1980). Guidelines for the identification of young and talented children.

Roeper Review, 3(2), 5-7.

McHardy, R. (1983). Planning for preschool gifted education. Gifted Child Today, 29, 24-27.

Plowman, P.D. (1987). Preschool gifted children. Gifted Child Today, 10(6), 24-26.

Renzulli, J., & Delcourt, M. (1986). The legacy and logic of research the identification of gifted persons. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30, 20-23.

Richert, S.E. (1990). Rampant problems and promising practices in identification.

Handbook of Gifted Education, 81-93.

Richert, S.E., Alvino, J., & McDonnel, R. (1982). The national report on identification: Assessment and recommendations for comprehensive identification of gifted and talented youth. Sewell, N.J.: Educational Information and Resource Center, for U.S Department of Education.

Rimm, S. (1984). The characteristics approach: identification and beyond. Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(4), 181-87.

Robinson, N.M. (1987). The early development of precocity. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(4), 161-64.

Sattler, J.M. (1980). Assessment of Children. 199-218.

Schaeffer, M. (1980). Child development principles and the gifted preschooler. Roeper Review, 7-9.

Torrance, E.P. (1984). The role of creativity in identification of the gifted and talented.

Gifted Child Quarterly, 6, 71-76.

Torrance, E.P., & Wu, T.H. (1981). A comparative longitudinal study of the adult creative achievements of elementary school children identified as highly intelligent and highly creative.

Creative Child and Adult Quarterly, 6, 71-76.

Tuttle, F.B., Jr. (1978). Gifted and Talented Students, Washington D.C.: National Education Association.

White, C.S. (1985). Alternatives to assessing the presence of advanced intellectual abilities in young children. Roeper Review, 8(2), 73-75.

Wolf, J.S. (1989). Consultations for parents of young gifted children. Roeper Review, 11(4), 219-21.

Wolfe, J. (1989). The gifted preschooler: developmentally different but still three or four years old.

Young Children, 44(3), 41-48.

Yarborough, B., & Johnson, R. (1983). Identifying the gifted: A theory-practise gap.

Gifted Child Quarterly, 27, 135-138.

Appendix A

Parent Questionnaire

Language and Learning

- talks early, reads early
- demonstrates advanced language proficiency
- has a large vocabulary early
- uses oral expression rather than action to communicate
- enjoys self-expression, especially in discussion
- has own unique learning style
- has greater than average attention span
- asks many questions
- exhibits advanced observational skills and retains information about what is observe or read
- understands abstract concepts and applies them appropriately
- discovers cause-and-effect relationships
- is willing to be alone or work alone for long periods
- is challenged by problems and fascinate by idea play
- shows interest in many kinds of books, encyclopedias, atlases, and fact books; has a large fund of information
- is interested in calendars, clocks, and puzzles
- chooses sophisticated activities, such as chess or collecting, as early as age 5
- is proficient in drawing, music, or other arts

Psychomotor Development and Motivation

- ___ walks early
- ___ displays early or advanced fine motor control in such activities as writing, coloring, and building things
- ___ is driven to explore things, is curious, often asks "why"
- ___ wants to master the environment; enjoys learning for its own sake
- ___ is extremely active and goal oriented
- ___ is independent in thought and action; is self- initiating
- ___ loves projects that require inquiry
- ___ has wide-ranging, consuming interests

Personal-Social Characteristics

- ___ spends less time sleeping
- ___ feels different from other children
- ___ is more dependent on adults for communication
- ___ interacts with adults more effectively than with children
- ___ struggles with adult inconsistency and unreasonable logic
- ___ is sensitive to dishonest and insincerity in adults
- ___ demonstrates awareness of issues, such as death, war, and world hunger

(...from Frazier, 1988)

Appendix B

Teacher Checklist

Directions: Check each item that best describes the child in comparison with other children at the same age.

- Wants to do things for himself/herself.
- Likes to try new things.
- Retains most of what he/she has seen or heard, remembers things you didn't even realize he/she knew.
- Likes grown-up things.
- Can anticipate the consequences of his/her actions
- Seems to know own capabilities.
- Has a good sense of humor.
- Not easily distracted from the thing he/she is doing
- Interested in all sorts of things.
- Uses and understands grown-up words.
- Can tell long involved stories.
- Likes to figure things out for himself/herself.
- Catches on quickly and easily.
- Tends to dominate peer groups; influential.
- Versatile; does most things well.

- ___ Likes consistent things (numbers, clocks, calendars).
- ___ Quick to get to the point of a joke or story.
- ___ Interested in relationships (grandmother to father).
- ___ Sensitive to others' feelings: visibly touched by sad or happy stories.
- ___ Likes to be with older children or adults.
- ___ Is critical about own work.
- ___ Understands abstract ideas (time, death, good distance).
- ___ Can always find something to do.
- ___ Can be reasoned with.
- ___ Notices words on boxes and signs and ask what they are (maybe has even begun to read).
- ___ Plays at reading.
- ___ Is persistent; sticks to tasks that excite him/her.
- ___ Can spend long periods of time in intense concentration.
- ___ Loves to enlist adults in two-way conversations.
- ___ Assumes a protective to responsible role when around younger children.
- ___ Can plan and carry out complicated activities.
- ___ Is an expert at something; knows a lot about one thing.
- ___ Is observant; notices things you miss, puts unusual detail in drawings.
- ___ Shows imaginative use of toys and adapts common objects for inventive purposes.
- ___ Full of good ideas and better ways to do things.
- ___ Asks lots of questions and keeps asking until getting an answer that satisfies.
- ___ Sizes up situation before plunging in.
- ___ Tries to understand complicated things.
- ___ Wants to know how things work; asks reasons why.

___ Not satisfied with routine, simple or obvious solutions.

___ Can wait for things to happen; has a sense of time.

___ Is able to manipulate situations to get desired results.

(...from Koopmans-Dayton, J.D., & Feldhusen, J.F., 1987)

Appendix C

Checklist for Selecting and Assessing an Instrument

Title of Instrument _____

Publisher _____

I. Defining the Goals of Identification Process

- A. List the major goals of the gifted program.
- B. List the areas of giftedness to be served.

II. Assessing Relevance of the Instrument

- A. What does this instrument purport to measure?
- B. Is this instrument relevant for intended purposes?

Does the instrument measure the behaviors listed in the goals of the identification process?

III. Technical Components in Selecting the Instrument

- A. Is the instrument reliable?
 - 1. What types of reliability coefficients are reported?
 - 2. What are the reported reliability coefficients?
- B. Is the instrument valid?
 - 1. What types of validity evidence are presented?
 - 2. What are the validity coefficients?

IV. Using a Variety of Evaluation Techniques

(What other evidence is available that may measure the constructs or behaviors of interest and relevance for identification of gifted students?)

V. Practical Consideration

Is the test efficient in terms of:

- a. administrative time?
- b. scoring?
- c. cost?

VI. Assessing the Limitations of the Instrument

List the limitations of the instrument.

VII. Interpreting test results

(Is there someone on the staff who is knowledgeable about psychometrics, who can appropriately interpret and use test results?)

(Name _____)

(...from Hansen & Linden, 1990)