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Abstract

One purpose of this paper was to investigate differences between gifted students' attitudes toward school according to assignment to self-contained or resource gifted classes. The other purpose was to investigate differences in knowledge of gifted and positive attitudes of the students' parents and school staff. The students' attitudes were measured using Hogan's Survey of School Attitudes with local items added. No significant differences were found in attitudes toward reading/language arts, science, mathematics, or social studies. There were minor differences in the students' attitudes toward their gifted program and being gifted. The parents' and staffs' attitudes were measured using a researcher made scale, the Gifted Attitude Survey. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups. The results of these surveys were affected by the composition of each class as well as by the use of a differentiated curriculum in the resource format class.
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Attitudes of Gifted Students,
Their Parents, and School Staff

Problem Statement

Are there differences in attitudes of gifted 3rd and 4th grade children who are served by self-contained gifted and those served by resource gifted classes? Are there differences in attitudes of the parents of these children and in the attitudes of the staffs in their schools?

Rationale

There are many decisions made about how to group gifted children. Studies into the effectiveness of gifted classes that discuss academic differences have proven to be inconclusive. "Although the arguments pro and con grouping frequently refer to such changes as work-study habits, social adjustment, attitudes toward learning, self-concepts, and other personal-social behaviors, few efforts have been made to evaluate the effect of grouping on these areas of development" (Passow, 1964, p. 247). These differences need to be studied. Student attitudes will be surveyed as well as those of parents and staff. "Parental response to programs (and their evaluation!) is another example of neglected study..." (Goodwin and Driscoll, 1980, p. 131). There are so many differences in values, needs and objectives between programs, schools, parents and individual students that it would be impossible to say that any one program is best for all. There may
be some generalizations that can be drawn from each kind of program. In a separate gifted class it is usually understood that "cognitive skill emphases, combined with a somewhat tacit theory of affective advantages for special class placement, suggest related outcomes of increased self-direction, responsibility, and satisfaction in learning" (Goodwin and Driscoll, 1980, p. 126). The assumption is that these differences must occur. The surveys in the project will identify differences (or lack of differences) in the attitudes of students, parents, and staff.

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to define attitudes toward the curriculum of gifted 3rd and 4th grade students in self-contained and resource gifted classes as well as the perceptions of parents and staff. To define these attitudes a standardized survey of curriculum attitudes for students and an attitude survey toward the gifted and program for parents and staff was used.

Review of Literature

Definition of Gifted

A gifted child was once defined as one with high intelligence as represented by an I.Q. score. The more popular and current definition is endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education.

Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who, by virtue of
outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school programs in order to realize their contributions to self and society (LeMahieu, 1980, p. 261).

This definition includes high achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, visual and performing arts, and psychomotor ability. Between 3 and 5% of the school population would be served under this definition.

The Florida definition is much more restricted and selects those children who have superior intellectual development and are capable of high performance. This identification is based on I.Q. test, characteristics of the student and the needs of the student. The Florida definition restricts those served to those who score in the top 2% of the tests given and are academically talented.

Program Formats

There are many different ways in which the academically gifted are being served. There are a variety of organizations and they present differing results. "It appears that the idealistic attempt of the gifted mandate under the Exceptional Children's Program has, at best, never come to fruition
and, at worst, has created a potential source of negative feedback to the gifted children" (Sellin and Birch, 1980, p. 12). The various formats possible become an issue if there are differences in outcome. This paper deals with the two most common organizations for serving the gifted: the resource room and the self-contained classroom. It is necessary to understand these two formats since "the planning and organization of such curricular modifications are the crucial factors, and ... pupil grouping should follow logically from the demands of the instructional program" (Goldberg, Passow, & Justman, 1966, p. 164). Even though organizational format is important, it still is subservient to the curriculum. "Grouping is an administrative arrangement and is probably far less important than what is done with, for, and to the child after a particular group is formed" (Sellin & Birch, 1980, p. 81).

Resource Gifted Classroom

The school may decide to reach the gifted child by selecting the resource room design. This may show a strong desire to avoid complete separation of gifted children from the rest of their age mates in the school setting. Such a complete separation in a special school or classroom signals, to some people, an attempt to give a better education to some students at the expense of others. Thus, the most popular
administrative device now in use in the U.S. is the resource room or itinerant teacher approach in which the gifted student spends a part of the academic day with an unselected group, and part of the day with a specially trained teacher assigned to help the gifted and talented (Gallagher, 1981, p. 233).

Having the student leave the classroom for one period a day or one day a week is one way to provide enrichment. These programs are sometimes called pull-out since the child is removed from the regular classroom. "Many educators [of the gifted] believe that gifted children should be provided with additional materials at the same level they have reached in a particular subject area, rather than being allowed to progress to the next highest level" (Roedell, Jackson, & Robinson, 1980, pp. 74-75). The resource room is the model chosen to provide enrichment. "Enrichment and individualization of instruction in a heterogeneous class is difficult if not impossible for the average teacher" (Meister & Odell, 1979, p. 82). Enrichment does not just happen, it must be planned for. "There is no doubt about it. There can be quite a distance between good intentions and enrichment. But it remains a tantalizing technique because it can work - and not only as a last or sole resort" (Laycock, 1979, p. 137).

When discussing enrichment/resource programs there should be a concern about what happens to the student
during the other hours at school. There may be negative effects from this kind of program. One kind of problem is that "it appears that gifted students are often subjected to ridicule and embarrassment simply because they create an inconvenience by being drawn from the regular classroom" (Nicely, Small, & Furman, 1980, p. 12). The attitudes of those around the child often create attitude and motivation problems. There can also be effects seen in the cognitive development of the child. When in the regular class "there is the risk that students can become bored or frustrated from being held back when acceleration is natural" (Morgan, Tennant, & Gold, 1980, p. 16).

Continuous development of the individual child should allow that "acceleration is a natural compliment of enrichment" (Keister & Odell, 1979, p. 81) and when "gifted children are not allowed to move ahead according to their own rapid developmental rate, their progress has been decelerated" (Roedell, Jackson, & Robinson, 1980, p. 75). The whole problem of bias against acceleration and special classes seems to be based on emotion rather than fact or experience. In response to a question about what kinds of programs exist, Marian Leibowitz stated that "most do what's easiest, not necessarily what's best: they establish pull-out programs" (Olson, 1980, p. 259). She also expresses what many feel to be the major problem with pull-out or
resource programs. "The problem, as I see it, is that youngsters are scheduled to be gifted" (Olson, 1980, p. 259).

**Self-Contained Gifted Classroom**

Homogeneous ability grouping developed as a way "to compensate for the weakness and ineffectiveness of the regimentation of the grades system" (Meister & Odell, 1979, p. 81). Ability grouping includes acceleration and enrichment and uses the best of both these approaches (Evans & Marken, 1982, p. 126; Meister & Odell, 1979, p. 82). Ability grouping of the gifted is favored by many of those concerned with programming for the gifted (Evans & Marken, 1982, p. 126; Gold, 1965, pp. 139 & 299; Gray, 1979, p. 105; Hildreth, 1970, pp. 253-256; MacLean, 1956; Meister & Odell, 1979, p. 82). Some of the arguments favoring separate classes for the gifted stress improved academic performance (Evans & Marken; Gold; Gray; Hildreth; MacLean; Meister & Odell). There are also arguments in favor of the affective benefits (Evans & Marken; Hildreth; MacLean). A preference for ability grouping is usually qualified by other needs. "A particular kind of teacher is one of the critical elements. Additional key elements include the selection process, curriculum, pacing, and the support of other personnel within the system" (Gray, 1979, p. 50). "Since grouping does not appear to have undesirable effects on any of the nonacademic variables studied, it might well be an effective method of
class organization for truly differentiated content" (Goldberg, Passow, & Justman, 1965, p. 163).

"Almost without exception, professional and lay advocates of intensified programs for the gifted call for ability grouping" (Gold, 1965, p. 299). It makes planning for this organization difficult when there are those in "universities and school systems [who] emphatically oppose ability grouping on social and philosophical grounds" (Gold, 1965, p. 299). Some see ability grouping as undemocratic since it offers different and better opportunities to a selected few and that it results in the development of stigma for the lower ability groups. Other opponents of ability grouping contend that in the adult world one has to live with all types of people and that ability grouping provides for an artificial conditioning for adult life (Meister & Odell, 1970, p. 82).

One answer to the last question says that in order to achieve equality in the schools we must see human individuality and provide "for individual needs of the ablest" (Tannenbaum, 1981, p. 35). Another typical response admits that while "arrogance, snobbery, boredom, indifference, and superficiality are a danger if segregation is poorly done" (Gold, 1965, p. 308) these problems are also found in gifted children who feel out of place in a heterogeneous class (Gold, 1965; MacLean, 1956). The most practical problems
of separate classes for the gifted have to do with things such as the distance of transportation, the small number of gifted, and the cost of implementation. Another problem has to do with the perception of the adjustment of the children. "For many of these children, who have been outstanding students in regular classes, the experience of being surrounded by individuals of comparable, or even greater ability must be unique and perhaps temporarily unsettling" (Coleman & Fults, 1982, p. 119). Short range problems of this nature may discourage those interested in ability grouping the gifted. There are concerns to be addressed, and those stated by the National Society of the Study of Education in 1936 are still of prime importance.

The results of ability grouping seem to depend less upon the fact of grouping itself than upon the philosophy behind the grouping, the accuracy with which grouping is made for the purposes intended, the differentiations in content, method, and speed, and the technique of the teacher, as well as upon more general environmental influences (Gold, 1965, p. 305).

Research

Studies into the relative merits of ability grouped gifted over those in a heterogeneous class tend to be inconclusive when there are no other changes in the schooling. (Gold, 1965, pp. 307-308; Goldberg, 1965;
Goldberg, Passow & Justman, 1966, p. 161; Laycock, 1979, p. 133; Passow, 1964, pp. 243-246). These data support the benefits of self-contained gifted classes where there is a differentiated curriculum. The change in curriculum does not even need to be conscious. When the same courses of study were followed in homogeneous and heterogeneous classes it was noted that with a "skillful teacher in charge of homogeneous classes differentiated subject matter and class procedure" (Passow, 1964, p. 246) occurred.

There is research to support the fact that the gifted students show better academic achievement and feel "more at home in the special class" (Goldberg, 1965, p. 36). Class placement can not always be the cause of differences between groups of gifted children. "One intangible difference might stem from home-parent-child factors associated with the decision to participate or not in the special class program" (Evans & Marken, 1982, p. 130).

Environmental control is one of the factors limiting the results of studies about gifted programs. It would be impossible to isolate the children and their attributes from their home environment.

We have some systematic evidence about how grouping works in comparison to nonsegregated schools of the bright. This evidence does not support claims of serious harm, and some of it show important benefits. But, partly because it is difficult to conduct research
that would be thoroughly convincing, we do not have
decisive data" (Laycock, 1979, p. 133).
In general, there is a lot of information about the philosophy
and theory of gifted education but a lack of evaluation
of various school programs (Evans & Marken, 1982; Gallagher,

Additional research about gifted deals with teachers.
One study "indicates that the more teachers know about
gifted students and gifted programs, the more likely it is
that they will be positively disposed to having students
removed from their classrooms to participate in gifted
programs" (Nicely, Small & Furman, 1980, p. 13).
A National Education Association Research Division (1961)
study "polled a nationwide sample of teachers in elementary
and secondary school in 1960 and discovered a two to one
preference in elementary school and a ten to one choice
in secondary schools supporting ability grouping" (Gold,

A number of needs for research have been described.
There is a need for self-concept and sociometric data
(Maddux, Scheiber & Bass, 1982, p. 81; Whitmore, 1980,
p. 56) as well as data about program formats. "Apart from
a moral imperative to provide or not to provide special
educational programs for the gifted, any decisions about
programming would seem well served by sound empirical
data" (Evans & Marken, 1982, p. 131).
Procedures

Sample

The survey included gifted children, their parents, and school staff. One set of subjects was taken from a class of 18 self-contained third and fourth graders. There were five third graders and 13 fourth graders combined in the class. These children were in the gifted program at Ortona School, Daytona Beach, Volusia County, Florida where the program is in its first year of implementation. The students in the class met the requirement of a 127 minimum I.Q. on the WISC-R as well as an acceptable score on the Renzulli-Hartman (a test of student characteristics). The other set of gifted children attended a resource class for one day a week and included 21 third graders and 18 fourth graders. The third and fourth graders each attended the special class on different days of the week for the full day. These students met the minimum requirement of 130 I.Q. on the WISC-R and an acceptable score on the Renzulli-Hartman. These children attended Neptune Beach Elementary School, Duval County, Florida. The socio-economic status of both schools appear very similar. Both of these groups were limited by those who returned release forms. There were four third graders and ten fourth graders tested in the self-contained class. There were nine third graders and nine fourth graders tested in the resource classes.
The parents included were those parents whose children returned release forms. Nine parent surveys were returned by parents of children in the self-contained class and 11 surveys were returned by parents of children in the resource classes.

The staffs of both schools were surveyed. The school in which the self-contained class is found had a staff of 26. Sixteen surveys were returned by these teachers. The school in which the resource format is found had a staff of 55, of which 27 were returned. Surveys were distributed to all of the teachers and the administrative/support staff.

Instrumentation

The students' attitudes were surveyed using the Survey of School Attitudes (Hogan, 1975) (see Appendices A and B). This produced a score on attitudes toward Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies (see Appendix C) as well as information about attitudes toward their gifted program (see Appendix D).

A survey was sent home (see Appendix E) to the parents of those children who took part in the survey. The same Gifted Attitude Survey was given to the staff of both schools. This survey used a three alternative Likert scale format. Knowledge about gifted and a positive attitude toward gifted were addressed in the survey (see Appendix F). The survey was based upon the specific characteristics of the two programs as well as the "Attitudinaire on
Mentally Gifted Minors" from the California Project Talent Talent (Bachtold, 1966).

Data Collection

Surveys were administered to the students in their gifted classes prior to standardized testing at the end of the school year. The third graders were given Form A (see Appendix A) of the Primary Level Survey of School Attitudes (Hogan, 1975) and the fourth graders were given Form A (see Appendix B) of the Intermediate Level of the Survey of School Attitudes (Hogan, 1975). Additional questions formulated for numbers 61 through 72 on the SSA were directed at the students' attitudes toward their schooling and their gifted program (see Appendix D).

Gifted Attitude Survey questionnaires for the parents of these children were sent home on the day the students were tested. There was a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope included.

The staff received the questionnaires in their school boxes on the day that student testing began. They returned them to a pre-arranged staff box as outlined in their cover letter.

Analysis of Data

The student attitudes as measured on the SSA (Survey of School Attitudes, Hogan, 1975) were analyzed using the t test to look for a significant difference among the four groups of students in each grade level, in each program
format, self-contained and resource. The program attitude questions on the student survey were looked at using the chi square test. The attitudes of the two staffs and the two sets of parents were also looked at using the chi square test. This tested the independent perceptions of each group, comparing group frequencies.

Analysis of variance was used to compare the differences among parents and staff using total score, knowledge and attitude subscales of the Gifted Attitude Survey by program type. The groups were also compared using responses for individual items. The .05 level of significance was used to make the statistical decision.

Results

There were two general research questions investigated in this study. These were:

Are there differences between the attitudes toward school of gifted students according to the type of program to which they have been assigned?

Are there differences between teachers and parents toward dimensions of the gifted program?

Student Analysis

The students were administered Hogan's Survey of School Attitudes, Primary or Intermediate, Form A. There were 12 items toward dimensions of the gifted program which were added to the survey by the researcher. The text has a section for the inclusion of local items. The research
question was translated into a series of null hypotheses that there were no mean differences between the attitudes of students in either self-contained class or resource class on their attitudes toward a) Reading/Language Arts, b) Science, c) Social Studies, d) Mathematics, and e) Gifted Program. The composite scores for each of the subtests were used for the analysis except for the local items which were also analyzed by individual item. Analysis of variance was used to test whether there were differences between groups. The means and standard deviations and resulting F ratios from the statistical analyses are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Comparison of Attitudes of Resource and Self-Contained Classes on the SSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Resource (18) M</th>
<th>Resource (18) SD</th>
<th>Self-Contained (14) M</th>
<th>Self-Contained (14) SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>20.71</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.820</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant mean differences found between the two types of classes. In general it is interesting to note that the means for the resource group were higher than those for the self-contained group except on attitude toward Mathematics. Attitude toward Mathematics had the lowest mean score of the SSA for both groups. The local items added to the scale were also analyzed individually. The results are reported in Table 2. It should be remembered that the scale ranges from 0 to 2, 2 represents liking an item and 0 represents disliking an item.

There were significant mean differences on two of the twelve added items. On item 70 and 72, the resource students rated the items more positively than the self-contained students. The items were concerned with going to gifted class and being gifted. It should be noted that overall the students in both groups had very positive attitudes toward schooling and their program. The least popular dimensions for both groups were numbers 62, 66, and 67. The result on number 62 meant that the students did not like doing the same work as everyone else in their class. The result on number 66 referred to the fact that they did not like to work independently and their result of number 67 implied that they did no like going to clubs or lessons after school.
Table 2

Comparison of Resource and Self-Contained Classes on the Locally Derived Items Included on the SSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Resource (18)</th>
<th>Self-Contained (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions for the above items. "Fill in the face to show whether or not you like:

61. to go on field trips.
62. doing the same work as everyone else in your class.
63. to do a good job on all your work.
64. to read at home.
65. playing with other children outside of school.
66. working independently.
67. going to clubs or lessons after school.
68. being with other gifted children.
69. learning new things in school.
70. going to gifted class. (For the resource class.)
    being in the class of all gifted children. (For the self-contained class.)
71. what you do in (the) gifted class.
72. being gifted."

Teacher and Parent Analysis

Teachers and parents in both schools were administered a 38 item survey (see Appendix E). Three different dimensions were addressed: high knowledge, positive attitude, and total score (see Appendix F). Two-way analysis of variance was computed on the three scales with group and type of program location as variables. The research question was translated in a series of null hypotheses in order to make statistical decisions. The results of the comparison of the group on total score are presented in Table 3.

There were no significant differences between the two groups or two locations of the total score on the Gifted Attitude Survey. There was also no significant interaction between group and location. The combined mean for parents and teachers of the school which had a resource program was 51.58 as compared to 50.48 for self-contained type of
Table 3

Analysis of Variance of the Total Score by Group and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>235.491</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117.846</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.605</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217.280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217.280</td>
<td>3.393</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Way Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Location</td>
<td>101.691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.691</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>337.182</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112.394</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3778.525</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4115.707</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

program. The overall mean for parents was 53.80 as compared to 49.91 for teachers. Although parents in both school situations had higher mean scores than teachers, these different scores were not statistically significant. In the resource condition, teachers had a mean of 49.74 as compared to 56.09 for parents. In the self-contained context, teachers had a mean of 50.19 as compared to a mean of 51.0 for parents.

The results of the comparison of the groups on the high knowledge scale of the Gifted Attitude Survey are presented in Table 4.
Table 4
Analysis of Variance of Knowledge Scale by Group and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>35.655</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.827</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.611</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.434</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Location</td>
<td>91.364</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.364</td>
<td>3.126</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>127.019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.340</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1724.530</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1851.549</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences on the variable of location or group or any significant interaction between group and location. Parents had a mean of 31. as compared to a mean of 30.19 for teachers. Parents and teachers from the resource program had a mean of 30.95 as compared to a mean of 31.0 for parents and teachers from the self-contained program.

The results of the comparison of the groups on the positive attitude scale are presented in Table 5.
Table 5
Analysis of Variance of Positive Attitude by Group and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>138.798</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69.399</td>
<td>3.431</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138.778</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138.778</td>
<td>6.862</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Location</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>139.586</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.529</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1193.297</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1332.883</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An F of 6.862 was computed on the main effects of group and with 1 and 59 degrees of freedom was significant at the .01 level. Parents had a significantly higher mean score than teachers, 22.95 as compared to 19.77. There were no significant differences on the main effects of group and no significant interaction between group and location.
Conclusions

The results of this study cannot be discussed without looking at how the classes were formed and how they are run. The way students have come to be in each class separates the children as to possible attitudes.

The self-contained class was in its first year of implementation. There were a variety of factors behind its initiation. One was the speculation that one of the parents was going to sue the school system over the lack of an appropriate education for the child. There was other vocal dissatisfaction with the previous pull-out program. The general reason for the rapid implementation seems to be 'angry parents'. Many of the children had previously been identified as being either under-achievers or behavior problems. The 18 children in the class were taken from six elementary schools, with an approximate population of 3000. The other gifted children were left in the heterogeneous classes. It is possible to assume that those are the children who perform adequately and are perceived as being happy and successful in their classes. It would seem that these 18 are not an even distribution of character traits of the gifted children in the district. This gifted class seemed to absorb those who were under-achievers or were behavior problems in the regular classroom, and who had parents who were dissatisfied. The
creation of the self-contained class seems to have isolated some of the gifted children, rather than positively serving them since there has been no provision for a specific gifted curriculum or even moderate acceleration of academic material.

The resource classes contain 39 children taken from one school with an approximate population of about 925. These children did not undergo any sort of selection that would isolate them as problem children. It appears that character traits are more evenly distributed in these classes. The parents have not been involved in any active process of dissent. While there seems to be some dissatisfaction among the parents there has not been any move to seek different services. The curriculum in these classes is specifically designed to meet the needs of gifted children, even though they only have access to it for one day a week.

There were no significant differences between the classes on attitude toward curriculum. It is not surprising since the self-contained class doesn't have a gifted curriculum and the children seem to be those with school problems. It may be that the results would be different if both sets of children had been exposed to the same curriculum or if one set had not already developed poor attitudes.
On the items created to test attitudes toward gifted (SSA items # 70 & 72), the self-contained students did not show as positive an attitude toward being gifted or being in the gifted class. It seems that this would not be unusual for students who have spent three or four years in school and have been identified as having behavior or under-achieving problems. These attitudes were formed over a number of years and also may be a reflection of how their parent felt about the gifted program. The children may have received some negative input during the parents' vocalization of problems with the previous gifted program.

Although not at a significant level, parents scored higher than staff on the Gifted Attitude Survey on both high knowledge and positive attitude scales. Comments on the survey support the impression that parents felt more positively about the gifted condition than did the school staffs. The parents have dealt with their children (and maybe their own experience with being gifted) all their lives and have had to adopt positive ways to deal with them. This usually included reading to educate themselves about the needs of gifted children.

The school staffs may have had dealings with the gifted children in ways that are negative for the children. There tended to be a feeling in the comments on the surveys that the pull-out is inconvenient, that the children resent
making up 'regular' work, and that the regular teacher is not fully appreciated by the gifted child. The school staff that has the one day a week resource format seems to show the greatest range of reactions. Many teachers added comments and alluded to the negative feelings others have toward gifted children. One teacher characterized the students being called "gifted" as an "outrage! [and] I object to it personally and professionally!!!" Another teacher (who is also the parent of a gifted child) expressed a differing viewpoint. This teacher praised the gifted program and then went on to say that the rest of the week of "...regular class is usually an exercise in patience..." for the children. The staff at the school with the self-contained classes tended to feel isolated from the gifted children.

One general conclusion of this research is that there was no difference between the attitudes of gifted students toward school depending on whether they were in a self-contained or resource gifted class. Also there was no difference in attitudes of teachers or parents toward dimensions of the gifted program. It might be possible to find differences in the attitudes of the students in the self-contained program if there was a differentiated curriculum, allowance for acceleration, and a more evenly distributed selection of children in each class.
Recommendations

It is suggested that this study be replicated using resource and self-contained students who are using the same curriculum materials. This may not be possible since a district usually commits to one format or another. Support of the district so that all gifted students could be tested would be advantageous to ensure a better representation of all gifted children.

The results of higher scores for parents on knowledge and attitude scales would support the active inclusion of parent support groups within the school, since they seem to have sufficient interest and knowledge to make a contribution to a program. Since the teachers scored lower there is a continued need for teacher education to improve both knowledge and attitude. Some teachers expressed opinions that appear hostile and that would probably not be expressed in relation to any other 'special' group of children, an area that they have been more greatly exposed to in their education.

It appears that the attitudes of the self-contained children support a need for counseling since they felt negatively about being gifted. All of the gifted children and their parents tended to have perceptions that could be well served by a trained counselor who is knowledgeable about the special needs of the gifted.
There may be significance in the fact that there were no apparent differences between these groups. Research supports the need for a differentiated curriculum as well as other special organizations. The self-contained format has the potential to allow both enrichment and acceleration where needed. Affective needs of the gifted children can be addressed in a self-contained class. Differences might be perceived when looking at the two groups of gifted children if the self-contained class took advantage of some of these possibilities.
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Appendix C

Classification of SSA Items by Curricular Area

from SSA Manual (Hogan, 1975, p. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Form A Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading/Language Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16, 32, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Words</td>
<td>12, 20, 36, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>8, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reading-related</td>
<td>40, 48, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts of Numeration, Sets, Etc.</td>
<td>1, 9, 37, 41, 45, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computation</td>
<td>5, 13, 21, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry and Measurement</td>
<td>25, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>17, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charts</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>3, 11, 23, 35, 51, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science, Astronomy</td>
<td>7, 15, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science, Mechanics</td>
<td>19, 27, 31, 43, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale

Social Studies

Cultures, Social Groups, and Customs
Travel, Commerce, and Business
Government and Politics
History
Geography and Map Skills
Weather

Form A Item Numbers

2, 6, 38, 46
26, 34
14, 42, 58
10, 22, 50
18, 54
30
Appendix D

Locally Added SSA Items # 61 - 72

The students marked responses to the following oral question in the SSA test booklets.

Fill in the face to show whether or not you like:

61. to go on field trips.
62. doing the same work as everyone else in your class.
63. to do a good job on all your work.
64. to read at home.
65. playing with other children outside of school.
66. working independently.
67. going to clubs or lessons after school.
68. being with other gifted children.
69. learning new things in school.
70. Resource class: going to gifted class.
    Self-contained class: being in the class of all gifted children.
71. what you do in (the) gifted class.
72. being gifted.
Appendix E: Gifted Attitude Survey

Please circle A if you agree with the statement, NO if you have no opinion or are unsure, and D if you disagree with the statement.

1. The gifted child is usually creative. A NO D
2. Gifted students profit less from practice or rote learning activities. A NO D
3. Superior intellectual development tends to cause emotional instability. A NO D
4. In-depth work is generally expected from the gifted child in the regular class. A NO D
5. The gifted child is singled out for negative comments. A NO D
6. Ability grouping is neither desirable nor feasible. A NO D
7. Genius is the product of exaggerated development of one faculty at the expense of others. A NO D
8. Gifted students need simply more of what average students need. A NO D
9. The gifted child is equally capable in all areas. A NO D
10. Gifted children like to read. A NO D
11. The gifted child needs to work with others of equal ability. A NO D
12. Gifted children as a group are superior in physical, emotional, and social adjustment. A NO D
13. If it's good for the gifted, it's good for all. A NO D
14. Since gifted children are known to work rapidly, they should produce more work in the classroom than average children. A NO D
15. The gifted program increases the self-esteem of the child. A NO D
16. The child can learn the same skills in the regular as in the gifted class. A NO D
17. The child should show the same level of performance in the regular and gifted class. A NO D
18. The gifted child is enthusiastic about academics. A NO D
19. The gifted program restricts the child's friendships. A NO D
20. The gifted child should be able to avoid repetitious work. A NO D
21. The gifted child is challenged by academic course work. A NO D
22. Gifted children should remain with their chronological age group for the sake of social adjustment. A NO D
23. The student misses valuable skills while in the gifted class. A NO D
24. Ability grouping is difficult in the regular class. A NO D
25. Programs for the gifted should be open only to students who make high grades. A NO D
26. The gifted child exhibits a different attitude when in the regular class than when in the gifted class. A NO D
27. The gifted child can develop new interests and abilities in the gifted class. A NO D
28. Acceleration is never appropriate for the gifted. A NO D
29. Pressure for conformity could determine the bright child's sense of worth. A NO D
30. The regular class is the best environment for all. A NO D
31. The child enjoys the time in the gifted class. A NO D
32. The program will improve the child's attitude about school. A NO D
33. Gifted students benefit from the program. A NO D
34. The program could be made more valuable. A NO D
35. I understand the objectives of the gifted program. A NO D
36. I have read books or periodicals about the gifted. A NO D
37. Which area of study is most interesting to the gifted child? 

38. The gifted child performs best in this area: ____________________

Please check all of these that are applicable:

__ I am a parent of ___ gifted child(ren).
__ I am a member of the school's administrative/support staff
__ I am a teacher of the gifted. __ I am a classroom teacher.
__ I have ___ gifted in my class this year. ___ I have had gifted in my class previous years.
Appendix F
Gifted Attitude Survey

Items that Address Different Dimensions

Items indicating high level of knowledge:
2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 22, 24, 25,
28, 29, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38

Items indicating positive attitude:
1, 4, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34