THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED K-8 STUDENTS IN TURKEY:

POLICY ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

SAKHAVAT MAMMADOV

BOĞAZİÇİ UNİVERSİTY

2012

THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED K-8 STUDENTS IN TURKEY:

POLICY ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Primary Education

by
SakhavatMammadov

Boğaziçi University
2012

The Education of Gifted K-8 Students in Turkey: Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation

The thesis of Sakhavat Mammadov
has been approved by

Prof. Dr. Fatma Gök
(Thesis Advisor)

Dr. Devrim Güven

Assist. Prof. Engin Ader

June 2012

Thesis Abstract

SakhavatMammadov, “The Education of Gifted K-8 Students in Turkey: Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation”

This study intended to examine two major issues related to the education of gifted K-8 students in Turkey. The first purpose of this study was to examine the existing policies and their elements regarding the education of gifted K-8 students. The second purpose was to conduct a program evaluation of K-8 Gifted Education Program to address how well the elementary schools with gifted programs respond to the needs of gifted students.

The first purpose is carried out through content analysis of publicly available policy documents. The second purpose is fulfilled through case examples of three elementary schools educating gifted students. Two private and one public schools with gifted programs were included in the case. The Classroom Observation Scale (COS) was theinstrument used for classroom observation data collection. In addition, interviews were conducted with teachers and administrators.

The findings of this study revealed there is a serious dearth of documented evidence regarding the education policy on gifted students and their schooling in Turkey. The study also revealed the lack of coherence in gifted education policy including definition, identification and placement concerns, and teacher training and personnel preparation.

Data collected based on program evaluation provided considerable evidence on the strengths and weaknesses of gifted programs in a public and private schools. Besides some important strength in gifted programs, program evaluation revealed that there are issues of concern such as the lack of well-defined and implemented effective curriculum, weaknesses in instructional strategies and curriculum modification to respond academic needs of gifted learners, and the problems in parent involvement and necessary funding allocation specific to public school.

This study will contribute to the body of knowledge related to the policy analysis and evaluation of gifted education programs in Turkey.

Tez Özeti

Sakhavat Mammadov, "İlköğretim Düzeyindeki Üstün Zekâlı Öğrencilerin Türkiye'deki Eğitimi: Politika Analizi ve Program Değerlendirmesi"

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de ilköğretim düzeyindeki üstün zekâlı öğrencilerin eğitimiyle ilgili iki önemli konuyu araştırmaktadır. Araştırmanın amaçlarından birincisi bu öğrencilerin eğitimi ile alakalı mevcut politikaları incelemektir. Çalışmanın ikinci amacı ise ilköğretim düzeyinde üstün zekâlı öğrencilere yönelik eğitim programlarını değerlendirmek ve bu programların öğrencilerin gereksinimlerini ne ölçüde karşıladığını incelemektir.

Birinci amaca yönelik olarak ilk kısımda, politika dokümanları içerik analizi kullanılarak incelenmiştir. İkinci amaç doğrultusunda ise üç ilköğretim okulunda vaka çalışması yapılmıştır. Üstün zekâlı öğrencilere yönelik eğitim programları olan iki özel ve bir devlet okulu bu kapsamda seçilmiştir. Sınıf Gözlemleme Ölçeği kullanılarak sınıf içi veri toplanması sağlanmış, ayrıca okul yöneticisi ve öğretmenlerle röportaj yapılmıştır.

Araştırmanın sonuçları, Türkiye'de üstün zekâlı öğrenciler ve onların eğitimi ile ilgili çok az sayıda doküman bulgusunun mevcut olduğunu, ayrıca bu öğrencilerin tanımlanması, yerleştirilmesi, yönlendirilmesi ve nitelikli öğretmen ve personel eğitimi ile ilgili kapsamlı politikanın eksik olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Program değerlendirmesi kapsamında toplanan veriler, üstün zekâlı öğrencilere yönelik eğitim veren devlet ve özel okullardaki programların güçlü ve zayıf yönleriyle ilgili önemli sonuçlar ortaya çıkarmıştır. Programların bazı güçlü yanlarıyla beraber, bu kısımdaki bulgular, seçilen okullarda üstün zekâlı öğrencilere yönelik iyi tanımlanmış ve uygulanmakta olan müfredatın bulunmadığını, öğretim tekniklerinde ve üstün zekâlı öğrencilerin akademik ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak adına müfredatta yapılması gereken değişikliklerde eksikliklerin bulunduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, devlet okulunda öğretmen eğitimi konusunda ciddi eksiklerin bulunduğu, veli-okul ilişkisinin istenilen düzeyde olmadığı ve programlar için yeterli fon ayrılmadığı açığa çıkmıştır.

Bu çalışma Türkiye'de üstün zekâlı öğrencilere yönelik politika analizi ve program değerlendirmesi konusunda literatüre önemli katkı sağlayacaktır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. FatmaGök, my thesis advisor, for all her guidance and generous support during the lengthy process of investigation and writing. I am also deeply grateful to Dr. EnginAder and Dr. DevrimGüven for all their guidance in the development of this thesis. Also, I would like to appreciate their tutelage and friendship which have had a great influence on my intellectual growth during my undergraduate and graduate years. And finally, I would like to thank my family for their continual love, support and encouragement.

To my parents and fiancée

CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background of the Study

Children with special learning needs are called exceptional students. Some exceptional students require special programs because of learning disabilities or difficulties. Other students are referred for an individual evaluation and intervention programming based upon superior intellectual development and advanced cognitive abilities. In both programs there is a need for identification and screening procedures, placement options and specially trained teachers (Kirk, Gallagher, Coleman, &Anastasiow, 2009). Students with superior intellectual development and advanced cognitive abilities are called gifted and talented. Gifted children, by definition, are "unusual" in social and emotional needs as well as in cognitive abilities when compared with same-age children; therefore gifted students require different educational experiences (Kleine& Webb, 1992).

The field of gifted education has developed from a notion of fixed intelligence and its longstanding tradition of assuming the identification of gifted children based on high IQ scores and achievement test scores. However, during the last decades the number of prominent studies explicitly set the stage for a focus on talents (Sternberg, 1991; Gardner, 1983; Gagne, 1993). Talent development emerged in the literature as a new paradigm which emphasized the transition in the field (VanTassel-Baska, 1998; Pleiss&Feldhusen, 1995; Feldhusen, 1996). Changing

expectations within a new paradigm entails policy makers and program administrators contributing to making the process and practices effective (VanTassel-Baska, 2006b). From this perspective, policy and program evaluation has a growing importance in gifted program development at the local and state level.

Although there are some common lines among gifted education policies, they significantly vary from nation to nation (Passow, 1997). The implementation of educational policy affects student learning experiences. Throughout history, there have been many examples of policy changes which have strongly influenced gifted education program options, identification and pedagogy of gifted students (Tannenbaum, 2000, Davis &Rimm, 2005, Matthews & Foster, 2005). The United State's post war effort in balancing egalitarianism and excellence, and its effect on gifted, the launching of Sputnik in 1957 which is viewed as peak period of interest in gifted education (Tannenbaum, 2000), and the policies of former colonies of European countries which are strikingly reflecting the traditions of the Western Civilization in terms of its definition of giftedness (Rudnitski, 2000) are some examples to the policy influences in the field of gifted education. As the state policy plays a vital role in programmatic decisions and practices of gifted programs (Gallagher, 2002), the evaluation of programs and examining their nature is an important activity in the development of effective programs.

Historically, Turkish educational system did not pay much attention to the education of gifted students. During the past few years, however, there have been some efforts toward taking more assertive steps in documenting and realizing reform ideas in this area. The Turkish Ministry of Education has charted a road map of developing and implementing the strategy for the education of gifted students. The Strategic Plan 2012-2016 is a very important part of this progress. Several

assessment and recommendation documents have been reported before the declaration of this strategic plan.

In Turkey, the Ministry of Education is responsible for making decisions about public and private education in pre-schools, secondary schools, high schools, and special education programs (MEB, 2006). The Ministry of Education is also responsible for policy formulation regarding the education of exceptional students including gifted and talented ones. The 2012-2016 Strategic Plan covers the processes addressing the education of the gifted children including their identification and screening, and providing various services to them.

Currently, there are one public and several private schools catering to the needs of gifted children at elementary school level. There are also the Science and Art Centers (BİLSEMs) operating under the Ministry of Education and a small number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as ÜstünZekalılarDerneği, TümYetenekliÇocuklarıDesteklemeDerneği, ÇocukVakfı, TürkiyeÜstünYetenekliÇocuklarıEğitimVakfı that are engaged in gifted education. There is only one undergraduate program offered by Istanbul University for educating gifted education teachers. A graduate program on gifted education is offered by Anadolu University and Istanbul University.

Purpose of the Study

This study intends to examine two major issues related to the education of gifted K-8 students. The first purpose of this study is to examine the existing policies and their elements regarding the education of gifted K-8 students. It is carried out through content analysis (Krippendorff, 2004) of publicly available policy documents. The second purpose of the study is to examine and describe current K-8 gifted education

programs of public and private institutions. The second purpose is fulfilled through case examples of three elementary schools educating gifted students.

Research Questions

Since this research study essentially consisted of gifted program evaluation and policy analysis regarding the education of K-8 students in Turkey, the following questions guided the process:

1. What is the nature of policies regarding the education of gifted children in Turkey?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these policies?
3. How well do the gifted education programs meet the needs of gifted students?
4. What are the practices of teachers and administrators regarding the gifted education programs?
5. How do teachers and administrators in the school with gifted programs view and evaluate the implementation process of these programs?

Significance of the Study

In Turkey, there are public schools (i.e., Science High Schools, Anadolu High Schools and Anadolu Fine Art Schools) which educate students with intellectual and artistic abilities. Although these schools are equipped with many facilities and qualified teachers are appointed by the Ministry of Education, these institutions do not cater to gifted students. Moreover, these schools operate only at the secondary school level. At K-8 level, however, there are state-run regular schools and private schools. The current implementation of instructional practices and programs in these

regular schools has not paid much attention to the education of gifted students. On the other hand, utility and quality of programs and strategies in the public and private K-8 schools educating gifted students has not been described in studies. The nature of state policies regarding gifted education and institutions' adherence to the standards set by these policies are also issues which need to be examined.

A statewide program evaluation and policy analysis in gifted education have never occurred in Turkey. As a result, the researcher decided to conduct a study to explore the nature of policies regarding gifted education in Turkey and to investigate the effectiveness of the program delivery models used by public and private schools with gifted programs.

Within the study, the researcher presents a better understanding of the gifted education in Turkey, related policies and educational practices for teaching gifted learners. The program evaluation helps to illuminate ongoing best practice as well as to determine gap areas that allow the opportunity for improvement (Patton, 2008). Learning more about the similarities and differences in individual gifted programs among school districts, while also examining their program delivery models for effectiveness, is a beginning in the evaluation and study of gifted education in Turkey.

For consideration in the program evaluation, the program delivery model needed to be recognized by the state as a program alternative for state assisted gifted programs. Examples of program delivery models included Resource Room Teacher (RRT), Educational Resource Teacher (ERT), Special Class Teacher (SCT), Gifted Resource Teacher (GRT), Programs for Exceptionally Gifted Students (PEGS) and Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate. The models require providing

differentiated instruction within the regular classroom to meet the social, emotional, physical, cognitive, and behavioral needs of gifted students, and screening and identification procedures.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

An effective gifted education policy and a comprehensive gifted education program are sine qua non for the talent development of students. To explore policies and program effectiveness for gifted children and to answer the research questions, first of all, it is important to have an understanding of the definition of giftedness, identification processes, and program models and practices addressing the education of the gifted. Moreover, it is also essential to have an understanding of the literature involving policy perspectives in the gifted education. The literature review below begins with definition of giftedness and identification of gifted children. The following sections present policy perspectives in gifted education, gifted programs and program evaluation. And finally, the last section focuses on the gifted education in Turkey.

Definition of Giftedness and Identifying Gifted Learners

The studies of giftedness closely parallel the research on intelligence. For most of the previous century, the conceptualization of giftedness was largely answered by IQ testing (e.g. Tannenbaum, 1983; Treffinger&Renzulli, 1986). For instance, students who scored in the top 3-5 percentiles were recommended to be identified as gifted and educated in classes for the gifted (Gagne, Belanger, &Motard, 1993). Terman (1925) argued that giftedness can be defined as “the top 1% of ability level in general intellectual ability as measured by the Standford-Binet Intelligence Scale or a

comparable instrument" (p.43). However, up until the end of the century, contemporary researchers in the area of gifted education criticized the logic of this conception of giftedness (Borland, 1986; Ceci, 1990) and argued that IQ tests do predict student success in school (Jensen, 1980; Morris, 1977; Sternberg & Wagner, 1993), yet there are a number of characteristics not measured by these tests (Renzulli, 1978; Maker, 1993; Torrance, 1978).

One of the important conceptions of giftedness is based on the Sternberg's triarchic theory of intelligence which includes analytical (componential), creative (experiential) and practical (contextual) facets (Sternberg, 1985). Each of three facets is a subtheory of intelligence. By synthesizing these subtheories, Sternberg stated that the interaction between these subtheories is a key dynamic in a complete explanation of intelligence. According to this theory, the individual's information-processing capacities, experiences in particular task or problem and his relation with the external world are three components of giftedness (Sternberg, 1986). Sternberg (1984) stated that intelligence is "purposive adaptation to, shaping of, and selection of real-world environments relevant to one's life" (p.271). Sternberg (1986) argued that individuals considered intelligent or gifted in one culture or context may not be looked on as the same in another.

Another conception of giftedness is Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences. Gardner's view of giftedness, like Sternberg, grows out of his theory of intelligence. Gardner, in his previous studies, argued that there are eight abilities or intelligences that an individual possess: spatial, linguistic, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal and naturalistic (Gardner, 1983). In his following studies, he also asserted that moral and existential intelligence may also be included in this list (Smith, 2002, 2008). According to

Gardner, there are various combinations of intelligences and by drawing on these combinations individuals become able "to solve problems or to create products that are valued within one or more cultural settings" (Gardner, 1985, p. x). Gardner (1993a) defines a gifted youngster as one who advances rapidly through a knowledge domain because of strengths in his intelligences and opportunities in the environment for this development.

The third and one of the well-researched conceptualization of giftedness is Renzulli's (1978) three-ring definition. Its difference from traditional theories based on IQ tests (Terman, 1925; Gross, 1993) and Gardner's (1999) multiple intelligence theory is that it focuses on diverse facets of giftedness. The conceptual framework of three-ring definition is about the relationship among three interlocking clusters of traits (above average intelligence, task commitment and creativity) in the specific domains of human performance. Both general and specific performance domains are involved in this model. Cohn (1981) also formulated a model of giftedness which includes three major categories: intellectual, artistic and social abilities. Each of these categories further contains several subcategories of talents.

According to Renzulli (2005), there are two broad categories of giftedness that have been dealt with in the literature: *schoolhouse giftedness* and *creative-productive giftedness.Schoolhouse giftedness* is easily measured by cognitive ability tests, such as Intelligence Quotient (IQ). This type generally used to select students for entrance into special programs. On the other hand, *creative-productive giftedness* is a product-oriented approach, which means that people with this kind of giftedness have an impact on others in some important respect. Renzulli (2005) suggested that education programs addressing second kind of giftedness must be different from regular school programming. In planning and creating appropriate educational

programs, one should consider three components of Renzulli's giftedness conceptualization. "Persons who manifest or are capable of developing an interaction among the three clusters require a wide variety of educational opportunities and services that are not ordinarily provided through regular instructional programs" (Renzulli& Reis, 1997, p. 8).According to this conceptualization, training all children in problem-solving skills and procedures is very essential. It also emphasizes the importance of providing motivating learning experiences based on real-life problem solving.

Studies have concluded that intelligence cannot be explicitly defined because of its nature and the nature of concepts used to define it (Neisser, 1979). Therefore, because it is closely related with intelligence, giftedness has been defined in many ways, with different suggestions (e.g. Maker, 1983; Renzulli, 1986; and Sternberg & Davidson, 1986). However, there is no single definition which has been accepted by scholars. Moreover, the definitions of giftedness have extended beyond intelligence based notions. One of the most comprehensive definitions of giftedness was given in Marland Report documented by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sydney Marland in 1972 (Marland, 1971/1972). In this report, the definition of giftedness was given as:

> Gifted and talented children are professionally qualified persons wherefore their outstanding abilities and high performance. Gifted and talented children are those who have the capabilities of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and potential in any of the following areas:
>
> 1. General intellectual ability
> 2. Specific academic aptitude
> 3. Creative or productive thinking
> 4. Leadership ability
> 5. Visual and performing arts
> 6. Psychomotor ability (Marland, 1971, pp. 1-3-4).

Hallahan, Kauffman and Pullen (2009) described giftedness as "cognitive (intellectual) superiority (not necessarily of genius calibre), creativity, and motivation in combination and of sufficient magnitude to set the child apart from the vast majority of age peers and make it possible for her or him to contribute something of particular value to society" (p.534).

Crammond (2004) argued that there is no need to a strict definition of giftedness. She explained it with an example of scientists in that they had to be able to identify the universe before studying its nature. On the other hand, Webber (2010) asserted that while schools provide different education programs for gifted students, they must have some working definition of giftedness to be able to decide on student selections and qualifications for these programs. She further discussed that by Crammond's theory, all students have to be involved in a completely individualized education plan which is beneficial but not practical for schools where we need some categorization for students in order to provide them education services.

Gifted students' potential capabilities in various domains, as discussed in previous paragraphs, are important part of the identification process. Definitions consider both academic and psychosocial dimensions of giftedness. In the light of contemporary definitions and conceptualization of giftedness creating permanent standards at state or local levels would be beneficial to address to the appropriate identification and placement processes. The identification process is the first step of creating and organizing services which ensure gifted children receiving appropriate academic support in school (Coleman, 2001). VanTassel-Baska, Patton, and Prillaman (1991), and Coleman (2003) recommended multiple criteria for the identification of gifted learners. Various sources including grades, test scores, performance tasks, recommendations and interviews are some of the standards for

gifted identification (Harwell-Braun, 2010). Student observation while interacting with different learning experiences is another suggested option in this process (Passow, & Frasier, 1996). Policy makers and program administrators should be aware of recommended standards and criteria to implement best practices of identification in the organization of appropriate services to facilitate academic growth of gifted students in schools.

Policy in Gifted Education

Policy Perspectives on Gifted Education

The term *policy* is recognized as difficult to define (Yang, 2007), yet it can be viewed as "socially constructed, consisting of a collection of documents, related texts, and interpretations of these documents and texts by policy makers and the key officials whose job it is to explain the policy" (Phillipson, Phillipson, & Eyre, 2011, p.236). Therefore, how policy makers perceive the intentions of current policies is a key element in the explanation of policy documents (Berk& Rossi, 1999). It strongly depends on the "agendas" of policy makers and changes over "time and space" (Berk& Rossi, 1999, pp. 10-11). Changing governments over time and political fluctuations directly impact the education policy of the nation. When we look at the history of gifted education and its development in the world, we can see various political issues behind it.

The gifted education programs and philosophies date back to the Ancient Athens and Plato. Plato thought that young boys with a particular ability should be educated in a specialized program where they can be prepared as future leaders of the state (Knight, 2006). Education in the Greeks was divided into writing, music, gymnastics, drawing and painting (Tannenbaum, 2000). During the Middles Ages,

the focus of education was on the preservation and understanding of Church ideals (Tannenbaum, 2000). Oxford and Cambridge were prestigious universities where bright students were educated in the areas of theology and philosophy. After the Renaissance the focus of education was on the arts and science instead of theology. The gifted persons were recognized for their performances in these areas (Knight, 2006).

Along with advances in the education studies during the 20th century, most of the developed countries created programs to meet the needs of gifted and talented children. Progressive Education Movement in the United States that peaked in the 1930's had a powerful influence on the education of gifted children. During that time, the first comprehensive studies in the area of gifted education were conducted by several researchers. The main practices recommended for the schools were enrichment and acceleration which used to address the gifted and non-gifted students' academic needs (Tannenbaum, 1983). Two of the pioneering scholars were Terman and Hollingworth. They had highly significant research studies on gifted children. Terman was mainly interested in the reasons of giftedness in the children; he focused on why children were gifted. In his Genetic Studies of Genius, Terman argued that intelligence is genetically inherited and measurable with the IQ test (Matthews &Foster, 2005). Terman also studied social needs and interests of gifted individuals (Knight, 2006). Unlike Terman, Hollingworth focused on how to meet the needs of gifted children (Matthews & Foster, 2005). Her studies influenced educators who stress enrichment rather than advancement over conventional subject matter for the gifted (Stewart, 1999).

After the World War I, the Soviet Union and Germany were two countries with highly structured policies in the education of gifted individuals. They used early

identification of children who had particular abilities and provided special programs for them as a part of a national goal to further the power of the state (Imbeau, 1999). In the Soviet Union, the government demanded well-educated people, especially in the area of mathematics and physics, in order to improve space and military industry. Such requirements necessitated the creation of specialized schools with a more complicated curriculum (Zhilin).

In 1958, Khrushchev, who was the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, implemented a new direction in the education system, called The Polytechnization of Education. One of the key parts of this reform was educational opportunities for gifted and talented students. According to Khrushchev (1960) "The new system of public education must provide appropriate secondary schools for particularly gifted children who, at an early age, clearly show an obvious aptitude for mathematics, music and arts." (p.17)

The modern origins of gifted education evolved after the launching of *Sputnik* by the Soviet Union in the late 1950s. The United States realized that in order to compete on an equal footing with the Soviet Union, they had to consider the education of gifted youth important (Tannenbaum, 1960). A major revival of interest in gifted education in the United States was started in 1970s. One of the important steps in the development of gifted education was the formal definition of giftedness which was issued in Marland Report. The report underlined the importance of special educational services for the children with special talents (Marland, 1971/1972).

In the following years, the identification of gifted and talented youth and their academic and social nurturance started to be an important concern throughout the world. These concerns, however, vary because of the philosophical base and motivations. Some nations see the education of gifted and talented population as a

basic need of society or state, whereas the motivation of some nations is the equality of educational opportunity or the full development of each individual for self-fulfillment (Passow, 1997).

Curricular differentiation and instructional modifications is the main focus of most nations which address the education of gifted children (Passow, 1997). Few countries develop special curricular materials for schools, yet many of them expect classroom teachers to differentiate the curriculum in the classroom for the gifted youth as well as other students who are in need for special education (Passow, 1997). In many nations, extracurricular programs and out-of-school activities are the main part of gifted education programs (Knight, 2006). Also mentorship with adult specialists is becoming an important component of provisions for the gifted youth (Passow, 1997).

In Europe, there is a continuous political struggle between the ideals of elitism and egalitarianism which impact gifted education differently in the various nations of Europe (Persson, Balogh, &Joswig, 2000). Therefore it does not function in the same way as it does in the North America, either as an academic discipline or as a national educational-political effort (Persson, 2009). In some national education policies of European countries, there is utmost emphasis on the education of gifted children, whereas in others, they do not use the term giftedness and do not have any special program for this population (Persson, 2009).

The Scandinavian nations, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark consider a special education program as a counter to the equal opportunity principle. These nations do not tend to make any class distinction for children. Therefore, there is no special program available for the gifted (Persson, Balogh, &Joswig, 2000).

The western part of Europe has the economic power and efficient administration to provide necessary support to the education of gifted children. These nations consider gifted education as an ideological issue. Their main concern is the formation of potentially privileged elite with the specialized programs for gifted children which is a contrary notion to democratic principles (Knight, 2006). Governments pursued a goal not to contravene democratic principles and to have the school systems to put Inclusive Education into practice, which means mixed-ability classrooms for all children (Persson, Balogh, &Joswig, 2000).

One of the important steps in the development of gifted education in Europe was in 1994, when twenty five members of the European Council issued key recommendations for the education of gifted children (Council of Europe, 1994). Some of these recommendations were as follows:

- To promote debate and research amongst psychologist, sociologists, and educators, on the vague and relatively undefined giftedness construct;
- Special educational provision should in no way privilege one group of children to the detriment of the others;
- To legislate for the special educational needs of gifted children to be recognized;
- To promote research on identification, the nature of success, and reasons for school failure;
- To provide information on gifted children within the ordinary school system-Inclusive Education;
- To take measures to avoid the negative consequences of labeling someone as gifted and talented.

Definitions of Policy

Policy in the field of gifted education has been defined by several scholars with subtle differences (VanTassel-Baska, 2009; Gallagher, 2002; Brown, Avery, VanTassel-Baska, Worley, &Stambaugh, 2006). VanTassel-Baska (2009) and Gallagher (2002) in their studies defined policy in a term of allocation of resources. VanTassel-Baska (2009) positioned her definition within educational issues that have to be addressed by a governing board with a major emphasis on resource allocation. VanTassel-Baska (2009) argued that "set of rules and standards by which educational agencies allocate resources to address the identified need" (p. 1297) is the essence of educational policies. Gallagher's (2002) position was within the perspective of social policy as allocation of resources to social needs. Brown et al. (2006) defined policy within the broad scope as the entire process of documentation, interpretation and implementation of ideas. According to Brown et al. (2006), "gifted education policy is tied to the rules, statues, codes, and regulations adopted by state legislatures, interpreted by state school boards of education and state departments of education, and implemented by local school districts" (p.11).

Policy Analysis

The main focus of policy analysis in the field of gifted education has been on the written mandates (Passow&Rudnitski, 1993; Coleman, 1992; Gallagher & Coleman, 1992; Clinkenbeard, Kolloff, & Lord, 2007; Zirkel 2005). State mandates are more important that other types of policy instruments (Clinkenberd et al., 2007). Moreover, they include four important sources of legal authority: (a) federal and state constitutions, (b) legislation or statutes, (c) court and hearing/review officer decisions, and (d) regulation and related administrative policy interpretations (Zirkel,

2005). Passow and Rudnitski (1993) included guidebooks and resource manuals produced by state agencies into the documents for policy analysis.

The literature on policies regarding gifted education has focused on the comprehensiveness of policies (Clinkenbeard, Kolloff, & Lord, 2007; Gallagher, 2002; Coleman, 1992; Passow&Rudnitski, 1993; Landrum, Katsiyannis, &DeWaard, 1998), policies regarding identification issues (Gallagher &Coleman, 1992; Coleman & Gallagher, 1995) or funding issues (Baker, 2001a, 2001b; Baker & McIntire, 2003). Passow and Rudnitski (1993) used a content analysis of several mandates across the states and presented overviews of their structure. Coleman (1992), in detailed case studies of three different states, explored policy structures addressing the needs of gifted children. Gallagher and Coleman (1992) in their Gifted Education Policy Studies Program examined mandates issued for the identification of gifted children and implementation of services.

Studies for a deeper analysis of the policies regarding the practice of gifted education have been carried out from different aspects as mentioned above. Each of the elements within the analyses can be discussed as to have crucial role in creating comprehensive services for the education of gifted children. If we consider that all policies in force have serious influence on the practice, evaluation of programs provided by public or private institutions and examination of their adherence to state policies can be viewed as of great importance. In the next sections, I presented literature on gifted programs and evaluation of the programs. The overall construction of all sections in the literature would help to establish the foundation and context for the topic of this study.

Gifted Education in Turkey

In the case of Turkey, the history of gifted and talented education is traceable to the mid-15th century. During the Ottoman period, bright students were selected and educated in Enderun Schools to become prepared for positions of greater responsibility in the state (Akarsu, 2004b). The aim at establishing the Enderun Academy was to educate ablest youngsters within the Ottoman Empire for the ruling class. The school was established by Mehmet II (1451-1481) with the improvement of the existing palace school (Akkutay, 1984). The ideal age of recruited youngsters was between 10 and 20 years (Taskin, 2008). The system was like a pyramid designed to select the ablest, the elite of the elite, and physically most perfect ones (Armagan, 2006). The curriculum used in Enderun was designed to cover five main divisions: (a) Islamic sciences including Turkish, Arabic and Persian language education, (b) positive sciences such as mathematics and geography, (c) the customs of the Palace, and government and administration issues, (d) art and music education, and (e) physical training. Graduates of the school were assigned to governmental or science positions (Armagan, 2006). Enderun is acknowledged as the first institutionalized gifted education system of the world (Corlu, Burlbaw, Capraro, Corlu, & Han, 2010). However, after the abolition of Enderun in 1909, for a long time there was the lack of comprehensive practice in gifted education.

Gifted education in Turkey, as one of the education fields, cannot be considered apart from the political pressures which directly influence finance and governance of school programs. During the second half of the 20th century, Turkish educational system underwent major changes. These were the changes in educational strategies, policies and processes which cover special education and view it as a

crucial part of the whole education system. The Ministry of Education attempted to make several regulations in order to improve the special education in Turkey. In 1960s, some low-profile efforts were made to establish gifted and talented programs (Enç, 2004). Some of these efforts were (a) the state regulation no.6660 to support education of highly talented children in music and fine art, (b) the project of Ankara Science High School, (c) the establishment of RehberlikveAraştırmaMerkezleri (RAMs, i.e., Guidance and Research Centers) for the identification and diagnosis of children with special needs, (d) free/public boarding school exams, and (e) TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) scholars (Enç, 1979).

Moreover, in 1960, the first school program upon the education of gifted students was implemented in Ankara at elementary school level. The program was named as "özelsınıfvetürdeşyeteneksınıfları" (special class and homogenous talent classes). The gifted students selected from various elementary schools were grouped within a program. In 1961, according to the 50th article of the newly admitted constitution, the education of students with special needs was initiated under the specific strategy plan. This development plan aimed at opening new institutions for children with special needs including gifted within a 10 years period of time (Çağlar, 2004c). However, in the following years the Ministry of Education put an end to the implementation of such a program. The students who completed their K-8 education in homogenous talent classes were enrolled to the Ankara Maarif College (now TED College) to pursue their high school education (Dağlıoğlu, 1995).

In 1965, Ankara University opened the School of Education and launched a special education program at the undergraduate and graduate levels. There were also

special courses on gifted education. In 1979, the School designed a teacher certificate program on gifted education, yet the program was mired down in procedure.

Although the Turkish Educational System has addressed the learning and support needs of exceptional students in a variety of ways, the state has few laws regarding gifted education. The body of literature addressing major issues in the education of gifted and talented students in Turkey is relatively small. Although interest in this area continues to grow, the organization and implementation of gifted programs and state support is limited throughout the country.

There is only one public elementary school in the country where seventy million people live in. Additionally, some private elementary schools do have special gifted classes focusing on the education of gifted K-8 children. These schools use curriculum prepared by the Ministry of Education for regular schools (Çamurlu, 2001). BILSEMs (the Centers for Extracurricular Science and Art Activities) and non-governmental organizations (e.g. ÜstünZekalılarDerneği, TümYetenekliÇocuklarıDesteklemeDerneği, ÇocukVakfı, TürkiyeÜstünYetenekliÇocuklarıEğitimVakfı) striving to respond to the needs of gifted children. The first BİLSEM was opened in 1995. These centers provide extracurricular education for gifted children from all grade levels (MEB, BilimveSanatMerkezleriYönergesi, 1997).

The first serious initiative of preparing comprehensive strategy plan for the education of gifted children was launched in 2004 with the organization of the first nationwide congress of gifted education. The second one was held in 2009. During that time, various reports, papers and assessment documents were presented to address the development of gifted education. The Policy Analysis in the findings and

discussion chapter focused on these documents. As the second part of this study intended to explore and examine current programs in K-8 schools, the review of literature for gifted programs and program evaluation would be important.

Gifted Education Programs

Researchers suggest several program delivery models that can be used in order to create and implement effective programs for the gifted learners. One important element of these models is acceleration. Acceleration is a rapid progress throughout the academic content and is considered as a "nonnegotiable" (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005, p.90) element in gifted education. Accelerated study includes flexibility in scheduling, content and grade level acceleration, and telecommunications options (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005).

According to Van Tassel-Baska (2005), flexible grouping or allowing students to work within the same group based upon their abilities rather than age, differentiation that refers to the curriculum, instruction and assessment are other two essential elements. In her article, she also discusses "higher level questioning techniques" (p.95) and quality teaching as other "nonnegotiables" of gifted education programs.

Scholars in gifted education developed a variety of theories and models addressing an effective learning environment for the gifted students (Hunsaker, 2000). Teachers should be able to understand the components of adopted models and implement them in classroom settings in order to successfully meet gifted students' academic needs. Some essential program delivery models in gifted education are provided below to be helpful lenses through which to examine the program evaluation practices.

Pullout Programs

Pullout program is a form of grouping which allows gifted students to be included in regular classrooms with admission to a resource room (Scott, 2008). In this type of program, students stay in their regular classes for the majority of their instructional time. And for part of the time, they attend a special class with other gifted students from different grade levels (Delcourt, Loyd, Cornell, & Goldberg, 1994). Across-grade grouping permits same achievement level gifted students from different grade levels to come together and form groups in order to work on a variety of topics chosen by themselves or the teacher.

Pullout programs have some weaknesses. Landrum (2004) noted that pullout programs have rigid schedules, and teachers and students do not have enough time to meet together. Moreover, these programs tend to operate as separate entities within schools which would have further disadvantages in schooling.

Within-class Programs

Within-class programs are also special classes where gifted services are provided through core content areas (Christian, 2008). In this model, gifted students receive enriched educational instruction within the regular classroom. They either are grouped together or are permitted to work independently. Within-class programs are usually used for the education of middle and high school level students. The focus of this program is non repetitious instruction, higher academic achievement and the emotional needs of gifted students (Delcourt et al., 1994).

Self-contained Gifted Programs

Self-contained gifted programs have similar characteristics to within-class programs. These two program delivery models are often part of the same gifted program in

local school districts (Christian, 2008). In self-contained gifted programs, gifted students spend all of their instruction time in gifted classes. This model is designed for the gifted students who are in or above the 98th percentile in IQ tests.

Self-contained programs either are housed in high schools to provide accelerated curriculum to gifted students in elementary and junior high school levels or are separated classes to keep gifted students with their age peers (Christian, 2008). Research indicated that self-contained gifted programs have positive outcomes for the gifted students in comparison to normal classroom settings (Van Tassel-Baska, Willis, & Meyer, 2004; Olszweski-Kubilius, 1998).

Resource Consultation Model

In this model all school personnel collaboratively work in a problem-solving process. The gifted teacher has a flexible schedule and works as a resource to both regular classroom teachers and students (Christian, 2008). This model aims at using limited and expensive resources efficiently in order to address gifted students' needs (Kirschenbaum, Armstrong, & Landrum, 1999).

Regular classroom teachers usually have difficulties in addressing gifted students' academic and affective needs because of various impediments including large class size, limited time, and the lack of preparation in the curricular approaches (Tomlinson, 1995). Informing teachers is not as effective as showing them how to modify curricular activities (Westberg, Archambault, Dobyns, &Salvin, 1993). Therefore, in resource consultation model, regular classroom teachers have opportunity to work with gifted teachers and plan how to modify and implement curricular activities collaboratively.

Research showed that resource consultation has led to the improvement in teacher and student behaviors for the school system (Graden, Casy, &Bonstom, 1985), positive teacher attitudes (Kratochwill& Van Someren, 1985), time and cost efficiency (Curtis, Curtis, &Graden, 1988; Knoff&Batsche, 1991), and students' social and academic success (Knoff&Batsche, 1991).

Mixed Model Programs

Mixed model programs are a combination of various program delivery models. Since gifted students have diverse needs, these programs are considered as an appropriate program delivery model in order to provide a variety of services for gifted students. Mixed model programs can be used within a school building or within a school district (Christian, 2008).

One mixed model program was used in a Chinese high school as a combination of accelerated courses and pull-out classes (Lim, 1996). In this program gifted students had opportunities to improve their social skills in a regular classroom with their age peers as well as to enhance academic skills in special classes with their intellectual peers.

Program Evaluation

The term evaluation in gifted education policies either is referring to the term *identification* or is used as a synonym of the term *assessment of programs* (Passow&Rudnitski, 1993; Paul, 2010). In this study, this term is used to refer to the assessment of gifted education programs. In gifted education, program evaluation is considered as very important, though it is more a neglected area of research (Van Tassel-Baska, 2009). Program evaluation is defined as the systematic collection, analysis, interpretation and communication of information regarding the

effectiveness of programs (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). There might be several important reasons for evaluation. Program evaluation can be designed as to aiming at a) determining the value and future of the program, b) improving the program, c) demonstrating that resources are well-managed and efficiently attain desired results, d) managing the program, for routine reporting and for early identification of problems, e) adapting in complex, emergent, and dynamic conditions, and f) enhancing general understandings and identifying generic principles about effectiveness (Patton, 2008).

According to Stufflebeam (2001) one can use various evaluation models and approaches to design a program evaluation. There are some suggestions in the literature specific to gifted program evaluation (Renzulli, 1975; Callahan, 1995; Callahan & Caldwell, 1993; Park, 1984; Van Tassel-Baska&Feng, 2004). However, these are the adaptations of existing models to the gifted education rather than unique theoretical work (Callahan, 2004). Selecting an appropriate methodology is a difficulty in evaluating gifted education programs (Van Tassel-Baska, 2006a). One of the program evaluation models in the gifted education is REDSIL model created by Silky and Reading (1992), but since it was "highly labor-intensive" as described by the authors its adoption as a key methodology might be problematic elsewhere (Phillipson, Phillipson, & Eyre, 2011). Another model for effective evaluation of gifted programs was developed by Tomlinson and Callahan (1994) as a planning matrix. There are some meta-evaluation studies (VanTassel-Baska, 2006a; Callahan, Tomlinson, Hunsaker, Bland, & Moon, 1995) and a handful of published articles of single gifted program evaluation studies (Avery &VanTassel-Baska, 2001; Avery, VanTassel-Baska, & O'Neill, 1997; Hertzog & Fowler, 1999). Carter (1992), in his gifted program evaluation study, used an ex post facto design to offset for the lack of

experimental conditions. House and Lappan (1994) considered the education of disadvantaged learners in their study and recommended authentic assessment as a part of the program evaluation.

The literature suggests student performance as a critical and nonnegotiable dimension of gifted program evaluation (VanTassel-Baska& Avery, 1997). Coleman (1995), for example, focused on both cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes. The researcher measured non-cognitive qualities using the insider perspectives on changes in their behaviors. Harwell-Braun (2010) conducted a mixed method study to evaluate a K-5 gifted program. Data collection in her study involved a survey for students, teachers and administrators, group interviews and classroom observations. She used a Classroom Observation Scale which provided observed quantitative data on classroom practices.

In Turkey, there is no research specific to the evaluation of gifted programs. Moreover, excessive alterations in policies for the gifted children with changing governments brought about the lack of comprehensive program development, and systematic and long-term assessment of programs. In order to address some of the purposes of program evaluation mentioned above, the evaluation process has to be functioned in a more broad sense. Conducting an evaluation program to demonstrate how resources in institutions are managed or to adapt the program in complex and dynamic conditions do need thorough and well-funded evaluation process. And such an evaluation can be accomplished by the Ministry of Education or professional evaluators with necessary funding. In this study, I aimed at to refer to the general understanding of program effectiveness to explore its strengths and weaknesses which would be helpful for the future decisions about the improvement of the programs.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine and describe the existing policies and their elements regarding the education of gifted K-8 students and current K-8 gifted education programs of public and private institutions. The research questions addressed in the policy analysis and program evaluation are as follows:

1. What is the nature of policies regarding the education of gifted children in Turkey?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these policies?
3. How well do the gifted education programs meet the needs of gifted students?
4. What are the practices of teachers and administrators regarding gifted education programs?
5. How do teachers and administrators in the school with gifted programs view and evaluate the implementation process of these programs?

Research Design

The research design used qualitative data to answer the research questions. The COS-R instrument provided a quantitative data on classroom practices. The quantitative data described teacher instruction, their behaviors, the strategies used by them and student responses to teacher behaviors. Permission to use this scale was obtained from the authors (Appendix A).

Research Question 1, which examines the nature and intent of policies regarding the gifted education in Turkey, was answered with the data gathered through content analysis of publicly available policy documents. Research Question 2, which pertains to the strengths and weaknesses of these policies, was also answered with the policy documents. Research Questions 3, 4 and 5 were answered through interviews, questionnaires and classroom observations.

Participants and Instruments

This study sheds light on gifted education policies and relative strengths, limitations, and effects on practices. A content analysis of high-level state policy documents was conducted to explore methods, practices and policies related to the education of gifted students. The researcher examined methods to determining giftedness and identifying gifted students. Moreover, the researcher explored the services provided for these students once they were identified.

The first part of this qualitative study is a content analysis of policy documents. The sources of information were the state department website and the publicly released statutory and regulatory documents of the Ministry of Education. Variouslegislations and regulations regarding special education, the Ministry of Education reports, 2012-2016 *Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted Education, Assessment Pre-report*, *Policy and Strategy Determination Report*, *and PolicyRecommendations Pre-report* werethe documents analyzed to answer first two research questions. These were all the available documents of last fifteen years on gifted education in Turkey.

The second part is the case examples which involve classroom observations in various grade levels of selected elementary schools, interview with teachers and

school administrators, and field notes in order to explore the nature, strength and weaknesses of three elementary schools offering gifted education programs. Two private and one public school with gifted programs were included in the case.

The Classroom Observation Scale (COS) was theinstrument used for classroom observation data collection (VanTassel-Baska&Feng, 2004). This instrument was developed by Dr. Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Dr. Linda Avery, Dr. Jeanne Struck, Dr. Annie Feng, Dr. Bruce Bracken, Diann Drummond, and TamraStambaugh at the College of William and Mary, School of Education. The tool can be used in all grade levels and in all subject areas. The main focus of the COS-R is on the utilization of various strategies in order to promote problem solving, higher order thinking, and meta-cognition (Harwell-Braun, 2010).

Research indicates that teachers of gifted students are strong in various categories of teaching; they have opportunities for improvement in the area of differentiated practices (VanTassel-Baska, 2006a). According to Tomlinson and Callahan (1992), inquiry-based learning, critical and creative thinking, higher-order questioning, and the use of various curriculum materials are innovative classroom practices preferred in the field of gifted education. However, there is minimal evidence to say that schools systematically evaluate gifted students' academic gains by using appropriate learning measures (Avery &VanTassel-Baska, 2001). The COS-R instrument provides an opportunity for gathering evidence of the nature, strengths and weaknesses in gifted programs.

In the field of gifted education, inquiry- based learning, critical and creative thinking, higher order questioning and the use of different curriculum materials are preferable classroom practices rather than explicit use of textbooks (Tomlinson

&Callahan, 1992). According to Avery and Van Tassel-Baska (2001), regardless of the practices there is no systematic evaluation of gifted students' gains in the school districts by using learning measures. The COS-R provides exemplary examples for the observer in order to examine the needs for specific emphases in the program evaluation.

The total instrument contains 25 expected teaching behaviors subsumed under six cluster areas. These cluster areas are curriculum planning and delivery (CPD), accommodations for individual differences (AID), problem solving strategies (PS), critical thinking strategies (CRI), creative thinking strategies (CRE) and research strategies (RS). The numbers of items per behaviors designed to be observed is given in Table 1.

Table 1 Number of items per Behaviors, COS-R

Behaviors	Number of Items
General Teaching Behaviors	
Curriculum planning and delivery	5
Differentiated Teaching Behaviors	
Accommodation for individual differences	4
Problem solving	3
Critical thinking strategies	4
Creative thinking strategies	4
Research strategies	5

The COS-R is composed of two instruments: The COS-R Teacher Observation and the COS-R Student Observation instruments. The COS-R Teacher Observation (Appendix D) is a performance based instrument which assesses teacher performance regarding gifted learners. The teacher behavior items are measured using a Likert scale of 1-3 (1 = non effective, 2 = somewhat effective, 3 = effective). The COS-R Student Observation instrument developed as a companion assessment to the COS-R Teacher Observation to assess student engagement behaviors. The COS-R Student Observation involves 25 corresponding behavioral items related to teacher behavioral items (Appendix E). The assumption is that the effective use of teacher behaviors will elicit a corresponding student behavior. For instance, "The teacher incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge"; the corresponding item in the COS-R Student Observation is "Student applied new learning". A Likert Scale of 0-4 (0=none, 1=few, 2=many, 3= most) was used to assess student engagement behaviors.

Preliminary analyses have demonstrated a .62 to .68 correlation between the COS-R Teacher Observation and the COS-R Student Observation instruments (VanTassel-Baska, Feng, Brown, Bracken, Stambaugh, French, McGowan, Worley, Quek, &Bai, 2008). The content validity of the COS-R is .98 (VanTassel-Baska, Quek, &Feng, 2007), and the interrater reliability according to Cohen's kappa is .82 (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005). The COS-R instrument provides information regarding the process and procedures that teachers and students use during the lesson including lesson delivery and completing assignments (Johnson, Johnson, &Holubec, 1998). The form helps to structure classroom observations and to determine the effectiveness of gifted education program at the classroom level.

Interviews were conducted with teachers and administrators using a semi structured format. Some of the questions for the interviews with teachers were paralleled the questions asked to school administrators or gifted education coordinators (Appendixes B and C). The intent of the design was to gather information using open-ended questions. This qualitative design instrument was used to allow participants to bring to the surface issues that might otherwise stay hidden.

Procedures

For the policy analysis regarding the education of gifted students in Turkey, data were collected by navigating to the web sites of the Ministry of Education and BİLSEMs, from publicly available documents and from various national reports including both electronic and book formats. Also, various Turkish web sites related to gifted education (i.e., NGOs web sites, and private school web sites) and references of articles used for the literature were reviewed to reach all current policy documents.

In order to analyze data, the first round was unitization which is a particularly helpful method in the analysis of documents. Unitization is the process of breaking data into chunks of information that can be analyzed in the light of research questions (Krippendorff, 2004). According to Krippendorff, there are three types of units used in content analysis: sampling units, recording/coding units, and context units. In this study, the policy documents were served as sampling units. Within sampling units, I selected pieces of raw data for coding and separated them from the larger sampling units. These pieces served as recording units. For instance, if a document selected as sampling unit contains a part with the placement procedures of all categories of students who are in need for special education, only the direct

references to the identification of gifted children were included into the pieces for recording analysis. Krippendorff (2004) described context units as "units of textual matter that set limits on the information to be considered in the description of recording units" (p.101). For this study, I used the categorization of high-level policies and mid-level policies as the context units. Policy documents were sorted into two levels: the high-level policies and mid-level policies. High-level policy documents were rules and regulations which had the statutory and regulatory language, whereas mid-level policy documents were interpretations of high-level policies or their application to practice (e.g. guidelines, and procedural manuals). Table 2 provides example to demonstrate the unitization structure for this study.

Table 2 Example Data for Unitization Structure

Example	Sampling Unit	Recording/Coding Unit	Context Unit
The Special Education Regulation	Section 6	Institutions Opened for the education of gifted students	High-Level Policy
	Institutions		
	Part One:	Article 43 –	
	Schools and Institutions for Special Education	(1) The Ministry of Education opens special day education institutions to enhance gifted elementary and secondary school students to develop their talents.	
		(2) In these institutions, the issues that have to be considered are:	
		a) Individualized instruction	
		b) Social and emotional characteristics of gifted students along their academic needs	

Then, these documents were analyzed for specific data on the current policy and practices regarding gifted education in the country. The codes were collapsed into categories to describe the major areas depicted in the state policy documents. These categories were: definition of giftedness, identification practices, screening processes, in-force or recommended program models, and the main objectives for the improvement of programs or implementation of new ones. The findings from these categories were discussed in Chapter 4.

For the program evaluation part of the study, two private schools and a public school with gifted education program were selected. Four different private schools were contacted for the permission. Two of these schools agreed to participate in the study and invited the researcher for information gathering within a short time period. After the school administrations were informed about the study, vice-principals and gifted education coordinators indicated that after meetings with teachers they would inform about their decisions. After the teachers accepted the observation, the classrooms were selected according to the researcher's schedule and for the purpose of obtaining data from more diverse grade levels and courses. Teachers were notified and scheduled for a classroom observation.

The observations in the schools began in March and were completed by the end of April, 2012. The researcher interviewed private schools teachers and gifted education program coordinators during the second week of April following the observation period. The researcher scheduled teacher interviews after the observations in order to prevent possible changes in the nature of lessons because of the issues in the interview questions. The public school coordinator and one teacher were interviewed in the first week of May. The public school program coordinators

were professors from one of the universities. The contact with one of the professors was held through e-mail. After she accepted the interview, the date was arranged. The gifted education coordinator from one of the private schools (School B) did not accept the interview to be audio-recorded, and suggested writing answers himself.

In one of the private schools (School B) I obtained permission for my partner to observe classes together. My partner is a master's student in gifted education program and she also works with gifted children in one of the NGOs. As she also completed COS-R consensus form (Appendix F), we could reach consensus on the teacher and student observation scales. Rates from both of us indicated that there were not remarkable differences between our checklists. The number of classes that we observed together was 6. Yet, the total hours of observation I had in that school were 22. In other two schools I didn't have a partner for achieving inter-rater agreement. It is one of the limitations of this study that I indicated in related section.

The classroom observations included the COS-R checklist utilization and observation notes. Moreover, I had opportunity to talk with other teachers from the institutions involved in the study about the program and to observe teacher-student relationships and collaboration among teachers during break times. The important data collected during these times were included in the researcher's observation notes. The observation data, COS-R checklists and the interviews allowed for triangulation which is the "process of using multiple data-collecting methods" (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007, p.464). This method was helpful for me with the results because data from various sources would produce more confident results.

The individual interviews with administrators and teachers were conducted onsite. The interview questions were focused on: (a) student identification, admission

and placement procedures, (b) assessment, (c) screening, (d) instruction strategies, (e) parent involvement, (f) teacher training, (g) out-of-school activities, (h) collaboration among teachers, and (i) program models. Each of the interviews lasted 25 minutes to 40 minutes. All interviews were taped with the permission from the participants. Guided by Creswell's (1998) process for analyzing qualitative data, the interviews and field notes were transcribed verbatim (Pooley, Breen, Pike, Cohen, & Drew, 2008). All interview transcriptions except one with the gifted education coordinator of the public school were provided to the participants for member-checking their corresponding interviews. Member-checking is an important method for validating and verifying information gathered through interviews (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995).

After the participant reviews the narrative coding was conducted (Glesne&Peshkin, 1992). Interview data were coded using researcher-generated categories derived from the research questions. The verbatim transcription of interviews and field notes facilitated data analysis. Since some of the interview questions directly referenced the specific issues (i.e., identification, placement, and assessment procedures), responses to these questions were parceled out from the whole interview transcripts. Other responses were categorized according to areas of concern. After reviewing and analyzing the field notes and interview responses, the researcher grouped the emerging patterns from both of the sources. The interview transcripts observation notes were categorized according to each of three selected schools. In order to avoid confusion and to keep the data well organized, the researcher followed Bogdan and Biklen's (2003) framework. That is, all data collected from each school were analyzed before moving on to the analysis of the next. Also, the COS-R results and the interview responses regarding instructional

strategies were matched in order to see if there are any inconsistencies. Conducting interviews at the end of classroom observation period provided an opportunity to look through a classroom observation result of each teacher before interviewing them. Therefore, in a case of inconsistency I could ask questions to open their responses or to clarify the specific issue of concern. Discussions on data gathered through both classroom observation scale and interviews were discussed in Chapter 4.The quotations from the interviews were included to demonstrate support for the categories.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are organized within two parts. Findings in the first part are based on analysis of policy documents regarding gifted education. This first part focuses on the gifted education policy in the light of following research questions:

1. What is the nature and intent of policies regarding the education of gifted children in Turkey?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these policies?

The second part presents the case examples of the current gifted education programs in Istanbul, Turkey at the elementary school level and explores the answers to research questions:

3. How well do the gifted education programs meet the needs of gifted students?
4. What are the practices of teachers and school administrators regarding the gifted education programs?
5. How do teachers and administrators in the school with gifted programs view and evaluate the implementation process of these programs?

Part 1

The Policy Analysis

The Constitution of the Turkish Republic underlines the importance of education for individuals with special needs. In Article 42, it is indicated that "…The Government

takes measures to help those in need of special education to become useful members of society. Education and instruction institutions provide activities related only to education, instruction, research and investigation. These activities may not be hindered under any circumstances." (Turkish Constitution, 1982, Article 42). Supporting individuals' own interests and abilities, and providing them with equal opportunity in developing their knowledge and skills were emphasized in the Basic Law of National Education no. 1739. According to the Law, the government aims at raising all Turkish citizens as:

> (a) individuals who have a balanced and healthy personality and character, who are developed in terms of body, mind, moral, spirit and emotions, free and with scientific thinking abilities and a wide worldview, who respect human rights, who value personality and enterprise, who are responsible towards society, who are constructive, creative and productive.
>
> (b) in line with their own interests and abilities, to prepare them for life by helping them to acquire the required knowledge, skills, behavior and cooperative working habits, and to ensure they have a profession which will make them happy and contribute to the happiness of society (MEB, 2001).

One of the important pieces of legislation (2916) regarding the special education in Turkey was accepted by the Parliament in 1983. It was modified in December 1985 (Special Education Committee Report, 1991). Because after that the special education has become one of the most important issues in Turkey, the passing of the legislation can be considered as a vital progress in the area. According the Special Education Legislation (2916), all children have the right to be educated and no one can be deprived of this right. The emphasis on each child's education right is also stressed in the Basic Law of National Education (1739). The Law guarantees primary education. The Article 8 of the legislation indicated that the government takes measures for the children who are in need of special education. Within this

context, all special schools should be organized for curricular issues, teacher training and funding.

In 1991, the Ministry of Education organized a National Congress for special education (MEB Report, 1991). Along with other categories such as students with learning disabilities or physical handicaps, gifted students are defined and accepted as a group who are in need for special education too. As a result, the considerable increasing in the number of special schools had continued up during 1990s. During those years, special education departments were established under the Ministry of Education and the government increased annual grant of special education teachers (MEB Report, 1997). However, the gifted education remained as problematic issue with almost devoid of the institution catering to the needs of gifted population. From the beginning of 2000s, the expectation of voluntary societies challenged the government to take an action in deciding national policy and develop necessary programs addressing the education of gifted children.

Definition

The First Special Education Council defined gifted students as students who, compared to their peers, demonstrate higher level performance from the aspect of general and/or specific talents identified by experts in the area (MEB, 1991). In the regulation for the Science and Art Centers (2001), gifted students are defined as those students who, compared to their peers, demonstrate high level performance in intelligence, creativity, art and leadership areas or in special academic domains and who are in need for services which cannot be provided by the schools to develop their talents. According to the Special Education Regulation of the Ministry of Education (2006), gifted and talented are individuals who have intelligence,

creativity, art, sport and leadership capacities or who demonstrate outstanding performance in special academic areas compared to their peers.

A definition of giftedness is based on a single measure of IQ testing which requires at least a score of 130 (ÜstünYetenekliÇocuklarKomisyonRaporu, 2004). In the module prepared by the Ministry of Education as introductory course project for teacher education trainees, gifted children are defined as those who continually score above 130 on various intelligence tests and score in the 98th percentile among population of their age peers (MEB, 2007). In this module, various definitions according to the classification of gifted and talented population were given. The classification and their definitions are as follows:

Child with special talents (*özelyetenekliçocuk*): either demonstrates outstanding performance in one or more intelligence or talent domains, or has potential intellectual abilities and has average skills in other areas.

Child with higher special talents (*üstünözelyetenekliçocuk*): demonstrates extraordinary talent or success in one domain and has average intellectual skills in other domains.

Creative child (*yaratıcılıkyeteneğiayrıcalıklıolançocuk*): has independent and outstanding thinking skills or is able to express his thoughts with domains of art or music.

Child with special leadership skills (*liderlikgizilgücüayrıcalıklıolançocuk*): possesses and presents talents and abilities from very early age in influencing other people.

Child with extraordinary talents (*olağanüstüyetenekliçocuklar*): demonstrates extraordinary talent in one of the performance domains such as music, ballet, drama and theatre.

Child with extraordinary talents in psychomotor domain: demonstrates extraordinary talents in sports and has outstanding abilities in speed, stamina, coordination, and ball control etc.

Identification

The RAMs are officially responsible for the identification and assessment of children with special needs for their provisions in schools. The General Directorate of Special Education, Guidance and Research Services is supervising the running of the RAMs (MEB Report, 2006). The formal identification strategies are based on the use of multiple criteria during the three phase process: pre-assessment, group aptitude and achievement tests, and some individual tests (MEB, BilimveSanatMerkezleriYönergesi, 2007). Teacher observation forms of students nominated to the identification process are evaluated by the Identification Committee. Based on the results, the names of students who are listed as candidates to group aptitude and achievement tests are notified to their schools or parents (BİLSEMs Regulation/Article 10). The Executive Board decides the dates of group tests and informs the schools or families of qualified students. Finally, the students who have shown particularly adequate performance are nominated for individual tests. The individual tests can be administered by the RAMs or the psychological counselors of educational institutions recommended by the Identification Committee (BİLSEMs Regulation/Article 12).

The private institutions have their own identification procedures which vary from school to school. For instance, TürkEğitimVakfıİnançTürkeşLisesi (TEVİTÖL), a private high school which offers a gifted education program at the high school level uses a comprehensive identification model including the

Progressive Matrices Group Test, WISC-R intelligence scale and one week orientation for performance assessment (Bildiren&Uzun, 2007). The identification procedures used by the private schools at the elementary school level were discussed in the next section based on the interview findings.

The identification procedure of gifted children in BİLSEMS as written in the document is as follows: The Ministry of Education sends "The Observation Form" to all school districts on October of each year. These forms are filled by the class teachers of primary and elementary school for K-8 students, and by the class guide teachers for high school students. Teachers and school committees nominate students who might be gifted according to their observations. School directorates prepare documents for these students and send to BİLSEMs by the end of March. BİLSEMs investigate the student documents and two months later invite them to take group tests prepared by the Ministry of Education. Primary and Elementary school students who are successful in group tests are directed either to BİLSEMs or RAMs. After the expert and psychologist observations list of students who are identified as gifted or talented are send to General Directorate to be approved. Lastly, the students are enrolled to the centers according to their total scores.

Placement and Screening

In the state documents, education of gifted students is included as a part of the special education. The main attention is permissive and inclusive education for all students with special educational needs including those identified as gifted and talented. The two major forms in the documents to respond these students' diverse needs are: (1) Placement, and (2) Screening. According to the Special Education Regulation of the Ministry of Education (2006), the requisite for the placement is to

appropriately direct the students with special education needs to the services where they can be educated in the least restrictive environment. The Committee on Special Education (ÖzelEğitimHizmetleriKurulu) decides an appropriate placement for an individual who has special educational needs. Placement options are decided according to individuals' interests, needs, and performances in developmental and academic disciplines (Placement/Article 12-b). In the Article 13 of the document, screening is taken as an important element in planning special educational services and providing continuous education. Individualized Education Program (IEP) is stressed as significant part of screening in order to review the realization of recommendedobjectives. Moreover, "the screening process includes the collaboration among the Committee on Special Education, RAMs, schools/institutions and families" (Screening/Article 13-3).

Strategy Plan

The number of public education institutions dealing with gifted children is limited in Turkey. At the elementary school level, there is only one public school, which only accepts 24 students every year. The lack of systematic effort for developing necessary practices and programs has been allowed to continue to the present time. However, during the last few years, the government has assumed a greater responsibility in gifted education. The Ministry of Education has taken the issue into an account and has charted the road map of the solutions catering to the needs of gifted children. Within this context, 2012-2016 *Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted* is a considerable step for the development of gifted education in Turkey.

Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted adopts an approach that allows the development of individuals' gifted potentials equitably, whatever their age, gender and background. The methods suggested in the document were based on various educational strategies for the education of gifted individuals. As Turkish education system experiences deficiencies in this area, the strategy plan aims at charting the road map for the gifted education in both formal and informal education settings. The intention to plan and develop this strategy document includes several processes such as condition assessment, policy recommendations, and policy and strategy determination. In 2004, the *Assessment Pre-report* was prepared in I. National Gifted Student Congress (UlusalÜstünYetenekliÇocuklarKongresi) as a result of the collaborative work of the Ministry of Education, ÇocukVakfı and the Marmara University. *Policy and Strategy Determination Report* which was prepared and approved on September, 2004 and *PolicyRecommendations Pre-report* can be considered as other important steps in developing the strategy plan.

Institutions for Gifted Education

According to the Article 117/d of Elementary Education Institution Regulation, students with special talents should be provided with support services in various institutions. The *Assessment Pre-report* (2004) summarized current practices regarding gifted education in Turkey. The report discussed several state-run institutions which provide education to students with high intellectual and artistic abilities. Science High Schools, Anatolian High Schools, Anatolian Fine Art Schools, TUBİTAK are the examples to such institutions. The public institutions that cater to specifically gifted children are Beyazit Elementary School, TEVİTÖL, and BİLSEMs.

According to the document, BİLSEMs hold a key role in addressing to the needs of gifted population. BİLSEMs are publicly funded centers which offer comprehensive out of school courses for this population. Currently, there are a total of 62 such centers in 56 different cities. And 9.125 students identified as gifted and talented are educated in the BİLSEMs (MEB, 2012). These centers are established by the General Directorate of Special Education, Guidance and Research Services.

The importance of the BİLSEMs also emphasized as a part of *The Advanced Level Learning Environments* approach in the strategy document. The document recommends increasing the number of these centers all around the country. Gifted students learn by working in groups on specific projects as an out-of-school activity. The projects might be a product or a thought on a specific topic as well as the solution to current problems of daily life. Preparing project proposal, making some plans on the budget, discussing possible solution ways, and writing reports regarding the results of the project are some important phases of this practice helping gifted students to develop academic and social skills. The report suggested teachers working in BİLSEMs to become capable of guiding and mentoring the students in these projects.

The *PolicyRecommendations Pre-report* indicated that the informal education would have a key role in gifted education. The document recommended the establishment of special centers called YETİ (YetenekTanılamaveİzlemeMerkezleriveNoktaları – The centers for talent identification and screening) for the identification and monitoring of talents. The establishment of such centers aimed at providing services for gifted children regardless of their socio-economic background. The importance of planning of

financial support for gifted children from low economic families is also underlined in the document. "The Institution Model" which indicates the establishment of a special institution for gifted education is another recommended issue. According to this model Turkish Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Institution (TürkiyeÜstünYetenkliÇocuklarveGençlerKurumu) will be responsible from informal educational activities for gifted individuals. The aims were to organize and conduct nationwide research studies, to evaluate and improve current education policies, to develop identification methods, and to contribute planning and implementation in gifted education programs. The document also recommended some funding provided in the establishment of this institution.

Strategic Purposes

Strategic purposes of 2012-2016 *Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted*include: (a) strengthening the legal and institutional structures, (b) forming education implementation models, (c) developing models and systems for the identification, monitoring, evaluation and decision of gifted students, (d) improving human resources who can either work in gifted education environments or give support to, (e) preparing criteria and standards in choosing materials concerning the education of gifted students in real and virtual environments, (f) improving public consciousness on gifted children, (g) cooperation with public, university, NGOs, etc. (h) creating differentiated and enriched education environments, and developing art, music and sport programs.

As one of the strategic purposes, the identification, monitoring, evaluation and decision making processes regarding gifted children take an important part in the document. Developing systematical techniques for monitoring and evaluating

children's talents and creating local, regional and nationwide instruments for the comparison of the talents are necessary requirements of this strategic purpose.

Standards and Principles

The values, standards and principles were formed and given in the strategic plan. The institutions with gifted education program will need to take account of the guidance that accompanies these obligatory norms. According to the document, *thevalues* in developing student talents are:

1- Respect to individual differences
2- Respect to interest areas
3- Liberty in producing their own academic work
4- Culture of support and encouragement
5- Respect to the individual having the right to develop their potentials

The standards given in the document are listed as follows: (a) Originality, (b) Quality in working, technical capacity, deep reasoning, (c) difficulty level, (d) complexity level, (e) Advantage and function, (f) Esthetic, (g) Cost effect, and (h) Ethics/ Sharing. Finally, the *principles* are:

1. Early intervention
2. Association with formal and informal education
3. Learning by doing and discovering in a project-based work
4. Thematic interdisciplinary models
5. Persistence and continuity in programs
6. Variety (approaches, materials, etc.)
7. Differentiation

8. Flexibility and dynamism
9. Enrichment
10. Originality
11. Practicality and applicability
12. Diversity evaluation environment
13. Considering social and emotional needs

Gifted Education Models

Moreover, the *Assessment Pre-report* discussed the nature of appropriate gifted education model from different aspects. First of all, the gifted education model recommended for the Turkey, have to be more than merely academic, social and psychological support or out-of-school activities. Besides increasing the number of BİLSEMs nationwide, there have to be formal education institutions for gifted children. The model suggested for the formal education has to be analyzed and evaluated thoroughly from different perspectives. Teaching programs, professional teachers, building, student identification, funding, and employment opportunities for the graduates are some aspects that have to be considered in order to create the education environment completely remote from political pressure and impact.

The Advanced Level Learning Environments is considered as a main approach that the 2012-2016 *Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted* is based on. The document explains that because gifted students are in need of diverse teaching techniques, this is the recommended approach to actualize such a strategy plan appropriately. *The Advanced Level Learning Environments* approach is related with the Complexity Theory, and is based on a paradigm composed of dynamic, individual based processes. This umbrella approach suggests the application of

various models in the education of gifted students. *Pullout program, Within-class program, Self-contained gifted program, Mixed-model program, Resource consultation model,* club activities, out-of-school activities are examples to these models.

The resource consultation model is also stressed in the Special Education Regulation (2006). According to this regulation, educational institutions have to open resource rooms for students with special needs (Section 3, Article 28/1-2). The number of resource rooms may vary across the institutions due to their sizes. School administrations are responsible to plan educational activities in these rooms. Identification of students who are in need for this service is carried out by school psychologists and counselors. The number of hours that a student spends in a resource room cannot exceed 40% of a total school time in a week. The education delivering model recommended in the Special Education Regulation for resource rooms is individual learning rather than group learning, but in some specific cases students can be grouped according to their performance levels (Article 28/2-e).

The *Strategy and Implementation Plan* document states that gifted students should not be labeled and the emphasis should be on presented talents rather than individuals themselves. Therefore, in order to decide the kind of appropriate program for a student, educators should consider the quality of a produced work and try to avoid the disadvantages of students' labeling.

Furthermore, the document examines the given models in both formal and informal education dimensions. Therefore, it focuses on two different application areas with their own models. According to the *PolicyRecommendations Pre-report* (2004), in the formal education part, cluster grouping and separate schools are two

recommended implementations. Cluster grouping can be made either with a large or a small number of students. One of the aimed regulations concerning gifted children is their early entrance into the school before the age of six. Moderate acceleration and radical acceleration are other important practices which recommended for addressing gifted children's academic needs. Summer schools, club activities, project groups, apprenticeship model, mentoring, e-learning, enrichment, special gifted classes are some other examples to models recommended in the strategy plan.

The *Assessment Pre-report* emphasized various programs that BİLSEMs offer for gifted students. These programs are categorized under five headings: (a) Adaptation Programs; (b) Supportive Education Programs; (c) Programs for Recognizing Individual Talents; (d) Programs for Developing Special Abilities; (e) Project Development Programs. Supportive Education Programs involve several interest areas in order to meet these students' multifaceted needs. As indicated in the document, these programs are:

1- Communication Skills Program,
2- Computer Skills Program,
3- Foreign Language Skills Program,
4- Problem Solving Techniques Program,
5- Collaborative Work Techniques Program,
6- Learning Methods Program,
7- Social Activities Program,
8- Research Methods Program,
9- Scientific Work Methods Program.

After the identification and assessment of each student, they are admitted to the programs according to their interests and abilities. The programs are designed to enhance students' various skills and techniques.

Part 2

Program Evaluation

The program evaluation aimed at examining and describing the current gifted education programs in Istanbul, Turkey at the elementary school level. One public and two private schools with gifted programs were the focus of this study. In this part, the data collection phase includes interviews with principals or gifted program coordinators, interviews with teachers, and classroom observations. The reported data regarding program evaluation answer to the following research questions:

1. How well do the gifted education programs meet the needs of gifted students?
2. What are the practices of teachers and school administrators regarding the gifted education programs?
3. How do teachers and administrators in the school with gifted programs view and evaluate the implementation process of these programs?

Classroom Observation Findings

The responses of these questions were explored through classroom observations and interviews. Also, field notes were helpful tools in gathering further information regarding the programs. The focus of the interview questions was on the presence, quality and content of a comprehensive plan that includes identification procedures, curriculum and instruction, teacher preparation, and parent involvement. Before and

during the lessons, teachers had provided necessary information regarding the content of the lessons and prepared activities.

Table 3 summarizes the number of teachers, students, classroom hours and grade levels involved in five week observation period. The observations were held in three different schools. These schools are designated as School A, School B and School C. The total number of observed classroom hours is 66, 26 hours in School A, 22 hours in School B and 18 hours in School C. Each classroom hour was 40 minutes in length. The observation was made during March and April, 2012. Two teachers from each school were involved in this observation period. The total number of observed students was 122.

Table 3. The Number of Observed Teachers, Students and Classroom Hours

	School A	School B	School C
The number of observed teachers	2	2	2
The number of observed students	36	38	48
The number of observed hours	26	22	18
Grade levels	1,3,5,6	3,6	4,5

Data gathered through observations in different classes provided snapshot of current instructional practices in the public and private elementary schools with gifted programs. Table 4 summarizes the data from the teacher observation.

Both the COS-R Teacher Observation and the COS-R Student Observation were rated on the basis of classroom observations of two different teachers from each

school. On the same day of observation in one of the classes, I completed both teacher observation and students observation checklists. At the end of observation period I had a total of 31 completed checklists which is almost half of a total number of observed hours. I added all scores for specific items obtained from each teacher's lessons and divided them into the number of observed hours. Then, I added all scores given to both teachers from each school, and completed table 4 indicating each school's total score for the given categories over the maximum possible score.

Table 4. COS-R Teacher Observation

Behavior	School	Score
Curriculum planning and delivery	School A	21/30
	School B	19/30
	School C	15/30
	Mean (all)	18.3/30
Differentiated teaching behaviors	School A	15/24
	School B	11/24
	School C	9/24
	Mean (all)	11.6/24
Problem solving	School A	11/18
	School B	11/18
	School C	7/18
	Mean (all)	9.7/18
Critical thinking strategies	School A	15/24
	School B	15/24
	School C	7/24
	Mean (all)	9.3/24

Table 4.(continued)

Behavior	School	Score
Creative thinking strategies	School A	19/24
	School B	17/24
	School C	10/24
	Mean (all)	15.3/24
Research strategies	School A	11/30
	School B	0/30
	School C	0/30
	Mean (all)	3.7/30

Table 5. COS-R percentages

Category	School A	School B	School C	Mean (all)
Curriculum Planning and delivery	70%	63%	50%	61%
Differentiated Teaching Behaviors	63%	46%	38%	49%
Problem Solving	61%	61%	39%	54%
Critical Thinking	63%	63%	29%	52%
Creative Thinking	79%	71%	42%	64%
Research Strategies	37%	0%	0%	12%

The use of problem solving behavior in the schools A and B was observed at an effective level. However, problem identification and definition was sometimes ineffective or the teachers had used is rarely. Brainstorming techniques were used generally at the introduction part of each lesson and during some problems. Critical thinking and creative thinking are very important behaviors that teachers of gifted learners should use regularly. Critical thinking percentages are the same for School A

and School B. Creative thinking percentages for both schools, on the other hand, are higher, but School B teachers used that strategy less than those of School A. The Table 5 shows that only creative thinking percentage of School A can be considered on the expected level, yet it also includes several insufficiencies. For instance, the creative thinking behaviors of one teacher were somewhat effective; there was evidence that the teacher was not clear and focused on the purposes of the learning.

The collected data revealed that research strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors have the lowest rates among observed categories. Research strategies were observed as underused behaviors among all categories. Only one of the teachers from School A used research strategies in his classes. He many times asked students to collect data and information from the internet or other sources and they discussed students' findings in the class. This behavior was not observed in School B and School C. Differentiated teaching behaviors in the schools were observed lower than the expected level too. The percentage of the behavior in School B is 46% which is very low for the class with gifted students. This rate is much lower in School C, 38%. The result of low rate differentiate teaching behaviors is consistent with the previous studies which suggest that while teachers of gifted students exhibit quality teaching behaviors in many areas of instruction, they have less success in differentiated practices (VanTassel-Baska, 2004).

Tables revealed that the overall rates of COS-R instrument for School C are very low. These data indicate that the education in this school is below the expected level of meeting gifted students' academic needs. One of the observed teachers in this school uses a traditional teacher-centered approach. Most of the recommended teaching behaviors for the education of gifted children were ineffective or non-observed in the lessons of one of the selected teachers in School C. The teacher very

rarely engaged students to develop and elaborate on their ideas. Further, she didn't employ brainstorming techniques effectively. Almost all employed problem solving and critical and creative thinking techniques were very below the expected level. Another teacher, however, evidenced some demonstration of behaviors such as providing independent and group learning, encouraging students to evaluate problems and issues, engaging them in comparing and contrasting ideas, and providing opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas.

The second part of the classroom observation scale included student observation which was related with student responses to teacher behaviors. The categories in this part of the instrument were arranged according to the first part. The data regarding student observation are shown on the Table 6.

Table 6. COS-R Student Observation, Percentages of Students Displaying the Mentioned Behavior

Category	Most (>75%)	Many (50-75%)	Some (25-50%)	Few (<25%)	None	N/A
General Classroom Behaviors		A B	C			
Differentiation		A	B	C		
Problem solving			A B	C		
Critical thinking			A B	C		
Creative thinking			A B	C		
Research strategies			A		B C	

Observed student behaviors shown on the table 6 were consistent with the teacher behaviors. As part of the general classroom behavior, more than half of the students demonstrated a high level of performance, successfully applied new learning, articulated thinking process and reflected on their learning. However, the number of students who demonstrated monitoring and evaluating behavior in this category was between 25 and 50 % of the total number of students.

Although the overall percentages of both School A and School B in critical and creative thinking strategies are shows as 25-50 %, the percentage of students in School A who were observed as engaged in some items of critical and creative thinking strategies is higher than the percentage of students in School B. For instance, between 50 and 70 % of the students in School A made judgments about or evaluated situations, problems, or issues. Also, the percentage of the students who were observed as engaged in synthesizing or summarizing information within or across disciplines is the same. However, these both values in School B are lower as between 25 and 50 % of the all students in visited classrooms.

The COS-R Student Observation data rates for the School C are also very low. Data indicated that student behaviors in private schools show substantial differences to those in a public school. Differentiation, problem solving, critical thinking and creative thinking strategies that the School C teachers used were very poor. The data in the Table 6 is consistent with this finding. That is, very few evidences were observed in student responses to those strategies. There were also some items which were not observed despite their significance in a classroom environment. For instance, during 18 hours of observation in classrooms, there was no evidence that the students worked on tiered assignments or tasks of choice. Furthermore, as a part of critical thinking category, two items were not observed during the lessons. Students did not have an opportunity to generalize from specific to abstract data or information, and to synthesize or summarize information within or across disciplines. Also, there was no evidence that students explored diverse ways to think about a situation, object or event.

Data presented above revealed that the overall effectiveness of schools in the education of gifted students is below the expected level. In some categories, the

School A showed more satisfactory results than other two schools, yet many important behaviors especially under the categories of problem solving and research strategies were either ineffective or not observed. The observation results of private schools (A and B) were close to each other in three categories (problem solving, critical thinking and creative thinking) of both the teacher and the student observation scales. As the Tables 4, 5 and 6 indicated, the results for the School C were not satisfactory. The percentages of the School C in all categories of the COS-R teacher observation instrument (Table 4.4) were below 50%, which means that the effectiveness of the School C is highly questionable.

Interview Findings

What the nature of gifted education programs is and how these programs are organized in order to meet the needs of gifted children was a key issue that I focused in this study. Besides the classroom observations, teachers' explanations about the program and their views on the gifted education were critical to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the schools. To answer these questions, I turned to the teachers and school administrators themselves. I met them within one-on-one interviews. The interviews were made with the gifted education coordinators from all three schools and with two teachers from the School A, two teachers from the School B and one teacher from the School C.

The interview questions for administrators and teachers were different. The main focus of questions to administrators was related to the general philosophy and intent of their program, the nature of the program; teacher training, current principles, student identification and placement, implementations and evaluation (Appendix B). The questions for teachers, however, included teacher techniques to

meet the needs of gifted children, lesson planning, curriculum adaptation, collaboration with colleagues and parents (Appendix C).

The quotations from the interview transcript or field notes will contain code numbers/pseudonym to mark the data and responses from the respondents. The last letter of a code indicates a school of respondent (School A, B and C). The first letters indicate either the administrator (A) or the teacher (T). For instance, T2-A is the second teacher from the School A, and A1-C is an administrator from the School C (Table 7).

Table 7. Respondents in the Interviews

Schools	School Type (Public / Private)	Respondents	Pseudonyms
School A	Private	The Gifted Program Coordinator	A1-A
		Clasroom Teacher	T1-A
		Classroom Teacher	T2-A
School B	Private	The Gifted Program Coordinator	A1-A
		Clasroom Teacher	T1-A
		Classroom Teacher	T2-A
School C	Public	The Gifted Program Advisor	A1-A
		Clasroom Teacher	T1-A

The interview with the administrator in School A was held with the Gifted Education Program (GEP) coordinator, who is also a school principal supervising all sixth graders. The administrator from the School B interviewed in the study was also the gifted education coordinator of the school. But his responsibility is only gifted classes. For the School C, which is a public school focused on the education of gifted students, I interviewed a professor from the university. She is one of the academic

advisors and a coordinator of this school. The school is operating as a pilot school under the supervision of the university.

Aims and Philosophies

The School A and the School B are operating as Integrated Programs schools with school-based gifted education program. “We aim at developing children’s various skills rather than preparing them to university or high-school entrance examinations” reported A1-A. He stated that within two years they will admit only students who are identified as gifted and talented. Therefore, the school will become one which only offers and education program for gifted children. During last seven years, the aim of the school administration has been to improve the program and became one of the leading institutions of gifted education in Turkey.

A1-B thinks that gifted students definitely need special education, and he stated that as a school philosophy they are aiming at providing necessary education for the children according to their talents and interest areas. “And making them happy and successful in their lives” he added. Although the school B has an eight-year experience in the gifted education, the school does need more systematic education program for these students. A1-B also underlined this requirement and explained that in the following years they will have more emphasis especially on teacher training and creating a collaborative environment where teachers will share their experiences and take a role in decision making processes.

The third school selected in this study is a public school which offers education for gifted students in mixed classes. The school has been operating since 2002. According to A1-C, initiating a gifted program in a public school under supervision of university professors who are leading figures of gifted education in

Turkey was very important step in developing the area in the country. “As gifted children are considered as part of the population who are in need for the special education, providing necessary academic, social and psychological support to them is a vital responsibility of the state” talked A1-C. Therefore, basic aim under founding such a school is to find out possible ways to educate this population and to trying a gifted education model in the country. A1-C underlined that the model utilized in the school is in its project phase and as a university they have various programs addressing issues from parent/teacher training to service development.

School Characteristics

Currently, in the School A, there are 120 students which are identified as gifted according to the WISC-R test. The gifted education program in this school was established in 2005. In the first year, the school implemented research and development in order to prepare curriculum and instructional support systems that address the education of gifted children. There are a total of seven classes: two classes for the first grade students, and one class for each grades from second to sixth.

In the School B there are a total of 214 students identified as gifted. The gifted education program in this school was established in 2004, now there are eight separate classes for gifted students from 1st to 8th grades. The number of students in each class is between 15 and 20. Not all gifted students are educated in separate classes, 70 of them are enrolled in enrichment classes where they receive within-class programs as well as pull-out programs. A1-B indicated that in order to prevent the disadvantage of a pull-out program where a group of gifted students might be seen as operating as separate entities within the school, teachers sometimes take gifted and sometimes another group of students to the resource room. Also, the pull-

out program involves only specific courses such as creativity, visual perception, art lesson, etc.

The School C has a total of 16 mixed classes from 1st to 8th grades with both gifted and normal students. During its first six years, school admitted a total of 60 students in each academic year. Half of the students were selected from those identified as gifted in RAMs, and another half were normal students from the school district. During last four years, however, the number of total students enrolled in the school is reduced to 48. Students are distributed into two classes, each class with the same number of gifted and normal students. In the academic year of 2011-2012, there are 24 students in each class from 1st to 4th grades and the average number of students from 5 to 8 grades is 30. The main gifted education model implemented in the school is within-class program. There are no pull-out or resource-room programs in the school.

The private schools in Turkey offering education for gifted students either are separate schools or are serving as Integrated Program schools with school-based gifted education program. In this study, both of the selected schools are Integrated Program schools with special gifted classes. One of them also has enrichment classes with both gifted and normally developed students. As it was indicated in the previous chapter, in both of the private schools gifted education programs are separate units which have gifted education coordinators designated within the school system as responsible for leading the programs. These coordinators are responsible to school directors and are able to arrange meetings with teachers, school psychologist and other personnel. The findings revealed that in both of the private schools, the members of staff are clearly aware of their responsibilities. The assignment of responsibility and personal functions in a school environment and contributing to the

system-wide collective efforts were emerged through the findings. This kind of organization can be considered as important element in the development of appropriate school environment for gifted children.

Identification and Placement

Identification and placement criteria or procedures usually are considered as part of the gifted evaluations (Christian, 2008). As discussed above, a single measure of giftedness is defined by WISC-R IQ tests in Turkey. But some institutions, especially schools offering gifted programs have some other criteria to enroll students who are identified as gifted according to their WISC-R test performance. One of the interview questions directed to the administrators was about the identification and placement procedures of the schools.

In the School A, A1-A reported that the reference testing for the placement of students is WISC-R. But this is not the single way to decide whether a student will be admitted by the school. Firstly, a student who applies for the gifted program must have a minimum score of 135 on WISC-R. Then, the school administers TKT (Basic Objective Test) and requires at least 120 from this test. Next step is an orientation program which generally lasts for four days. During this period of time, students take all necessary placement tests including Torrance Test of Creative Thinking, Raven's Progressive Matrices Test and Bender-Gestalt Test. Based on student scores on 12 different tests, the school admits students to either gifted or enrichment classes. The students enrolled to the gifted classes are those with highest scores from the series of placement tests. Remaining students with enough scores from these tests are admitted to enrichment classes.

The School B has a two phase testing process in admission of students to the gifted program. The minimum score on WISC-R is 130 for students who want to apply to this school. But in some cases the school may include students with special talents who score below 130. The school designed the placement tests for all entering students. Also, the placement includes the assessment by a school psychologist and gifted education coordinator. “In the country, we do not have specific placement standards, and student identification is based solely on one test. If we do not assess the students and administer further tests, the placement won’t be objective and fair” reported A1-B. The school has an academic advisor who supervises placement and program implementation processes regularly.

Students, who apply for the School C, have to be identified as gifted in RAMs. The students have to be aged at least 60 months. The school administers two phase tests: group and individual performance tests. Consequently, the results are approved by the Ministry of Education; the school announces the names of enrolled students. The identification and placement process is limited to general intellectual and specific academic areas.

Content of the Programs

In the School A, there are some courses which are called as “*FarkDersleri*” (Distinction Courses) as a part of the gifted education program. These courses are Creativity, Visual Perception, Thinking Skills and Play Skills. The teachers who taught these courses are also class teachers of each gifted education classes from 1st to 5th grades. They are working with the gifted education coordinator as a separate group focused on gifted education. Other teachers of regular courses such as science, language, music, or art are not involved in Gifted Education Project nor do they answer to the gifted education coordinator. They are directly connected to the vice-

principal who supervises all education activities including gifted education. The School A also put various weekend workshop activities into practice which designed according to students' interest areas and intended for developing their academic and social skills.

In the School B, besides normal school courses there are also some courses such as Creativity, Social Skills, Drama, and Thinking Skills as a part of gifted education program. The natures of the programs in both private schools are very similar, but the content of program offered for gifted students in School B is not extensive as in the School A. There are some Science and Project Olympiad groups in the School B which have members from both gifted and enrichment classes. The weekend workshop programs were designed for students of various interest areas, "but there are some difficulties in this project and it does not function as organized as expected" (A1-A). The reason is that the teachers, who are responsible for guiding these workshops, as they are full-time teachers, do have a very busy schedule during the week. Majority of other teachers, however, are not occupied as much as these ones. Therefore, there are some complaints about the school program and planning. The workshops which are also designed as product-based programs are not operated well and the gifted program seems to be limited with only four distinction courses which, according to the classroom observation data, do not include important teaching strategies at expected level.

The collected data showed that the School C has very limited services focused on the education of gifted students. There is almost no practice that address to improving students' skills. The lack of special courses or workshops that enhance gifted students' talents according to their interest areas can be considered as an

important incompetence of the school. Although the teachers try to meet academic needs of both gifted and normal students in the same class, interview and observation findings showed that the performances are very poor.

Curriculum and Assessment

Findings showed that the School A and the School B take gifted students' various academic needs into the account by implementing several programs such as the distinction courses, weekend workshops and activities, science and art groups and Olympiad teams. Beside these practices, teachers also should structure a classroom environment to address the variety of abilities, learning preferences and interests. In this context, differentiated instruction should be considered as a sine qua non of a classroom with gifted children. Research indicated that purposeful differentiated instruction during the school day is beneficial for students, both gifted and non-gifted (Landrum, 2004). Table 4 and Table 5 in the previous section demonstrated information regarding differentiated instruction strategies used in the schools. The percentage results were below expected level for the classrooms with gifted students. This issue was also involved in the interviews. One of the interview questions to administrators and teachers was about meeting diverse academic needs of gifted students within a classroom. Before the question of whether teachers differentiate the instruction, I wondered if they accept the variety among gifted students. Two of the teachers mentioned that differences among gifted children are much more extensive than differences in a class of non-gifted. "Therefore," T2-A explained, "these students do need more differentiated instruction because of large differences in their interest areas and learning styles".

A1-A and A1-B reported that the contents of the distinction courses taught in these schools are focused on diverse student profiles. “We prepared the content of these courses in order to improve students’ skills and develop their creativity in various domains. Although teachers sometimes ask students to work in groups, the main emphasis in these courses is individual work. We request from teachers to pay attention to each student’s progress individually” commented A1-A. Therefore, differentiated instruction in the distinction courses is supported by the course design and curriculum planning by the school administration. In other courses, however, varying the instruction is dependent on teacher initiative. It is similarly up to the teachers’ own preferences in School C.

Teachers from both private schools explained that they consider diverse student factors during planning and delivering instruction. T1-B and T2-A reported that while planning the instruction according to various student profiles, they face serious challenges. The reason, as they revealed, is the lack of comprehensive curriculum. “It doesn’t allow teachers to organize, for example, recommended problems and activities for various academic levels. It contains only one or two activities after each lesson plan. And these tasks usually are either very easy or complex to embed into your lesson plan. So, we have to use various sources in order to design a lesson plan which would address all students’ interest areas” told T2-A. “The curriculum does not consider distinctness in student interest and intellectual levels. The tasks and activities in the curriculum are not suitable to be taught at different degrees of complexity” (T1-A). T1-B underlined that she spends too much time preparing tasks, activities and assessments because of the lack of a guide and source. She added, “But despite all these problems and difficulties, I think that it is my responsibility, and I have to try to do my best in differentiating the lesson”.

The School A uses a curriculum compacting, especially through 1st to 3rd grades. A1-A explained that:

> The gifted students have high perception and learning capacities, they can learn more easily in contrast to their age peers. In the curriculum, however, there is a lot of repetitive knowledge. By using a curriculum compacting we get more time. For instance, in the curriculum the number of class hours for the Turkish language course is given as 11, but we reduced it to 9 hours. Remained 2 hours, we allocate for the Difference Courses such as creativity, visual perception on for the social activities.

T2-B reported that she uses curriculum acceleration and compacting. But in the school B it is not compulsory for all teachers; it is on teachers' responsibility to decide how to design and plan the lesson, however "cooperation with experienced colleagues is very beneficial in making decisions regarding the changes in the curriculum" (T1-B).

Grade skipping, early entrance, advanced level courses, compacted courses, continuous progress in the regular classroom, concurrent enrollment in advanced classes, and credit by examination are some of the education options recommended for the education of gifted children (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985). A1-A reported that the school currently implements advanced level courses and compacted courses as a part of the gifted education program. The school B implements these two options in the similar way with the school A. Also, both of the private schools group students only within their grade levels.

T1-A and T2-A pointed out that they have various assessment methods to measure students' academic growth over time. Based on the assessment the teachers determine the extent to which the students acquired necessary knowledge during a specific time period. T1-A added that "based on the assessments we made some modifications in the curriculum and in our instruction method. These assessments

have a role to check ourselves in the light of students' progress." T1-B reported that in order to assess her students' mathematics skills she often prepares problems on the topics that she has yet not taught. "But these problems are open-ended and students can solve them with logical reasoning. In this manner, I assess how they approach to the problem, and learn about their problem solving skills." T1-A, T2-A and T2-B stressed that one of the assessment methods that they use is observation. T1-A told that he likes to open up students' responds and initiate discussions in a classroom environment. "Usually I use the 'why?' question, and ask them to support their ideas" he added. Therefore, in the School A and B students' classroom performances during group works or classroom discussion are considered an important part of assessment.

A1-A explained that they have special training camp programs with the class teachers of gifted students at the beginning of each semester. These programs take four to seven days. "We discuss pros and cons of previous semester education and try to find solutions to specific problems" stated A1-A and continued, "…also we work on the content of each course and prepare materials for the next semester." Although the courses specific to gifted students can be taught by all gifted class teachers, each teacher have experienced in one of the courses. For instance, Creativity course is taught by three different teachers, but one of them is responsible to research recent studies on creativity and to learn how the creativity courses are designed in different nations. "The teacher responsible to the research on the specific course shares findings, and we together discuss how to improve the content of the lesson and to prepare the curriculum specific to the course.

Teacher Training

As teacher preparation is a key factor for the appropriate education of these children, the focus of some interview questions were on in-service teacher training and teacher selection. A1-A explained that they have already arranged all teacher training programs before the academic year. As a part of their training programs, teachers are asked to attend to various national and international education seminars, workshops and conferences. For instance, the teachers have learned how to administer Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking in one of the gifted education centers. The Torrance Test education was taught by Dr. Bonnie Cramond who is a Torrance Center director in the US. Furthermore, Dr.Cramond has visited the school and gave a seminar to teachers and parents on gifted education. A1-A indicated that "The training programs include several symposia and seminars presented by various scholars from Turkey and US. Our teachers are desired to participate in such programs. They are eager to improve themselves. And as a school administration we are here to support them and ensure the effective education for all our students including those who are gifted and talented."

The interviewed teachers from the School A underlined that they are aware of the importance of improving themselves in gifted education. Therefore, they are very eager in attending various education programs and doing research in order to improve the quality of their lessons. T2-A has 15 years of teaching experience. He started teaching gifted children 6 years ago; now his students are fifth graders. "When I started to work with these children I realized that teaching these students is much difficult. Addressing their academic success and focusing on their social development at the same time is really challenging. And now, after the five years of

experience in working with them I cannot say yes, I know all about these students" he explained.

T1-B is a young teacher who has graduated from one of the prestigious universities in Turkey. "Since it's my third year in this profession", she added, "There are a lot of things I really need to learn both from my colleagues and even from my students". She believes that as a teacher of gifted students she has big responsibilities, and because of it she has to be a well-organized and knowledgeable teacher. "Teaching these students is a rewarding experience but it is not as simple as teaching normal students; if you come to the class without necessary preparation they will easily punish you with their deep and meaningful questions and very demands" she stated. T2-B pointed out that he loves to work with gifted students: "Although it has some challenges, working with these children is my own preference and I really enjoy when I see their success". Both of the teachers from the School B underlined that they are willing to participate various education programs even the school does not ask them.

In the School A, the teachers of distinction courses were not graduates of gifted education department. However, they are planning to attend online gifted education courses this year. A1-A explained that they met college professors, enrolled all teachers to the program and planned all the procedures for the Fall, 2012. He told that,

> We pay attention to teacher training. During the last six years, since we started the gifted education project we have arranged various seminars and panels for it. Also, with our teachers we went to the United States in order to see current practices in the area. We visited some schools with gifted programs there and had opportunity to talk with school administration and teachers. This year we talked with our advisor and planned to enroll our teachers to online certification program in gifted education.

The content of teacher training program of the School B is similar to that of the School A. A1-B reported that they follow the dates of important national and international education conferences, seminars and workshops and that they inform teachers. The emphasis here was 'suggestion' and 'willingness'. The field notes and interview with the teacher also support this remark. For instance, one of the follow up questions with the T1-B was: "Do you, with the coordinator and other teachers, schedule these (seminars, conferences, etc.)? Have you decided which programs are you going to attend, for example, following months?" T1-B said "no", but she explained that she is already following and is on to these programs from the internet or other sources, but the school does not ask whether they attended or not. These findings revealed that the program of the School B regarding teacher training was not planned and well-organized. A1-B mentioned some seminars and workshops that the teachers were asked to attend. However, field notes reveal that these programs were not scheduled in the school's academic calendar, and only volunteer teachers with interests planned to attend.

A1-A reported that although the distinction course teachers are dynamo of the program, they regularly meet with other teachers and work in collaboration. "For instance," he added, "for the next year we planned our teachers to be enrolled to the online gifted education program. Not only the distinction course teachers but also other teachers are involved in this program" Eight different courses will be taught by professors. " He said that, for example, creativity or visual perception teachers are experienced to teach gifted students, but teachers of music, foreign language or science and technology courses are not very knowledgeable about the education of gifted learners. "Now we are in the second phase", added A1-A and continued, "we aim at enriching the content of other courses. I mean, we plan to embed, for instance,

thinking skill in to the English language course. We meet with the teachers and discuss how we prepare various activities to address these skills".

A1-C revealed that school administration does not have any plan for teacher training. Various seminars and workshops for teachers are organized by the gifted education department of the university which supervises the program. "The teacher training programs", added A1-C, "are spread throughout the academic year". The responsibility in designing and implementing the school program including teacher training is not shared by school administration, the only initiative is on the university. Therefore, a lack of organization in such an essential part of schooling might cause overall ineffectiveness in the program. On the other hand, since the establishment of this school was the very first step in an advancement of gifted education in Turkey, failure of a project would have a destructive effect on the area and might cut off the sustaining efforts. A1-C said that "it is almost tenth year of the project. It is quite a long period for deciding whether the program is beneficial or not. So, the Ministry of Education should either terminate the project or approve it."

Problems and Solutions

Careful planning and problem solving can be considered to be key elements of the appropriate gifted education program. The field notes, interviews and classroom observations were helpful tools to explore the presence of careful planning and problem solving in the schools. Actually, it should be a good chance to have an opportunity to participate in teacher meetings and observe how these processes are going on. The findings revealed that the private schools successfully overcome problems by means of collaborative work. However, in the public school there were many opposing complaints from both parents and teachers as observed during the

school visits. On the other hand, planning in the School A was encouraging. The number of regular and irregular teacher meetings, one to one talks and discussions in teachers' room were as much as expected for the successful gifted education program. In the School B and School C, however, there wasn't any evidence of careful planning, and the connection between the coordinator and the gifted teachers was not at expected level.

Gifted children should be considered as a unique population. Teaching this population presents its own convenience and challenges. Gifted children have characteristics which differ from their age-maters. Some of these attributes are strengths, yet potential problems might be associated with them (Clark, 1992). Therefore, teachers should be aware of characteristics of gifted students in order to be able to solve their academic and psychosocial problems and enhance their development. The teachers, in this study, emphasized the challenges in teaching gifted children, yet they also stressed that working with this population has its own rewards. T2-B underlines the complexity and variation in the characteristics of gifted students. According to him, gifted children are very sensitive to criticism and tend to be accepted by their environment. "But sometimes they can easily criticize others, for example, their peers. This behavior and 'emotionality' of peers who are also gifted might cause conflict in a classroom setting". T1-A explained that "During my five years of teaching gifted students, I have experienced many different problems that I hadn't met before while working with non-gifted children. It brings a great responsibility, and sometimes a teacher becomes perplexed because of these confused and interesting problems. Sometimes it really becomes very difficult to solve problems of these students." According to T2-A, one of the problems that he encounters is avoidance of risk-taking. "I have observed it in many of my students"

he explained, “firstly, somehow they weigh out the given task, and then decide not to undertake it if they don’t accept the risk.” T2-A confessed that it is very hard to him to motivate those students in such cases.

Further, they discussed how they consider these students’ differences and what they do in order to cope with the potential problems. The School-A teachers and the GEC stressed the importance of collaborative work with colleagues and parents. T1-A stated that the traits of gifted children are presented in the same way at their homes. He further explained, “So, their parents also are aware of their children’s characteristics. It helps us to establish a dialogue with families.” T2-A also underlined crucial role of collaboration between teachers and parents. He told that “If you have a close communication with families and if no one criticizes other side in case of problem, it means that you already have moved ahead in solution.” According to A1-A, the presence of collaboration in their school is a kind of tradition. “The parents of gifted children, generally, are knowledgeable. We consider that their role in this institution is very crucial. Therefore, we intended to establish such an atmosphere where we can benefit from parents’ experiences”, he revealed.

A1-A reported that it’s teachers’ fifth years with the same classes of gifted students. According to him, the teachers know their students well. T1-A said that he considers them as members of his own family: “I spend most of my time with my students. Even more than with my own child (he smiles). Not only in class hours, but also during break times or in the weekends we all are together”. “Students do not hesitate to ask or express their problems to their teachers”, A1-A continued. Some examples in my field notes supported these views. In observed gifted classes, teacher student relationship within a class hours and during the break time was at expected

level. The positive impact of the teachers' care on children's behaviors was noted during observations. Teachers were patient while listening to students' expressions on, for example, conflicts or other problems. In the beginning of 3rd graders' Thinking Skills course T1-A asked students to work individually on at least eight activities from their book. Throughout the class hour the students were asking the number of finished activities to each other and were competing with each other. It was a kind of motivation for them, and almost all students were engaged in the task, except one female student. She didn't want to keep working on the activities after the third one. While visiting each of the students, the teacher realized that the student was demoralized and had lost her concentration. Although the teacher tried to learn the problem and helped the student to continue working, he wasn't successful. After the lesson when other students went out, the teacher sit in front of the student and asked why she was sad. The reason was that she couldn't fall into step with her peers. She considered it as a big failure and didn't want to compete with others. It was a kind of avoidance of risk-taking. And the research show that it might result in underachievement (Whitmore, 1980). The teacher (T1-A) talked with the student and tried to motivate her. Next lesson I have an opportunity to observe the same class, but since there was no individual work and competence among students, I couldn't understand whether the teacher motivation had an impact on the students' effort. But the key point here was the teacher's desire and approach to solve the problem and the relation between the teacher and the student. The student expressed her problem cordially and expected the teacher to find a solution to her problem. There was a trust and healthy dialogue.

T1-B reported that she has a very close relationship with her students and parents: "I know even my students' shoe sizes; our relationship is smooth and

cordial. They easily share their problems and we help families in the solutions." T2-B underlined that if teacher student relationship is not at expected level, children do not tend to share their problems. He further discussed that, "as teachers, it is our responsibility to care for them and understand whether they are happy or have any problem." However, "sometimes it is very difficult to understand problems of, especially, quite students. You cannot observe any changes in their behaviors unless it affects their academic achievement" (T2-B). In such cases, according to teacher reports, working in partnership with parents and school psychologist or counselor would be a way of problem solving.

According to T1-B, working with gifted students is easier for teachers, and "usually I enjoy teaching them because of their higher intellectual capacity". On the other hand, their characteristics sometimes lead to social and emotional problems in school settings. Also, possible social and emotional problems "might affect group work or even individual work when they consider specific tasks as a competence" (T2-B). Therefore, might be destructive from academic aspect. In other to prevent such problems, the teachers are aware of knowing gifted student characteristics very well and learn about potential problems and their solutions.

In the School C, both normal and gifted students are educating in the same classrooms. Studying in the school is considered highly selective for gifted children, yet the administration has to register non-gifted students whose official place of residence is nigh the school. Therefore, "there might be some students who are under normal intelligence level" (A1-C). Teachers of these school also complaint about such diversity in the classrooms."Gifted students are not grouped according to their intelligence levels; also normal students show a great diversity in their intellectual

capacities. Therefore teaching in such an environment builds a big burden to a teacher" (T1-C). Families of non-gifted students who live in a school district are very eager to enroll their children to this school. "They think that among gifted learners their children's achievements will be affected positively" explained A1-C. Parents of gifted students, however, are not pleased because of this issue. The Ministry of Education has launched investigations into parent's complaints since the establishment of the school. And during last few years many school principals have been dismissed from their positions.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Previous studies show that according to teachers "strength of the program lay in the infrastructure and in the resources provided by the school" (Lim, 1996, p. 6). The participants in this study also underlined the importance of such resources and made a complaint against poor resources for the gifted education program. However, in the private schools these insufficiencies were not due to the lack of necessary funding by the school administration, rather especially related with the stagnant development of the area in the country. Teachers and administrators reported that there were almost no books written in Turkish that can be used as a resource in their lessons.

A1-A underlined the importance of teaching materials for lesson such as creativity, visual perceptions and thinking skills. "However," he stressed, "in Turkey there is a lack of such resources. So, it is very difficult to find any books or other materials here." Therefore, the private schools generally purchase such materials from abroad. Teachers or the gifted coordinator, for example, visit education expositions in Europe. They research and obtain information on various resources. Finally, the school administration approves and provides funds for the purchase.

T1-B also reported that she prepares assignments from various foreign resources written in English. “Then, I have to translate them in Turkish” she added. A1-B explained that school textbooks do not address to gifted students well, “also for some of the courses such as creativity, thinking skills, it is very hard to find any national resource” (A1-B). However, the private school teachers and administrators (Schools A and B) believe that in spite of such difficulties, after some years of experience in this area they have assured necessary materials and prepared their own resources.

T1-A indicated that a weakness of their school is a lack of infrastructure of special centers such as a botanical garden. He told that:

> These students tend to learn by seeing, touching and doing. I usually plan some field trips to give them such opportunity and they love these very much. Museums, for example, are importance places where students can learn. But rather I would hope to have our own centers, for instance a botanical garden where students become interested in plants and learn.

T2-B also talked about the weaknesses of the school B. He said: “The school should be much systematic, should improve assessment methods and curriculum. Also, we should stop to work as parents demand. The school administration should allow teachers of gifted students to concentrate on this area and make them to have opportunity to research on the area.”

One of the observed features of the School A and School B that can be considered as an important strength was collaboration among teachers. All of the teachers from these two schools underlined the need to learn more and improve themselves in this area in order to successfully address gifted students’ academic and social needs. In the School C, however, teachers were not inclined to work together. Moreover, some problems and tensions were observed in the school setting. The

principal has recently been appointed to the school and previous school counselor who was a doctoral student in gifted education had left the school during this academic year. Analysis of the observation notes revealed that the teachers were repeatedly expressed their displeasure about the program. They were complainant due to the tensions they were feeling about the investigations. “Parents, especially those of gifted, have regularly blame teachers and school administration that we cannot meet their children’s needs” pointed one of the class teachers in our talk during the break time. T1-C, the interviewed teacher, touched on all these problems and indicated that “these issues became ordinary problems that we meet almost week”.

Discussion

The issue of identification and the screening mechanism was a considerable one that emerged from the findings. The identification processes of gifted students are generally carried out by RAMs. The private schools (the School B and C) admit only applications of students who are identified as gifted in these centers. The only procedures that private schools implement are their own assessment standards for student admission and placement. These standards are neither supervised by the Ministry of Education nor referenced to any state document. The identification procedure in School A, however, matches that indicated in the BİLSEMs Regulation document. As it was described in the policy analysis, group tests and individual tests are two important assessment processes used for the identification. Class teachers in regular schools can nominate students for the identification processes. Teacher observation forms help teachers to describe their observations about students’ talents, attitudes and skills (MEB, BilimveSanatMerkezleriYönergesi, 2007). The following processes are group and individual evaluation as mentioned above.

This kind of screening process identifies a large pool of potentially eligible students. However, these two phased procedure might have a risk that many nontraditional gifted students might be ignored and never have a chance to receive the thorough evaluation and education in such program. Research recommended that comprehensive screening process should include several strategies (Coleman & Gallagher, 1992). First of all, in each school district there should be a screening process of all student files for indications of giftedness. Staff development in regular schools to increase their ability to recognize nontraditional gifted students is also important issue for comprehensive screening process. Moreover, the use of a checklist by teachers and case study examples on nontraditional gifted students would be helpful to recognize underachieving students. Encouraging the use of autobiographies is another recommendation that would assist with the identification of gifted students from special populations. The similar strategies do not appear in any policy document.

Teacher nomination has a significant role in this identification and screening system. According to Renzulli and Reis (1985), orientation and training of teachers about the program and procedures for nominating students should be in a consideration. “In this regard, we recommend the use of a training activity that is designed to orient teachers to the behavioral characteristics of superior students.” (pp. 203- 210) This recommendation covers all regular school teachers especially those at elementary level. Organizing nation-wide training programs would need necessary regulations and systematic effort as well. Although, for example, the BİLSEMs regulation described the roles of regular school teachers in student nomination (MEB, BilimveSanatMerkezleriYönergesi, 2007), there is no special emphasis on the training of these teachers in any state policy.

The identification of the gifted population in Turkey is based on a single measure of intelligence. The *Assessment Pre-report* (2004) criticized the identification of gifted children based only this measure. The document indicated that rather focusing on different aspects of intelligence, IQ test instruments such as WISC-R measure the total intelligence power of an individual. The document proposed various recommendations regarding the identification of gifted students. The identification should include various aspects. Besides the objective measuring instruments, the parent and teacher observations should be considered in order to have much accurate information about students. The identification and selection procedure should consist of several processes. Therefore, primarily the instruments and scales should be available to make all the processes applicable. Also, the validity and reliability of all adapted or developed instruments have to be tested.

On the other hand, the identification based on a single intelligence measure does not support the placement of gifted students in appropriate programs. Various selection and admission procedures used by the schools strive to obviate disadvantages of this identification practice. However, the findings indicated that each of the selected schools has its own procedure which does not have any connection to state policies. The worse is that prescribed policies or regulatory base for procedures of the identification and placement do not exist. Systematically identifying gifted students and connecting to supplemental policies should be a considerable issue that the state should pay attention to (Brown et al., 2006).

Having distinct placement procedures and education models with a lack of basis on specific state-wide standards would have further problems. Currently, the number of elementary schools with gifted programs is limited, therefore distinction in placement and education models do not attract much attention. When the number

increases, auditing all institutions with distinct programs will become inconvenient. Creating systemic reform agenda after the private institutions with gifted programs become prevalent might have serious problems in reestablishing education models in these schools. Moreover, such a reform agenda will be a late realization of the confusion and complexity in the education of gifted students. Therefore, assertive steps in studying and documenting necessary standards for integrating gifted education programs are very important.

Identification practices are closely related to the issue of gifted children from culturally diverse populations or low socioeconomic families. Identification and inclusion of gifted students from low socioeconomic, disadvantaged and minority populations are key equity issues which nested within findings (Russo, Harris, & Ford, 1996; Fithian, 2003). Research indicates that limited identification practices, such as exclusive reliance of intelligence tests, beget gifted students who have often been overlooked (VanTassel-Baska, Patton, &Prillaman, 1991). Students with disabilities and students from culturally diverse populations and economically disadvantaged families are the potential population that might have been overlooked (Richert, 1991). The analysis revealed that state policy concerning the education of gifted children from low socioeconomic, disadvantaged and minority populations does not exist. Moreover, the findings from gifted programs revealed that there is not any attempt on identification and inclusion of these children in the schools. The private schools offer financial support only for a very few number of students who demonstrate outstanding success in various national examinations or contests. These students, however, have to be in eighth grade or even older. However, if we consider that the identification and placement of gifted children should be in early grades for early intervention, the school districts and state policies do not have concerns for

greater equity. Overall, we should consider that giftedness is not elitist. It cuts across all socio-economic, ethnic and national groups (Dickinson, 1970). Therefore, there is a strong need for the state-wide policies to eliminate this problematic situation.

The state policy documents underlined the importance of the education of gifted students starting from their early ages regardless of their backgrounds. Equity in education was taken as a considerable issue that has close relationship with gifted education. Individuals with gifted potentials, on the other hand, are emphasized as valuable resources for meeting the needs of the society and state. The intention and motivation of planning such strategy overlaps with Passow's (1997) findings. He stated that some nations consider the education of gifted students as a basic need of state, whereas some others have an intention to provide the equality of educational opportunities and the development of each individual's self-fulfillment. This document stressed both issues to underpin the importance of gifted education.

There are some flexibly paced educational options recommended for gifted programs in K-8 level. According to Cox, Daniel & Boston (1985) such options which are relatively easy to implement in school settings include grade skipping, early entrance, advanced level courses, compacted courses, continuous progress in the regular classroom, concurrent enrollment in advanced classes, and credit by examination. The findings revealed that the School A and the School B use advanced level courses and compacted courses in gifted classes. Since these two options: advanced level courses and compacted courses are based on competence and demonstrated ability (Webb, 1994), using arbitrary age groupings in the program would not be appropriate. As findings demonstrated, both of the schools which use indicated options group students only within their grade levels/ages. Actually,

arbitrary age groupings are not supported and allowed by the Ministry of Education in any of the school districts with gifted programs.

The program evaluation also revealed that the School A uses compacting in the curriculum especially in the first three grades in order to enable students to skip parts of the curriculum they have already mastered and substitute more challenging content. The School A pays attention to modifying the curriculum, in the School B, however, it is a teacher's initiative to decide whether to use any modification or not. The previous studies strongly stressed the importance of curriculum modification in the education of gifted. For instance, Rogers (1991) argued that enriched or accelerated curriculum is very beneficial for gifted students to experience substantial academic gains. Rogers (1991) indicated that:

> it is very clear that the academic effects of a variety of long and short-term grouping options for both the purposes of enrichment and acceleration are extremely beneficial for students who are academically or intellectually gifted or talented. There is no body of evidence that "the research says" otherwise! (pp. 25-26).

Therefore, various programs for teachers of gifted students organized by school districts should provide necessary information and training to enable teachers to practice on these strategies. Moreover, it should be watched closely by school administrations to decide whether teachers guarantee proficiency in basic curriculum and create a challenging learning environment for gifted children.

Both the public and private schools with gifted programs use the same curriculum prepared by the Ministry of Education for regular schools. As it is indicated in the literature review, all schools with gifted programs in Turkey follow the same curriculum designed by the Ministry of Education (Çamurlu, 2001).The

findings revealed that teachers complained about the content of curriculum indicating that it does not address to gifted students learning styles and academic levels. The complaints were specifically on the problems, tasks and activities in the curriculum. The teachers from private schools pointed out their efforts to modify curriculum. The data collected from the public school, however, didn't demonstrate an evidence of a curriculum modification. According to Davis and Rimm (2005), a high-quality curriculum should always be devised with the consideration of the learning activities that are provided in an exemplary gifted program. Thus, curriculum developers and policy makers should consider that it would be an important step to develop a curriculum which accounts for the broad range of talents and academic needs of gifted learners.

The gifted program in private schools was designed as to address to student abilities in various domains as well as to their academic needs. As mentioned in the previous chapter, both of these schools (the School A and B) designed several courses (i.e., creativity, visual perception, and thinking skills) which they call the distinction courses. Among the core classes taught in all regular schools, this kind of classes has a key role in developing students' talents on the basis of their interest areas. The content of these courses are also feasible and appropriate for both individual and group works. The practice which address a broad range of student talents (academic, artistic, creative, leadership), socio-emotional and academic needs, and grouping processes is considered as a must of gifted program design (Purcell & Eckert, 2006).

The policy documents also emphasized several components of effective programs. The strategy document listed the principles in developing student talents. The list of principles was given in the previous chapter. Some of these principles are

related with the practices that the private schools implement. Variety in approaches and materials, learning by doing and discovering in a project-based work, thematic interdisciplinary models, and programs considering social and emotional needs of gifted students are some of these which are aimed in the private schools. The collected data revealed that these and other principles given in the state document are not met in the public school.

Extracurricular activities also are very important parts of gifted education programming. In many nations, such activities are embedded into nationwide gifted programs (Knight, 2006). Findings revealed that the School A does not have any program for extracurricular activities and the School B implement some programs for all students, not specific to gifted ones. The School A, as described in the findings, pays attention to extracurricular programs. Various in week and weekend programs are considered as important part of schooling for gifted students according to their interests. Research suggests that students who are involved in extracurricular activities are less likely to become underachievers (Colangelo, Kerr, Christensen, & Maxey, 1993; Reis, Herbert, Diaz, Maxfield, &Ratley, 1995). The analysis of documents revealed that such activities are strongly recommended by the state too. BİLSEMs, as emphasized in the literature and findings chapters, are centers established especially for this purpose. The meaning of BİLSEMs as indicated before is the Centers for Extracurricular Science and Art Activities. The newly documented strategy plan also attaches importance to this kind of programs. However, a lack of extracurricular program in the School A which is directly supervised by the Ministry of Education , the agency for government policy, funding, curriculum planning in all levels of public education, can be considered as an incompatible issue in gifted programming.

Although there are many advantages of being a teacher of gifted students, successfully responding to these students' needs is really challenged. The interview findings revealed teacher views on this subject. The teachers explained pros and cons of working with gifted students, but none of them had a complaint about it. But the question is whether teachers were able to create effective teaching learning environment for gifted learners. The data collected from classroom observations indicated that teacher behaviors and student responses to corresponding behaviors in the private schools are tolerable in compared with those of observed in the public school. Teacher training programs provided by the private school administrations and the voluntariness of the gifted education teachers in these schools might increase the effectiveness of gifted programs in the following years. However, as the findings revealed, there is serious problems in the implementation of education model recommended for the School C. Without teachers with experiences and necessary knowledge in the area, expecting prosperous effectiveness in the gifted program is not realistic enough.

The problem is that as the School C is a public school, majority of teachers in the school are permanent (*'kadrolu'* in Turkish) teachers. Permanent teachers appointed directly by the Ministry of Education and they cannot be expelled by the school administration. Although the school is established to educate gifted students, during teacher recruitment processes the Ministry of Education does not consider whether appointed teachers have gifted education background or they have required skills and capabilities. The gifted education advisor of the School C (A1-C) stressed the lack of necessary experience or education of the school teachers in the gifted area. The effects of this problem were observed during classroom observations. The COS-R findings indicated the same problematic issue too. The tables in previous

chapter revealed how teacher instruction strategies were effective during lessons. Moreover, although T1-C was a voluntary participant in the study, his responses to the interview questions were very short. He described himself as: "Hardworking, caring my students, love my profession, and doing my work decently." The responds to specific questions were restricted into some specific and basic expressions. And these were not consistent with classroom observation data. He refrained from giving comprehensive answers especially in questions related to classroom teaching strategies and teacher-parent collaboration. Research shows that the teacher recruitment process for the public school with gifted program carried out by the Ministry of Education is highly debatable. Research discussed the issue of teacher assignment for gifted programs. For example, Mandrell and Fiscus (1981) argued that not all teachers should be assigned to teach the gifted. Teachers assigned to gifted programs should be enthusiastic (Chandler & Bean, 1998; Heath, 1997; Sisk, 1989), flexible (Renzulli, 1992), creative (Chandler & Bean, 1998), and expert in the area being taught (Bishop, 1968). These are some of the characteristics that effective teachers of gifted possess.

Research indicated that ineffective teachers had a depressed effect on gifted students' achievement (Sanders & Rivers, 1996). Therefore, the point that effective teachers of gifted should possess specific characteristics is as of great importance as having necessary knowledge and experience in teaching gifted students. The findings indicated that interviewed teachers from two of the private schools reported a preference for teaching gifted students, being more student-centered in their teaching style, and enthusiastic about the profession. Some of these characteristics are suggested in previous studies. For instance, in the research study with 200 teachers of gifted students, Bishop (1968) concluded that a group of exemplary teachers was

characterized by higher achievement needs, systematic and orderly, enthusiastic about their subject matter, superior intelligence and greater literary and cultural interests and student-centered.

Interpreting Bishop's findings Howley, Howley and Pendavris (1986) suggested that effective teachers possess the characteristics (i.e, creativity, tolerance for ambiguity, and interest in literature and cultural matters) very similar to those ascribed to gifted students. Also, effective teachers of gifted have similar personality and cognitive orientations with their students. According to Renzulli (1992), school districts should "devote considerable effort to analyzing the preferred learning styles of students and look for opportunities to place students with teachers who have compatible styles" (p. 58). Since personality and cognitive styles of gifted students differ from those of more average-achieving students (Mills, 2003), teacher characteristics and styles for being a teacher of gifted students should be viewed different than those required for teachers of high achievers. Therefore, private school districts and the Ministry of Education should have plan for changing their policies and standards in teacher selection and appointment process.

Because gifted students have distinct academic, social and emotional needs and can exhibit many unique characteristics, using individualized education for these students should become a component of the gifted program and curricula. Teacher should be trained to learn how to use differentiated education strategies to respond gifted students' needs and how to deal with various problems that might appear in lessons. Since in the country there is only one undergraduate program for teaching gifted, in-service training should be helpful to develop teacher skills in educating gifted learners. Nevertheless, providing services to gifted population with well

trained teachers will remain as a highly problematic issue unless the number of the gifted programs at university level is increased.

The findings indicated that all three schools give importance to teacher training. Moreover, the teachers of the private schools revealed their voluntariness in participating in conferences, workshops and training programs organized by different institutions. The policy documents also discussed the need for teacher training. For example, *the Assessment Pre-report* emphasized the need for teachers to become knowledgeable about gifted children's characteristics and their academic and social needs. Teachers also should become prepared to use various learning materials and test and measurement instruments. In-service training was stressed in various parts of policy documents. However, in these documents the emphasis on how to educate teachers of gifted is scarce. There isn't special stress on the education of teachers at university level.

Collaboration among teachers, parents and school administrations is another issue which has a key role in the effectiveness of gifted programs. The findings revealed that the private schools and the public school possess different atmospheres in terms of collaborative work. In the public school, there is not adequate collaboration between parents and teachers. Some teachers and principals of this school have been under investigations carried out by the Ministry of Education. The subjects were parent complaints and concerns that were raised against teachers' ineffectiveness in responding to gifted children's needs. In the private schools, however, parents were considered strong advocates for gifted students. Teachers and school administrations work with parents either to hear their suggestions or to help them become more aware of children's needs. In these two schools parental support can be seen as strength.

When we look at the history of gifted education in Turkey we recognize the lack of systematic effort for the development of both policy and practice. Therefore, *Development Strategy and Implementation Plan of the Gifted* is a vital attempt to overcome major problems in the education of gifted population. The rationale of the strategy plan covers deficiency and incompetence in many units involved in gifted education. The lack of enhanced and implemented education models, the limited scientific research regarding gifted education in the country, a small number of experts, gifted teachers and gifted administrator, and insufficient fund allocation are some important justifications which underpin the policy and practice regulation requirements.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study aimed at examining two major issues related to the education of gifted K-8 students. The initial purpose of the study was to analyze current state policies in gifted education. The research questions that guided the policy analysis were:

1. What is the nature of policies regarding the education of gifted children in Turkey?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these policies?

The second purpose was conducting a program evaluation in order to determine whether current programs were responding to the needs of gifted K-8 students. Three questions guided the program evaluation part:

3. How well do the gifted education programs meet the needs of gifted students?
4. What are the practices of teachers and administrators regarding the gifted education programs?
5. How do teachers and administrators in the school with gifted programs view and evaluate the implementation process of these programs?

Data presented in the study was collected from a variety of sources including state policy documents, interviews, field notes and classroom observations. In the first part, the data collection was carried out through content analysis of publicly available policy documents. Research Questions 3, 4 and 5, which pertained to the program evaluation of elementary schools with gifted programs were answered through interviews, field notes and classroom observations.

Interviews were conducted with school administrations, gifted education coordinators or advisors and teachers from three elementary schools with gifted programs. Although the number of schools participated in this study was too small, this sample can be considered as a good representative since the total number of schools with gifted programs in Turkey is very scant. The instrument used for data collection from classroom observations was the Classroom Observation Scale which was developed by VanTassel-Baska et al. (2003) at the College of William and Mary.

The findings of this study revealed there is a serious dearth of documented evidence regarding the education policy on gifted students and their schooling in Turkey. The study also revealed the lack of coherence in gifted education policy including definition, identification and placement concerns, and teacher training and personnel preparation. For example, the clear definition of giftedness and gifted students does not exist in the policy documents. The definitions were given in various documents with distinctions. In the module prepared by the Ministry of Education, definition of the gifted was not the same with that of described in the state documents, but were the translated from foreign sources. Moreover, classification of gifted learners in this document neither was used in any other policy documents nor emphasized in any practice and implementation. Identification, screening and placement mechanism is another issue which was discussed in the previous chapter.

First of all, there is a need for a comprehensive definition of giftedness and a clear description of a gifted child. Also, the Ministry of Education should give consideration to the systematic identification and placement of gifted students and connect ongoing practices and implementations on the supplemental policies. The IQ

testing which is seen as only measure of giftedness nationwide should be a part of multidimensional identification procedure. All high and critical weaknesses in the state policies and their practices should be fixed urgently.

Although private institutions adopted several steps in the placement of gifted learners, the Ministry of Education does not have an evaluative role on these procedures. The school administration, gifted education coordinators and teachers in the private schools have efforts to improve the program. Nevertheless, without appropriate program evaluation and documentation to support improvement, programs and services will remain inadequate in meeting gifted students' needs. Teachers decide how to change the content of the courses in their own after experiencing some inappropriateness in the practice. There are not any standards to adhere to and any national resources to use for the enrichment of courses.Therefore, all the identification and placement procedures as well as the various education models adopted by private schools should be evaluated. Gifted education programs offered by these schools should adhere to certain standards and norms. It does not necessarily mean that all gifted education programs should be identical. Rather, the Ministry of Education should take a proactive approach to acknowledging diversity.

The findings also revealed an absence of connectivity between implemented programs and state education policies. Data collected from the public school indicated that the principles and models given in the state documents are not reflected in practice. Superintendents should consider the fact that there is a need for evaluating the effectiveness of the programs and their adherence to state policies. Only the systematic evaluation would determine the value and the future of the program and identify problems early (Patton, 2008). From this perspective, providing

a comprehensive preparation program in the universities that will ensure proficiency in the program evaluation is highly essential. Therefore, the Ministry of Education and the Council of Higher Education (*YÖK –YükseköğretimKurulu*) should cooperate to establish education programs for graduate students to prepare them for collaborative planning, implementation, and evaluation of gifted programs.

The education of gifted students in the public school was observed as to have considerable problems concerning issues such as a lack of well-defined and implemented effective curriculum, teacher training, personnel preparation, parent involvement and necessary funding allocation. Although it is the 10^{th} year of its foundation, the school and the model implemented here is still in its project phase and waiting for the decision of approval or deny from the Ministry of Education. Since it was the first public school catering to the needs of gifted K-8 students in the country, the effectiveness of the program would lead to increase in the number of gifted programs in elementary schools. Therefore, the Ministry of Education should conduct thorough evaluation from various aspects and make decision as soon as possible to whether terminate the program or modify implemented model.

Pedagogy in the form of modifying curriculum, compacting, enrichment and acceleration are key methods in effective gifted programs. None of the schools use all these methods in gifted programs. The only finding regarding the systematic use of curriculum compacting was emerged from the data collected in the School A. And it was limited through first three grade levels.The statepolicies should include the implementation of ongoing professional developmentto increase teacher knowledge and skills in the curriculum modification and their awareness of differentiated instruction, so that the schools can adopt these methods and use them appropriately,

Parental involvement in the education of gifted students showed differences in public and private schools. The private school teachers work with parents collaboratively, whether in the public school there isn't any cooperative work atmosphere. The private schools also pay attention to parent training; they organize various seminars for parents and assist them to become aware of their students' needs. Parenting skills to understand and meet gifted students' characteristics and needs play a key role in the education of these students. Therefore, implementation of parent workshops and organization of seminars should become an integral part of gifted education programs.

Data collected during classroom observations were based on assessment of teacher behaviors and student responses to corresponding behaviors. Teacher behaviors were grouped under six categories: curriculum planning and delivery (CPD), accommodations for individual differences (AID), problem solving strategies (PS), critical thinking strategies (CRI), creative thinking strategies (CRE) and research strategies (RS).

The classroom observation findings revealed that research strategies and differentiated teaching behaviors have the lowest rates among observed categories. In all three schools, research strategies were observed as underused behaviors among all categories. Overall rates of COS-R instrument for School C are very low. COS-R percentages in all categories were below 50%. The highest rates in both of the private schools were observed in creative thinking strategies.

Based on the teacher observation findings, it can be concluded that teacher effectiveness in responding to gifted students' needs through the implementation of effective and targeted changes in pedagogical practice is below expected level.

Findings revealed that the private school teachers do have some motivation to improve themselves and their services. However, schools working with teachers who do not have formal background in gifted education obviouslymight bring challenges. If the state aims at meeting gifted students' diverse needs by comprehensive gifted education programs and considers these programs to be a part of the whole education system,teacher education should be addressed in the state policies.

A lack of leadership resources and a limited number of personnel for right management in gifted education are other considerable issues which impede the development of national gifted programs. The undergraduate gifted program is offered by only the Istanbul University. And the number of colleges which offer graduate program on gifted education is two. Teachers of gifted children in schools do not have necessary education on this area. The private school administrations pay attention to teacher training, yet the public school does not have a serious demand from the teachers.

The issue of teacher assignment for gifted programs was discussed in the discussion section. Also, the research findings indicating the characteristics of teachers of gifted students weregiven in that part. It was discussed that besides necessary knowledge and experience, teacher personality, characteristics and cognitive orientations are important factors in the effective schooling of gifted learners. There is evidence presented in this study that while teacher recruitment the Ministry of Education does not takes this issue into account. As the development of gifted education in Turkey is in its very early years, focusing on this issue with particular attention would be a great opportunity for the later steps of the improvement.

In order to improve the education of teachers for gifted programs, the number of special education and practicum courses in teaching programs should be increased. Also, increase in the number of gifted education departments would be a good opportunity in teacher preparation. Private institutions should recruit teachers only with formal gifted education background. It may include either to have a gifted education certificate or to be a graduate of degree program in gifted and talented. In the teacher recruitment for public schools, the Ministry of Education should design the process in which teachers are selected among those who respond some criteria.

A strong education system necessarily addresses to academic development and social-emotional nurturance of gifted children. School administrators and teachers, and the state policy that underpins them are key factors for the foundation for success in the education of this population. A curricular focus that is based on differentiated instruction, creative and critical thinking skills, and problem solving strategies is another requirement for the strong and uniform organization. And finally, funding is a sine qua non of successful and full implementation of state policy.

This research suggests the following areas for further study related to the policies of gifted education and their practices:

- Parent thoughts and perceptions would present an important perspective on the success of policies and practices.
- Student perceptions were not included in this study. A student survey would be a valuable source on the exploration of gifted education program effectiveness.

- BİLSEMs and other institutions engaged in the education of K-8 students could be included in further program evaluation studies.
- Interviews with policy makers would be another valuable source for the exploration of the success of the respective policies.

Limitations

Limitations in this study include the limited nature of the geographic area from which schools were selected, as all three schools in this research were in Istanbul. Although there are few numbers of institutions with gifted programs operating in other cities than Istanbul, involving them would be helpful to provide more data regarding the gifted education programs.

One of the participants, who was in school administration as a gifted program coordinator didn't accept to be interviewed. He requested to write responses instead of interview. In addition to have a time to be prepared for the questions, the researcher was not able to use follow-up questions in order to open issues more deeply and obtain more thorough data.

Providing inter-rater reliability in the classroom observations, whereby checklists independently completed and compared for the agreement, was an important process for the actual agreement in the rating to each item. In six hours I could observe classes with my partner to reach consensus. In remaining hours I didn't have a partner for achieving inter-rater agreement.

Appendix A

Permission to Use COS-R Instrument

apps
powered by Google

Sakhavat Mammadov <[redacted]v@email.wm.edu>

permission, COS-R

2 ileti

Sakhavat Mammadov <[redacted]@email.wm.edu> [redacted]012 20:50
Kime: [redacted]@wm.edu

Dear Dr.VanTassel-Baska,

This is Sakhavat Mammadov from Bogazici University, Turkey. I am currently a master's students in Elementary Education. And starting from Fall 2012, I will be a doctorate student of Dr.Tracy Cross in Gifted Administration at the College of William and Mary. As a part of my research study on gifted education programs in Turkey, I would like to use Classroom Observation Scales (revised version). I would like your permission to use this instrument in my study as a part of my data collection.

Yours Sincerely,
Sakhavat Mammadov

Vantassel-Baska, Joyce <[redacted]@wm.edu> 012 01:03
Kime: Sakhavat Mammadov <[redacted]@email.wm.edu>

You have my permission although t is public domain and on the William and Mary website.

Best, joyce

Dr. Joyce Van Tassel-Baska, EdD.
Smith Professor Emerita
College of William and Mary

http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/jlvant/home

From: Sakhavat Mammadov [[redacted]@email.wm.edu]
Sent: Monday, June 04, 2012 1:50 PM
To: Vantassel-Baska, Joyce
Subject: permission, COS-R
[Alıntılanan metin gizlendi]

Appendix B

Interview Questions (School Administrator)

1. iraz kendinizden bahseder misiniz? Kaç yıldır yöneticilik yapıyorsunuz? Kaç yıldır üstün zekâlı öğrencilerle ilgili çalışmalarda bulunuyorsunuz?
2. Okulunuzun bu çocukların eğitimine verdiği önemin altında yatan temel felsefe veya amaç nedir?
3. Okulunuzda üstün zekâlı olarak tanımlanan kaç öğrenci var?
4. Her sınıf seviyesinde (grade level) üstün zekâlı çocuklara yönelik kaç sınıf var?
5. Bu öğrencilerin tanımlanmasında hangi araçları kullanıyorsunuz?
6. Diğer öğrencilerden farklı olarak bu sınıflarda ne gibi programlar mevcuttur? Eğitim ve öğretimde ne gibi farklılıklar var?
7. Üstün zekâlı çocukların eğitimi için görevlendirdiğiniz öğretmenleri hangi özelliklerine göre seçiyor ve bu sınıflar için uygun görüyorsunuz?
8. Öğretmenler dışında bu çocukların eğitimi konusunda uzman ve karar verme konumunda olan personel var mı?
9. Bu programların planlamasını nasıl yapıyorsunuz? Uzmanların rolü ve genel koordinasyon hakkında bilgi verebilir misiniz?
10. Bu çocukların eğitiminde müfredatta değişikliğe gidiyor musunuz? Ne gibi? Nasıl planlıyorsunuz? Öğretmenler kendileri mi yoksa birlikte mi kararlaştırıyorsunuz?
11. Öğrencilerin öğrenme şekilleri, ilgi alanları vb. noktaları dikkate alınıyor mu? Bu farklılıktan dolayı nasıl uygulamalar yapılıyor?
12. Öğrencilerin akademik gelişimlerini nasıl gözlemliyor ve takip ediyorsunuz?
13. Bu çocukların eğitimi konusunda velilerle bilgi alışverişinde bulunuyor musunuz?

14. Veliler aktif olarak çocukların eğitiminde tavsiyelerde bulunabiliyor ve görüşlerini bildiriyorlar mı?
15. Öğretmenler bireysel eğitim planı gibi uygulamalar yapıyor mu? Bu öğretmenlerin yapması gereken bir zorunluluk mu yoksa öğretmenlerin kendi inisiyatifinde olan bir konu mu?
16. Öğretmenlerden bu çocukların eğitimine yönelik uygulamalarını istediğiniz ve takip ettiğiniz bir yükümlülük var mı?
17. Genel olarak program değerlendirmesi yapıyor musunuz? Bu konuda bilgi verebilir misiniz? Ne gibi değerlendirme, belli standart var mı vb.
18. Öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişimlerini sağlamak için ne gibi olanaklar okul yönetimince sunulmaktadır?

Appendix C

Interview Questions (Classroom Teacher)

Branş: _____

1. Biraz kendinizden bahseder misiniz? Nereden mezun oldunuz? Kaç yıldır öğretmenlik yapıyorsunuz?
2. Kendinizi nasıl bir öğretmen olarak tanımlarsınız?
3. Sınıfta kaç öğrenciniz var?
4. Sınıfta tipik bir gününüz nasıl geçiyor?
5. Öğrencilerinizle ilişkinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız? Onları ne kadar yakından tanıyorsunuz? Bunun için neler yaparsınız?
6. Üstün zekâlı öğrencilerle çalışıyorsunuz, bu öğrencileri genel olarak nasıl tanımlarsınız?
7. Genel olarak, bu öğrencilerin eğitimi konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?
8. Bu çocuklar kendi içlerinde de akademik yönlerden farklılık gösteriyor mu?

    - Farklılık gösteriyorlarsa sizce ne gibi farklılıklardır? Örnek verebilir misiniz?

9. Farklı akademik düzeyleri belirlemek için uyguladığınız yöntemler, kullandığınız araçlar var mı?
10. Bu öğrenciler için farklı öğretim biçimi uygular mısınız? Müfredatta değişiklik yapar mısınız?
11. Öğrencilerin başarıya ulaşması için günlük ve uzun vadeli planlarınız var mı? Bunlardan bahsedebilir misiniz?

12. Üstün zekâlı öğrencilerle mi yoksa diğer öğrencilerle mi çalışmak daha zor/kolaydır? Neden?
13. Üstün zekâlı öğrencilerin eğitimi ile ilgili kendinizi bu alanda daha da geliştirme adına araştırma yapar mısınız?
14. Okul tarafından seminerler, çalıştaylar düzenleniyor mu?
15. Sizce bu çocukların eğitimi diğer öğrencilerle aynı sınıfta mı yoksa farklı ortamlarda mı olması daha uygun olur? Neden?
16. Sizce, okulunuzun, üstün zekâlı öğrencilerin eğitiminde en güçlü olduğu nokta nedir?
17. Sizce, okulunuzda bu çocukların eğitimi için eksik gördüğünüz, geliştirilmesi veya uygulanmaya konulması gereken alanlar nedir?
18. Öğrenci velileriyle ne sıklıkla görüşürsünüz? Onlarla koordineli çalışır mısınız? Nasıl?
19. Okul sonrası, ders-dışı etkinlikler yapar mısınız? Bu gibi aktivitelerin öğrencilerin gelişiminde ne gibi katkısı olur?
20. Öğrencilerle ilgili gelecek planlaması (lise, kariyer) vb. yapıyor musunuz?
21. Hangi alandaki meslektaşlarınızla sıklıkla çalışıyorsunuz? Hangi durumlarda koordineli çalışma gereksinimi duyuyorsunuz?
22. Sınıfınızda diğer akranlarından akademik olarak daha üst düzeyde olan öğrencileriniz var mı? Onların eğitimi ile ilgili neler yaparsınız?
23. Sınıfta başarısız olan öğrencileriniz var mı? Onların eğitiminde ne gibi yol izlersiniz?

Appendix D

COS-R (Teacher Observation)

The William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales, Revised (Part 2)
Teacher Observation

Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Ed.D. *Linda Avery, Ph.D.* *Jeanne Struck, Ph.D.* *Annie Feng, Ed.D.*
Bruce Bracken, Ph.D. *Dianne Drummond, M.Ed.* *Tamra Stambaugh, M.Ed.*

Directions: Please employ the following scale as you rate each of the checklist items. Rate each item according to how well the teacher characteristic or behavior was demonstrated during the observed instructional activity. Each item is judged on an individual, self-contained basis, regardless of its relationship to an overall set of behaviors relevant to the cluster heading.

3=Effective	2=Somewhat Effective	1=Ineffective	N/O = Not Observed
The teacher evidenced careful planning and classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting many appropriate student responses. The teacher was clear, and sustained focus on the purposes of learning.	The teacher evidenced some planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting some appropriate student responses. The teacher was sometimes clear and focused on the purposes of learning.	The teacher evidenced little or no planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting minimal appropriate student responses. The teacher was unclear and unfocused regarding the purpose of learning.	The listed behavior was not demonstrated during the time of the observation. (NOTE: There must be an obvious attempt made for the certain behavior to be rated "ineffective" instead of "not observed".)

General Teaching Behaviors

Curriculum Planning and Delivery	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
1. set high expectations for student performance.				
2. incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge.				
3. engaged students in planning, monitoring or assessing their learning.				
4. encouraged students to express their thoughts.				
5. had students reflect on what they had learned.				

Comments:

Differentiated Teaching Behaviors

Accommodations for Individual Differences	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
6. provided opportunities for independent or group learning to promote depth in understanding content.				
7. accommodated individual or subgroup differences (e.g., through individual conferencing, student or teacher choice in material selection and task assignments.)				
8. encouraged multiple interpretations of events and situations.				
9. allowed students to discover key ideas individually through structured activities and/or questions.				

Comments:

Problem Solving	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
10. employed brainstorming techniques.				
11. engaged students in problem identification and definition				
12. engaged students in solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation.				

Comments:

Critical Thinking Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
13. encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues				
14. engaged students in comparing and contrasting ideas (e.g., analyze generated ideas)				
15. provided opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data or information to the abstract.				
16. encouraged student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines.				
Comments:				

Creative Thinking Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
17. solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas.				
18. engaged students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas.				
19. encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems.				
20. provided opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas.				
Comments:				

Research Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
(It is atypical for these to be observed in one session. Some teachers, however, may use Items #21-25 within a single period to illustrate the full research process to students. Please note those observations in the comments section.)				
The teacher…				
21. required students to gather evidence from multiple sources through research-based techniques (e.g., print, non-print, internet, self-investigation via surveys, interviews, etc.).				
22. provided opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables.				
23. asked questions to assist students in making inferences from data and drawing conclusions.				
24. encouraged students to determine implications and consequences of findings.				
25. provided time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation.				
Comments:				

Additional Comments:

Appendix E

COS-R (Student Observation)

The William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales, Revised (Part 3)
Student Observation

Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Ed.D.; Bruce Bracken, Ph.D.; Diann Drummond, M.Ed

Student Responses to General Classroom Teacher Behaviors

Engaged in General Classroom Behaviors Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
1. demonstrated a high level of performance.						
2. applied new learning.						
3. demonstrated planful, monitoring, or evaluating behavior.						
4. articulated thinking process (e.g., verbal mediation).						
5. reflected on learning						
Comments:						

Student Responses to Differentiated Teaching Behaviors

Engaged in Diverse Self-selected or Self-paced Activities Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
6. worked on projects individually or in pairs/groups.						
7. worked on tiered assignments or tasks of choice.						
8. explored multiple interpretations.						
9. discovered central ideas through structured activities and/or questions asked.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Problem-solving Strategies Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
10. brainstormed ideas or alternative possibilities.						
11. defined problems.						
12. identified and implemented solutions to problems.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Critical Thinking Strategies Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
13. made judgments about or evaluated situations, problems, or issues.						
14. compared and contrasted ideas and concepts.						
15. generalized from specific to abstract data or information.						
16. synthesized or summarized information within or across disciplines.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Creative Thinking Strategies Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
17. demonstrated ideational fluency.						
18. explored diverse ways to think about a situation/object/event.						
19. offered imaginative, sometimes playful, suggestions as solutions to problems.						
20. provided examples and illustrations of ideas.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Research Strategies Students:	**Most** >75%	**Many** 50-75%	**Some** 25-50%	**Few** <25%	**None**	**N/A**
21. gathered evidence through research techniques (e.g., surveys, interviews, analysis of primary and secondary source documents).						
22. manipulated and transformed data to be interpreted.						
23. made inferences from data and drew conclusions.						
24. determined the implications and consequences of situations.						
25. communicated findings (e.g., report, oral presentation).						
Comments:						

Appendix F

COS-R (Consensus Form)

Consensus Form

The William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales, Revised (Part 2)
Teacher Observation

Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Ed.D. ***Linda Avery, Ph.D.*** ***Jeanne Struck, Ph.D.*** ***Annie Feng, Ed.D.***
Bruce Bracken, Ph.D. ***Dianne Drummond, M.Ed.*** ***Tamra Stambaugh, M.Ed.***

Directions: Please employ the following scale as you rate each of the checklist items. Rate each item according to how well the teacher characteristic or behavior was demonstrated during the observed instructional activity. Each item is judged on an individual, self-contained basis, regardless of its relationship to an overall set of behaviors relevant to the cluster heading.

3=Effective	2=Somewhat Effective	1=Ineffective	N/O = Not Observed
The teacher evidenced careful planning and classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting many appropriate student responses. The teacher was clear, and sustained focus on the purposes of learning.	The teacher evidenced some planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting some appropriate student responses. The teacher was sometimes clear and focused on the purposes of learning.	The teacher evidenced little or no planning and/or classroom flexibility in implementation of the behavior, eliciting minimal appropriate student responses. The teacher was unclear and unfocused regarding the purpose of learning.	The listed behavior was not demonstrated during the time of the observation. (NOTE: There must be an obvious attempt made for the certain behavior to be rated "ineffective" instead of "not observed".)

General Teaching Behaviors

Curriculum Planning and Delivery	**3**	**2**	**1**	**N/O**
The teacher…				
1. set high expectations for student performance.				
2. incorporated activities for students to apply new knowledge.				
3. engaged students in planning, monitoring or assessing their learning.				
4. encouraged students to express their thoughts.				
5. had students reflect on what they had learned.				

Comments:

Differentiated Teaching Behaviors

Accommodations for Individual Differences	**3**	**2**	**1**	**N/O**
The teacher…				
6. provided opportunities for independent or group learning to promote depth in understanding content.				
7. accommodated individual or subgroup differences (e.g., through individual conferencing, student or teacher choice in material selection and task assignments.)				
8. encouraged multiple interpretations of events and situations.				
9. allowed students to discover key ideas individually through structured activities and/or questions.				

Comments:

Problem Solving	**3**	**2**	**1**	**N/O**
The teacher…				
10. employed brainstorming techniques.				
11. engaged students in problem identification and definition				
12. engaged students in solution-finding activities and comprehensive solution articulation.				

Comments:

Critical Thinking Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
13. encouraged students to judge or evaluate situations, problems, or issues				
14. engaged students in comparing and contrasting ideas (e.g., analyze generated ideas)				
15. provided opportunities for students to generalize from concrete data or information to the abstract.				
16. encouraged student synthesis or summary of information within or across disciplines.				
Comments:				

Creative Thinking Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
The teacher…				
17. solicited many diverse thoughts about issues or ideas.				
18. engaged students in the exploration of diverse points of view to reframe ideas.				
19. encouraged students to demonstrate open-mindedness and tolerance of imaginative, sometimes playful solutions to problems.				
20. provided opportunities for students to develop and elaborate on their ideas.				
Comments:				

Research Strategies	3	2	1	N/O
(It is atypical for these to be observed in one session. Some teachers, however, may use Items #21-25 within a single period to illustrate the full research process to students. Please note those observations in the comments section.)				
The teacher…				
21. required students to gather evidence from multiple sources through research-based techniques (e.g., print, non-print, internet, self-investigation via surveys, interviews, etc.).				
22. provided opportunities for students to analyze data and represent it in appropriate charts, graphs, or tables.				
23. asked questions to assist students in making inferences from data and drawing conclusions.				
24. encouraged students to determine implications and consequences of findings.				
25. provided time for students to communicate research study findings to relevant audiences in a formal report and/or presentation.				
Comments:				

Additional Comments:

Consensus Form

The William and Mary Classroom Observation Scales, Revised (Part 3)

Student Observation

Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Ed.D.; Bruce Bracken, Ph.D.; Diann Drummond, M.Ed

Student Responses to General Classroom Teacher Behaviors

Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
26. demonstrated a high level of performance.						
27. applied new learning.						
28. demonstrated planful, monitoring, or evaluating behavior.						
29. articulated thinking process (e.g., verbal mediation).						
30. reflected on learning						
Comments:						

Student Responses to Differentiated Teaching Behaviors

Engaged in Diverse Self-selected or Self-paced Activities Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
31. worked on projects individually or in pairs/groups.						
32. worked on tiered assignments or tasks of choice.						
33. explored multiple interpretations.						
34. discovered central ideas through structured activities and/or questions asked.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Problem-solving Strategies Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
35. brainstormed ideas or alternative possibilities.						
36. defined problems.						
37. identified and implemented solutions to problems.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Critical Thinking Strategies Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
38. made judgments about or evaluated situations, problems, or issues.						
39. compared and contrasted ideas and concepts.						
40. generalized from specific to abstract data or information.						
41. synthesized or summarized information within or across disciplines.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Creative Thinking Strategies Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
42. demonstrated ideational fluency.						
43. explored diverse ways to think about a situation/object/event.						
44. offered imaginative, sometimes playful, suggestions as solutions to problems.						
45. provided examples and illustrations of ideas.						
Comments:						
Engaged in Research Strategies Students:	**Most**	**Many**	**Some**	**Few**	**None**	**N/A**
46. gathered evidence through research techniques (e.g., surveys, interviews, analysis of primary and secondary source documents).						
47. manipulated and transformed data to be interpreted.						
48. made inferences from data and drew conclusions.						
49. determined the implications and consequences of situations.						
50. communicated findings (e.g., report, oral presentation).						
Comments:						

Appendix G

Letter to School Administrators

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM FAKÜLTESİ
Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

14 Mart 2012

(n Okulu Müdürlüğü'ne,

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, İlköğretim Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Sehavet Memmedov Türkiye'de üstün zekâlı çocukların eğitimi ve bu çocukların eğitimine yönelik mevcut programlar konusunda yüksek lisans tez çalışması yapmaktadır. Çalışması kapsamında okulunuzda haftanın belirli günleri olmak üzere 3 hafta boyunca gözlem ve iki öğretmen ile röportaj yapmayı planlamaktadır.

Tez Danışmanı olduğum Sehavet Memmedov'un tez çalışmasını yürütebilmesi için gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Prof. Dr. Fatma Gök
Tez Danışmanı

34342 Bebek - İstanbul Telefon: (0212) 359 66 08 Faks: (0212) 257 50 36
263 02 33

T.C.
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Sayı: B.30.2.BÜN.0.41.00.00.300.99/2012-64

7 Mayıs 2012

İlgili Makama,

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İlköğretim yüksek lisans öğrencisi Sehavet Memmedov"" "Türkiye'de Üstün Zekalı Çocukların Eğitimi ve Bu Çocukların Eğitimine Yönelik Mevcut Programları" konusunda tez çalışması yapmaktadır. Çalışması kapsamında Fatih İlçesi ı okulu'nda haftanın belirli günleri olmak üzere 3 hafta boyunca gözlem ve iki öğretmen ile röportaj yapmayı planlamaktadır.

Bu konuda gerekli iznin verilmesi hususunda yardımlarınızı rica ederim.

Saygılarımla,

Prof.Dr.Ceyza Sevgen
Enstitü Müdürü