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ABSTRACT

During the past decade increased emphasis has been placed on the educational needs of more able pupils. The writer's participation in a nation-wide survey of major programs for more able children in public schools prompted this study of programs in Louisiana.

It was the purpose of the study to determine the kinds of educational opportunities offered to more able pupils in the white public elementary and secondary schools in selected parishes in Louisiana. There were eighteen parishes included in the study. Three parishes were selected from each of six major geographical areas: Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southwest, South Central, and Southeast. Each area except Southwest included a large parish, a medium parish, and a small parish defined as follows:

1. Large: white public school enrollments of 10,000 or more
2. Medium: white public school enrollments of 3,000 to 9,999
3. Small: white public school enrollments of less than 3,000

The study included five large parishes, six medium parishes, and seven small parishes.

Information was obtained through the use of interview schedules for parish superintendents and principals. The schedule for superintendents was designed to reveal information regarding:

1. Physical aspects of the school system
2. Official policies and practices relating to more able pupils
3. Suggestions for improving the education of more able pupils
The schedule for principals was designed to reveal information regarding:

1. Physical aspects of the school
2. Identification and selection procedures used with more able pupils
3. Specific administrative arrangements favoring more able pupils
4. Specific instructional adaptations used with more able pupils
5. Number of pupils participating in special arrangements
6. Qualifications and selection of teachers assigned to work with more able pupils

The study included a total of 358 schools, of which 230 were elementary schools, 30 were junior high schools, and 98 were senior high schools. The total population of the 358 schools was 143,386 pupils, or 32.5 per cent of the total enrollments of the white public schools in Louisiana, excluding the parish of Orleans.

According to information received from the superintendents:

1. The large parishes had taken positive steps in defining, identifying, and making instructional adaptations for more able children.
2. The medium parishes had no parish-wide programs, but included some individual school programs for more able pupils.
3. Only one of the seven small parishes reported any type of special program for more able pupils.
4. Sixteen of the eighteen parishes had testing programs through which more able pupils could be identified, but only five parishes were
involved in parish-wide programs for more able pupils.

5. Superintendents offered ninety-nine suggestions for improving instruction for more able pupils. The suggestions were in the areas of effective planning, reduced class size, additional resource materials, assistance from central office staff and special consultants, and more parish-wide studies regarding more able pupils.

According to information received from the principals:

1. Of all more able students who were receiving special attention in the eighteen parishes studied, 88.09 per cent were enrolled in schools in the five large parishes.

2. The criteria used to identify more able pupils included: group intelligence tests, achievement tests, previous grades, teacher judgment, and minimum I.Q. levels.

3. The administrative arrangements used in instruction were: separate classes, ability grouping within classes, special blocks of time for some groups, seminars and projects, independent study, advanced sections in high school subjects, and special periods for music and art.

4. Parishes which had made studies of more able children were more specific about goals, identification procedures, and teacher selection.

5. The selection of teachers for more able pupils was based largely upon a record of successful teaching, interest in more able pupils, high degree of competence in subject, and a willingness to work harder.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The decade of the 1950's included a tremendous increase in educational opportunities for all types of exceptional children. During the latter part of that decade, particular emphasis emerged favoring special provisions for more able children. Public and private agencies have in recent years invested millions of dollars in experimental projects concerning the education of more able pupils. Publishing companies offer growing lists of books, and popular and professional periodicals have kept the subject of more able children in the public eye as well as before the teaching profession.

The Educational Policies Commission, in a report issued in 1950, stated that now, more than ever, the United States needs to have its ablest citizens in positions of influence and responsibility.¹ The report was the third major publication issued by the Commission on the education of American pupils. The first, Education for All American Youth, was issued in 1944, followed in 1948, by Education for All American Children. Each of these publications emphasized that in order to develop the rich resources of human talent which gifted children and youth possess, the schools and colleges must give special attention to

the education of their gifted students. The 1950 report was issued because the Commission's study group was of the opinion that the gifted members of the school population represented a minority which was largely neglected. It was stressed that Education of the Gifted was an extension of the two earlier policy statements, and that the singling out of the gifted for special attention in a separate report implied no disparagement of any other segment of the pupil population nor of their need for the best possible educational opportunities.

After the Educational Policies Commission took a favorable stand concerning special attention to the needs of gifted children, activity increased throughout the country in the interest of superior students. With Paul Witty as editor, the American Association for Gifted Children issued a major volume entitled, The Gifted Child. Experimental programs began, foundation money was invested, and doctoral studies began to include more and more topics related to pupils of high ability.

By 1957, when the Russian satellite program shocked the American public and prompted into action the critics of the public schools, the gifted child programs were in good position to capitalize on a public opinion favorable to assistance for our more able children. The following year, 1958, the United States Congress responded to the call

---

2 Ibid., p. 111.
3 Ibid., p. v.
for more trained brainpower by passing the National Defense Education Act, which channeled millions of dollars to education for the purpose of strengthening and increasing the guidance and testing programs and to assist in upgrading school offerings in mathematics, science, and modern foreign language. The National Merit Scholarship Program and the National Science Foundation are other examples of efforts toward the recognition, encouragement, and assistance of the more able students in American schools.

Many kinds of programs for gifted children had developed throughout the country by the late 1950's, but the efforts were isolated. In 1960, the Southern Regional Education Board, representing a compact of sixteen Southern states, designed a project to study programs for gifted children in all sections of the United States. The project was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and coordinated by the University of Virginia, under the direction of Dr. Virgil S. Ward. One person from each of nine state departments of education, plus the director and his assistant, were the regular participants in the Southern Regional Project. It was the privilege of the writer to have represented Louisiana and the State Department of Education during the nationwide study.

I. THE PROBLEM

One result of the Southern Regional Project was the writer's continued interest in programs for more able children, especially an
interest in learning what provisions the public schools of Louisiana offered for more able students. As the study developed, it became apparent that all schools in the state could not be included in a personal survey. It was decided that a sampling of parishes from six geographical areas of the state would be used.

**Statement of the problem.** The purpose of the study was to determine the status of educational opportunities offered more able children in the white public schools of selected parishes in Louisiana.

**Importance of the study.** The intellectually superior child is an exceptional child with exceptional educational needs. He is a rapid learner and a rapid developer in ways which indicate that teachers need to make special plans to provide the particular educational experiences commensurate with the student's high capabilities. This study reports the status of educational opportunities offered more able children in selected school systems in Louisiana. The findings will be of assistance to other school systems which have not yet begun to make special provisions for the more able, and to still other systems the study will suggest ways of improving programs already in operation.

As far as the writer has been able to determine, this is the first study of its kind in Louisiana. It should serve as a basis for future research concerning the education of more able children in Louisiana.

**Delimitation of the problem.** The study was limited to the white
public elementary and secondary schools in selected parishes in Louisiana.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

More Able. The literature is filled with definitions and labels descriptive of children with high ability. This study has used the term "more able" to refer to highly able groups of children who, because of advanced mental development or superior academic achievement, were found to be in need of an instructional program different from that provided for other pupils in the regular classroom.

Acceleration. For purposes of this study, acceleration has been used to include any administrative practice which allowed the completion of a course, term, or program of study in less time than that which was usually required by the school in the regular program.

Enrichment. Enrichment was used to refer to the practice of systematically providing learning experiences which were broader and deeper in scope than were the experiences offered to an entire regular class.

Grouping. Grouping was used to mean the technique of selection and assignment of more able pupils into classes or subdivisions of classes for purposes of instruction.

Curriculum differentiation. The adjustment of materials and
methods of instruction to suit the needs of more able children has been considered curriculum differentiation.

**Administrative programming.** This term was used to indicate the administrative arrangements by which a school organized and conducted classes or activities specifically designed for more able students.

**Program.** Program was used to refer to the total learning experiences provided by the school to meet the needs of more able children.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

In May, 1962, the writer met with the Assistant Superintendent of Elementary and Secondary Education in the State Department of Education and other members of his staff to discuss the study. It was his approval of schedules within the Department that made possible the continuation of the study.

**Selection of parishes.** It was important that the study include a group of parishes which would be representative of the entire State. The first criterion was that of location. Parishes were selected from sections which could definitely be categorized as Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southeast, South Central, and Southwest. From each of the geographical areas, a cluster of three parishes was selected. Each cluster included one parish with a total enrollment of less than 3,000 in the white public schools, one parish whose white public school
enrollments were between 3,000 and 10,000 pupils, and all areas except one included a parish with a white public school enrollment in excess of 10,000 students.

A total of eighteen parishes was selected, having a total of 302 schools and 145,512 pupils. This pupil population included in the study represented 32.5% of the total enrollment in the white public elementary and secondary schools in Louisiana, exclusive of Orleans, according to the latest report of the State Department of Education.\(^5\)

Obtaining data. Two separate interview schedules were used in obtaining data. The first schedule was used during personal interview sessions with the superintendent of schools, or his representatives, in each parish included in the study. The schedule for superintendents included questions and check-list items which revealed information about the school systems, the official position of the local school boards regarding the education of more able students, policies and practices in operation, and possible next steps in program organization or improvement.

The second schedule was designed to reveal information about specific activities for more able pupils in each white public school in all parishes included in the study. The writer or one of his co-workers explained to the principals, sometimes in group meetings for that

purpose, that the researcher was interested in recording the school activities which had been planned specifically for more able students. Those principals who indicated that such opportunities were available in their schools were seen individually and the interview schedules were completed. The check-list included items relating to identification, selection, instruction, acceleration, administrative programming, materials, teaching personnel, and subject areas included in provisions for more able pupils. It was necessary for the writer to make extensive notes since many significant responses were not anticipated by the check-lists.

The remainder of the study included tabulation of data obtained from the interview schedules, categorizing the data according to size of parish and type of school, and interpretation of the data. The final step was the presentation of a summary and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The pursuit of appropriate education for children of high ability has led educators in many directions. Tannenbaum has commented that in our society, where universal education is a cherished objective, it is inevitable that providing adequately for the educational needs of our ablest students should become a persistent, and sometimes confounding, problem. But with all of the differences of opinion regarding the nature of programs for more able children, it is generally agreed that the goals are the same, that is, preparation of the individual to assume an adult social role commensurate with his unique abilities.

The extreme positions concerning the type of child who should be singled out for special attention are widely separated. One point of view holds that only the upper one percent in intelligence, as measured by an individual examination, are in need of specially devised school programs. By that definition, those pupils with an intelligence quotient above 136 would qualify. A much more liberal stand is taken by Conant, whose group of "academically talented" is defined as approximately the top fifteen to twenty percent of a typical American comprehensive

---

high school. His report further suggests that as much as fifty percent of the enrollment of some high schools located in economically favored communities would be included in the academically talented group. The same report concedes that the term "gifted" should apply to no more than the upper two percent, but that the larger group of fifteen to twenty percent should have "hard core" subjects since they were the college bound students.

The differences among educators concerning programs for high ability students caused the writer to ask each school to identify the group of students for whom special programming was done and, in the interest of uniformity to refer to all groups so identified as "more able."

I. ADMINISTRATION

The ultimate responsibility for any activity conducted under the auspices of a school rests with the administration of the school system. Programs or activities for more able children are part of that responsibility. Martinson lists five major aspects of programming which must be accepted as administrative:


3Ibid.
1. Philosophical acceptance by members of the professional staff
2. Planned objectives and evaluation procedures
3. Continuity at all levels
4. Inservice education for teachers
5. Consultant help

Gallagher summarizes that two major items must be dealt with continuously by planners and coordinators of programs for more able children:

1. The problem of providing a comprehensive curriculum which would place emphasis on productive thinking rather than learning facts and processes

2. The problem of providing for the pupils of high ability who are not included in special classes or programs

Each of the sources just cited implies that the central administrative office must have a staff member who is knowledgeable about the demands of a special program and who can coordinate and interpret its activities. The Portland report indicates that such a person was engaged from the beginning and had the following duties:

1. To coordinate the work of the various school committees

---


2. To direct procedures of identification with the help of specialized assistance

3. To help members of school staffs in evaluating and adapting existing programs

4. To exercise general supervision over the program

5. To formulate plans for the development and extension of the program

When administrative guides are provided at the central office level, there are varying degrees of freedom left to the initiative of the individual school principal. The National Education Association bulletin concerning the administration of programs for the academically talented points out that the school principal will be busy with decisions about school policy, scheduling, obtaining materials, coordinating efforts of community resource persons, and interpreting all of the school activities of the program to the parents and to the general administrative office. The continuous function of administration in the individual school is that of leadership and coordination. Faculty acceptance, special committee assignments, and proper adaptation of


materials and personnel will result from skillful execution of the leadership function. The principal's role is not easy, but its complexity is an indication of its importance.8

II. THE CHILD

Any endeavor which seeks to improve education must be cognizant of the nature of the beneficiary of that improvement. Whether the instrument of improvement is a new type building, laboratory equipment, new textbooks, or a differentiated curriculum for more able pupils, the key to success is the effective merging of the new commodity with the child who is the intended user.

It is likely that any study involving giftedness in children will begin with some reference to the monumental research by Lewis M. Terman and his colleagues.9 Terman's study, which included 1,528 children with IQ's 140 and above, was designed to reveal what gifted children are like as children, what kind of adults they become, and some of the factors that affect later achievement.

Before the Terman work began, the gifted child was often considered to be an unattractive, unhealthy, undersized misfit. The first report indicated that gifted students as a group were healthier, more pleasant in appearance, larger physically, and better adjusted. Numerous studies since have confirmed the multiple superiority of the gifted group.

8Tbid., p. 29.

The early days of the psychological testing movement were directed to the study of mentally retarded children. It was not until tests were used with children of high ability that the critics began to attack. In 1922, Walter Lippmann charged that Terman's measurement of hereditary intelligence had "...no more scientific foundation than a hundred other fads, vitamins and glands...and will pass with them into that limbo where phrenology, palmistry, and characterology and the other Babu sciences are to be found."10 Professor Terman's reply was equally cutting, saying that if Mr. Lippmann believed so much in the nursery years as the major determinants of intelligence, then he should recommend that our millions go into kindergarten work and let up on higher education.11

The questioning attitude about testing is still evident today. The reliance on test scores in identifying more able pupils is challenged by some who claim that tests lack refinement. The writer knows of no test instrument which has been represented as being perfect. Neither has he encountered a school system which uses a single test score as the sole criterion for identifying more able students or students of any other ability level.

Test scores do vary, especially group intelligence tests as

11Lewis M. Terman, "The Great Conspiracy or the Impulse Imperial of Intelligence Testers, Psychoanalyzed and Exposed by Mr. Lippmann," New Republic, XXXIII (December 27, 1922), 116-120.
compared with individual test scores. In a special class of seventeen
gifted children at Western Carolina College, the group test scores
ranged from 121 to 159, while individual test scores ranged from 150 to
183. The mean difference was 27.5 with no individual score less than a
group score.\textsuperscript{12}

In regard to the variations in test scores, Gallagher points out
that these fluctuations are generally traced to limitations in the tests
rather than changes in the ability of the child.\textsuperscript{13}

In assessing the potential of more able children to fit into
special instructional programs, traditional intelligence tests are
usually supplemented by measures of another facet of the intellect,
creativity. It has long been known that the objective format of the
general intelligence test does not measure the attributes of imagination
and originality which are associated with creativity. Several researchers
paralleled the development of the general intelligence test with studies
of "spontaneity" and "inventiveness." In 1922, Simpson charged that
even though tests designed to determine native intelligence were
valuable to an employer, there was nothing in those tests to determine
one's likelihood of creative productivity or originality.\textsuperscript{14} Subsequent

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{12}Harold R. Bixler, C. Douglas Carter, and C. D. Killian,\textit{Enriching the Curriculum} (Cullowhee, North Carolina: Western Carolina


\textsuperscript{14}R. M. Simpson, "Creative Imagination," \textit{American Journal of
Psychology}, XXXIII (April 1922), 241.
\end{footnotes}
correlational studies have continued to produce evidence that high creativity and giftedness according to an intelligence test were not the same. Correlations of less than .10 were common, and Welch's .27 was not significant.\(^{15}\)

The discussion concerning the difference between the metric IQ and creativity is summarized in the statement from Getzels and Jackson which follows.

Giftedness in children has most frequently been defined as a score on an intelligence test, and typically the study of the so-called gifted child has been equated with the study of the single IQ variable. Involved in this definition of giftedness are several types of confusion, if not of outright error.\(^{16}\)

They point out the restrictive elements of the single metric, the improper acceptance of the intelligence test as a sampler of all cognitive processes, and the fallacy of relating creativity only to performance in the arts.\(^{17}\) A broader acceptance of giftedness, the same writers contend, must include the concepts of moral character, psychological adjustment, and creativity, as well as intelligence.\(^{18}\)

The call for a broad definition of giftedness is not new. Even though most of Hollingworth's research dealt with children of extremely

\(^{15}\)Livingston Welch, "Recombination of Ideas in Creative Thinking," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXX (December 1946), 642

\(^{16}\)Jacob W. Getzels and Philip W. Jackson, Creativity and Intelligence (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962) p. 8.

\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 7.

\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 10.
high intelligence, her writings often revealed an interest in a much larger group. In 1931, she wrote that a gifted child "...is one who is far more educable than the generality of children. The greater educability may lie along the lines of one of the arts; it may lie in the sphere of mechanical aptitude; it may consist of power to achieve literacy and abstract knowledge." She urged that it was the business of education to consider all forms of giftedness in children and to devise means of training them for their own welfare and for the good of society. Witty agrees with a more flexible view of giftedness and suggests that the term might apply to any child "whose performance in any valuable line of human activity is consistently or repeatedly remarkable." Another example of the expanded meaning comes from Fliegler and Bish, who look at the top fifteen to twenty per cent in achievement or at those with talent or high special ability. In a symposium introductory chapter to the Fifty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Havighurst and his colleagues indicate that the book was dedicated "not to the two or five

---


20 Ibid.


per cent with promise of exceptionally good performance in a variety of areas of constructive activity."

While the major emphasis among educators is toward working out adequate school programs for the high-achieving academically talented group, there are those who urge that attention should be concentrated at a higher level of ability. Ward devotes an entire book to the presentation of basic principles for the education of children who comprise "...the upper one, two, or three per cent of the general intelligence scale and who are intrinsically motivated toward academic, scientific, or other intellectual accomplishment." The great study conducted by Terman and his colleagues included a group of more than 1,500 children ranging in IQ from 135 to 200, with a mean Binet of 151.

The "more able" child as defined in this dissertation refers to one whose advanced ability requires a program of instruction which is different from that provided for other pupils in the regular classroom. Cutts and Moseley summarize the general characteristics of children who would fall within that definition. These characteristics are:

1. Large vocabulary and accurate use of words

---


2. Ability to make generalizations
3. Abstract thinking ability
4. Insight into problems
5. Reasoning and problem solving
6. Speed of learning
7. Persistence
8. Memory
9. Foresight
10. Humor and wit
11. High range of interests
12. Alertness
13. Initiative
14. Critical judgment
15. Desire to be of service

It was pointed out that not all bright children exhibit all of the traits mentioned, but that systematic observations usually reveal a majority of the list of characteristics to be applicable.

II. IDENTIFICATION

Identification is the process of screening children by means of tests and observations, and selecting the superior pupils for specially


27 Ibid., p. 18.
designed educational programs.²⁸ Procedures of identification assist in tailoring the instructional program to the particular needs of the child, and a good identification program will stimulate teachers and administrators to do something for the children they have identified.²⁹

Numerous criteria and instruments have been used in identifying gifted children. There are those who hold that the principal means of identifying the superior student is systematic observation by the teacher.³⁰ In such cases, standardized tests and psychological services are considered supportive to the teacher's judgment. The other point of view considers general intelligence to be the basis of selection, and for this reason selects the intelligence test result as the major basis for selection. It was reported by the National Education Association that studies concerning teacher judgment have revealed that teachers picked only a small percentage of the gifted group, and at the same time picked many who were not gifted.³¹ Supporters of those studies contend that teacher judgment is only one of many factors which must be considered if proper selection is accomplished.

It is generally agreed that identification and selection of bright


²⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

³⁰ Cutts and Moseley, op. cit., p. 13.

pupils must be based upon a definition of the type of pupil to be
selected. The Southern Regional Education Board report states that

...explicit definitions, a knowledgeable utilization of
existing psychological instruments, and a judicious involve-
ment of the judgment of personnel closely acquainted with
potential candidates for the program are essential to adequate
processes of identification.32

The report insists that identification begin in the primary grades and
extend continuously through the secondary school.

The Portland, Oregon program for gifted students, consisting of
approximately the top ten per cent in each school, has what is con-
sidered by many as an outstanding system of identification and selection.

Their criteria indicate that the identification program should:

1. Include a wide variety of talents

2. Make use of all data, including regular testing program and
cumulative folders

3. Use a variety of information, including tests, teacher
observations, parent observations, peer observations, interests, "drive,"
and maturity

4. Be systematic and continuous from kindergarten through twelfth
grade

5. Consider all children eligible until definite proof of
ineligibility

6. Be flexible and allow children to move in and out as conditions
dictate

for Program Improvement (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board,
7. Emphasize curricular adaptation rather than labeling children.\(^3^3\)

The summary of criteria concerning identification also includes the reminder that placement and instruction are the end toward which the identification process was directed.

III. ADAPTATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION

The recognition and appraisal of more able students is the logical first step toward providing an educational program particularly suited to their high abilities. It is doubtful that anyone would question the importance of having a proper instructional program for the full development of the students identified as needing special attention, but conflicts do occur as to the particular method and setting most appropriate for producing the desired results. Some recent writings have charged that there have been changes in administrative, guidance, and instructional practices which have occurred without careful reflection to see if the changes were consistent with educational goals. For example, Fliegler points out that some schools advocate independence and creative response, yet show a de-emphasis on projects and unit methods while subject matter and teacher-centered classes are increased; improvement in leadership skills is needed, but extra curricular and club activities have been curtailed; concern for humanities is emphasized,

\(^3^3\)Portland Public Schools, \textit{op. cit.}, p. \underline{14}.\)
but the competition for science scholarships decreases time and interest in the arts.  

He blames much of the current neglect of peripheral subjects on the public demand to strengthen the academic program, all of which has affected the learning experiences of more able children as well as the generality of pupils.

Experience has shown educators that there is no best way to provide for the needs of superior children. Many techniques, arrangements, and adaptations have been tried, some with success and others completely inadequate. But there is one factor upon which there seems to be general agreement. That factor is that no special arrangement is justifiable for its own sake. Only to the extent that the special setting enhances the educational growth of children can schools justify a system of grouping, segregation, clustering, or any other departure from regular class organization. For a school to report that "we accelerate," or "we enrich," or "we group homogeneously," means little without careful explanation of learning experiences which accompany such techniques. As Lane points out, when we are questioned about what we are doing for the gifted, we often reply with what we are doing about them.

Special provisions for gifted children, then, generally are

---


35 Ibid.

involved with some sort of administrative plan for rearranging pupils in a manner considered more appropriate for instruction. In common usage, this arrangement is called "grouping."

**Grouping.** Attempts toward individualizing instruction are not new. Before World War I, the well-known Dalton and Winnetka Plans were providing for individual rates of learning, but attention to depth and breadth of coverage was not considered a major factor at that time. Other measures were sought for improving provisions for individual differences.

With the popularization of group intelligence testing, the period 1920-1930 included widespread use of ability grouping based on the results of group tests. According to Della-Dora, the basic assumption was that groups so constituted would be more homogeneous in general learning ability and could proceed at a rate commensurate with the general ability of the entire group, thus leading to more learning for classes of bright students and less pressure on slow students.\(^{37}\) He further reported that aims were limited to subject-matter or content mastery, and that little attention was given to methods and materials.\(^{38}\)

Newer approaches to the matter of differences in children consider the total aspect of learning. In summarizing factors which affect

---


\(^{38}\)Ibid.
learning in general and grouping practices specifically, Burton emphasizes that social, emotional, and intellectual forces interact simultaneously in every learning situation and must not be considered as independent variables. This position is supported by Passow in his statement that "...each learner brings into the classroom with him certain potentials, values, attitudes, aspirations, perceptions, and emotions which color what and how he will learn." It is emphasized that those factors apply whether there is ability grouping or regular classroom organization.

A frequent criticism of grouping according to ability is that research does not indicate that grouping, per se, will improve the achievement of pupils in the special group to a greater degree than the achievement of pupils of similar ability in a regular classroom. The recent large-scale study by Passow involving 3,000 fifth graders in schools verifies this criticism. The Southern Regional report takes particular notice of grouping as an administrative technique and agrees that "...mere grouping of pupils does not make a program, nor does absence of grouping mean that a program is absolutely ineffective.

---


41 Ibid.
Nevertheless, ability grouping greatly increases the school's power to effect a marked improvement in the process of education for gifted students. The report continues to emphasize that grouping makes possible the improvement of learning experiences for children, depending upon the competency of the teacher in adapting methods and materials.

Other criticisms of grouping or other special arrangements for gifted children center around the social and emotional effects of the grouping on the children placed in the selected group. Research emphatically negates the idea that special attention tends to foster "elitism," "snobbishness," or social unacceptance. Goldworth's study of special groupings revealed that the social relationships between regular students and the special groups were not adversely affected by the grouping. Martyn found that among 3,001 students, the social acceptance as rated by peers outside the special group placed gifted students as high or higher than those not gifted. In still another study, Mann's sociometric research indicated that gifted and non-gifted children tended to reject members of their own groups more frequently than they rejected persons from the opposite group.

---


15 Horace Mann, "How Real Are Friendships of Gifted and Typical Children in A Program of Partial Segregation?" Exceptional Children, XXIII (February, 1957), 206.
Grouping practices vary widely, but have been summarized by Fliegler as falling into these major groups:

1. Total ability grouping in a special school or special classes in a comprehensive school, the latter represented by a multi-track plan

2. Modified ability grouping, including cluster groups, seminars, and interest groups

3. Talent sectioning for youngsters possessing high-order talent in various areas

It is further pointed out by Fliegler that the decision to form a special group recognizes that the gifted child shows a general attribute of superiority, but that he is not equally superior in all areas. He concludes, then, that the case for grouping is not directed to remoteness or proximity of people or buildings, but to the content of ideas which are developed within the classroom.

---

Acceleration. There have been intensive investigations in recent years concerning early admission, rapid progress sections, grade skipping, and advanced placement. All of these are forms of acceleration which allow gifted students to complete some phase of formal education in less time than is usually required. Advocates of some form of acceleration

---


\[^47\] Ibid., p. 22.
usually offer reasons similar to those given by Abraham, which follow.

1. Acceleration is easy and economical. Does not alter the basic curriculum, nor does it disrupt classes.

2. Provides motivation, prevents poor work habits, reduces frustrations caused by boredom.

3. Reduces length of formal education without lowering competency, and allows capable people to become productive workers at an earlier age.

4. Allows promotion when work is completed, not at a future date which signals the end of a term.¹⁸

Traditional arguments against any acceleration have been condensed by Abraham to include:

1. Important to keep child with his age group in order to prevent social and emotional disturbance.

2. Accelerants will likely miss some important phase of schooling usually obtained with chronological age group.

3. Similar mental age alone does not guarantee similar responses or interests among pupils of differing chronological ages.

4. Inequalities will result from full grade acceleration since no one is advanced to the same extent in all areas.¹⁹

Neither the pros nor the cons just cited have claimed complete


¹⁹Ibid., p. 78
research justification for their respective positions, but according to Fliegler and Bish, well-planned acceleration—specifically early admission, rapid progress sections, and advanced placement—appears to be a beneficial practice and does recognize individual differences. A more positive position favoring acceleration is taken by Shannon, whose survey indicated no published research showing acceleration to be harmful. One study reported that the younger accelerants took more scholarship honors, took part in more activities, including football, and were elected to more class offices than were their older classmates. Three studies indicated no significant difference in achievement between accelerants and non-accelerants, but the younger age of the accelerated pupils led the researchers to conclude favorably for acceleration. General conclusions by Shannon were as follows:

1. If properly used, acceleration of gifted children does not handicap them personally or socially

2. Children who have been accelerated can maintain the quality of work done by their older classmates or even do better scholastic work at the high school and junior high level

---

50 Fliegler and Bish, op. cit., p. 430.
52 Ibid., p. 72.
53 Ibid.
Whether acceleration takes the form of rapid progress through a non-graded elementary school or by advanced placement arrangements in the final year of high school, those who support the technique insist that it be a part of a well-conceived plan which has considered the total needs and abilities of the child.

A concluding voice favoring some kind of acceleration is that of Professor Emeritus Sidney L. Pressley of Ohio State University, whose studies concerning rapid academic movement of gifted students span a generation. He asks for "...open-minded consideration of the possibility that for able students to progress through school at a faster-than-average pace is normal for them, not hurrying; that there are ways of facilitating their progress which help rather than hinder good social adjustment; and that such steps can lessen the load and facilitate the work of our overcrowded schools."\(^5\) Pressley further points out that many of the highly successful accelerants were not carefully screened nor properly counseled, yet suffered no ill effects. This fact, he says, suggests even greater potential for rapid progress programs if good selection and guidance procedures are used.\(^5\)

**Enrichment.** DeHaan and Havighurst refer to enrichment as "...more opportunities for the gifted child to go deeper and to range


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 287.
more widely than the average child in his intellectual, social, and artistic experience."

Dorothy Norris offers an even shorter definition which states that "...enrichment is the best thing we know about teaching to meet the individual needs of these students."

The term "enrichment" is often referred to as a device rather than a combination of complementary learning experiences for children. Fliegler insists that the term is overused and abused, and that enrichment practices should be employed in any adequate instructional program.

Another point of view is presented by Gallagher, who says that enrichment is the further development of skills and talents which research has indicated as being characteristic of gifted children.

Those major skills are:

1. Ability to associate and interrelate concepts
2. Ability to evaluate facts and arguments critically
3. Ability to create new ideas and originate new lines of thought
4. Ability to reason through complex problems
5. Ability to understand other situations, times, and people;

---


58 Fliegler, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
to be less bound by one's own peculiar environment.\textsuperscript{59}

Gallagher adds that these skills are also found among average and below average children, but that they are more abundant among the highly able group. Thus, for the enrichment activity to have value more than "busy work," the experience should be related to one of the basic skills at the level commensurate with the ability of the child.\textsuperscript{60}

There is no apparent conflict among educators on the point that children of high ability need experiences which are of a more complex nature than are activities which stimulate the average intellect. McClelland and his associates indicate that there is a lack of specific direction for enrichment of high general intelligence except in the pursuit of an occupational goal, but adds that "...we still know far too little to be confident about how to develop talented performance out of talented potential."\textsuperscript{61} Ward concurs in this point of view and warns that the difficulty of establishing usable definitions of specific traits toward which the educative process can be directed might well render the idea of specific enrichment as impossible of execution.\textsuperscript{62}


\textsuperscript{60}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{62}Ward, op. cit., p. 38.
Within all of the arguments favoring and questioning the matter of classroom enrichment as a method of challenging the more able child, there appears to be at least one thread of common agreement. It is a fact that many schools, either because of limited enrollment or the nature of the student body, cannot feasibly use special grouping, sectioning or other common manipulative devices. In such cases it is left completely to the ingenuity and skill of the classroom teacher to provide, within the group, experiences which will enhance the growth of each child. Those teachers who have this total responsibility may take comfort in the review of certain advantages of this arrangement as listed by Kough.

1. Requires few, if any, additional expenditures or administrative alterations

2. Allows gifted students to stimulate other students

3. Keeps brighter students with age-mates for social development

4. Enrichment idea is a step toward general individualization of instruction for all students

5. Aspects of grouping and acceleration can be used within the classroom

For every argument favoring the classroom enrichment idea, there are statements offered in an attempt to discount the listed advantages.

---

Kough presents the opposing views as follows:

1. Not democratic to keep brighter pupils in with a pattern of average ability; home and community allows for healthy social development

2. Gifted students more likely to develop a sense of superiority in a regular class, while competition with other able pupils will provide stability and humility

3. Classroom enrichment plan causes excessive burden on teachers; teachers with special competencies are needed for gifted children

4. Teacher must spend greater amount of time with slow child; gifted child often left to provide for himself

In much of the literature concerning adaptations for teaching more able children, the implication is often given that the ideas of grouping, acceleration, and enrichment are either/or propositions. To the discerning educator, this implication must be discounted as misleading, if not false. The writer is enjoined at this point to attempt a clarification. Enrichment of the pupil is a goal of education in a system which subscribes to the philosophy of providing for the differences in children. The administrative techniques such as grouping, acceleration, and independent study are mere attempts to create an environment that will facilitate the enrichment process.

A concluding statement from Passow will suffice for summary.

_________________________

6U Ibid., pp. 145-146.
He says:

Careful appraisal of the results of school programs through evaluation of specific goal attainments is necessary. Only in this way will the school be able to determine whether or not it is actually providing experiences appropriate for the optimum development of its gifted students. 65

IV. THE TEACHER

When a school system begins to consider the matter of selecting teachers for more able students, several things may be assumed immediately. The first is that gifted children exist. Secondly, they are identifiable individually and as a group. The third assumption is that highly able pupils have needs that differ perceptibly from the majority of children. A fourth assumption would call for a teacher of special competencies to deal with children who have special needs—needs that differ in degree rather than in kind.

To know just what kind of teacher would best serve the needs of gifted children would give teacher education institutions and faculty study groups a boost in the right direction. No such composite person has yet been sufficiently described. Further evidence of the lack of definitive standards for teachers of exceptionally able children is the absence of certification requirements as reported by each State Department of Education. Pennsylvania, the only remaining state issuing

certificates to teachers of gifted children, was reported in 1962 to be in the process of eliminating the credential.66

The lack of certification requirements is paralleled by a similar scarcity of courses offered in the area of the gifted by teacher education institutions. A U.S. Office of Education study of 463 colleges revealed that a total of 1,976 fifth-year programs were offered for classroom teachers. Of that number, only sixteen clearly indicated that specific attention had been given to the area of the gifted child.67

It has been observed by the writer, during visits across the country in connection with the Southern Regional Project, that educators generally oppose certification for teachers of the gifted. Dissatisfaction is also encountered when a series of specific courses about gifted children is offered in a prescribed teacher education program. The most promising practice observed was that of college sponsorship of workshop opportunities for the study of specific topics requested by the teachers, themselves. Such workshops were geared to the specific needs of the teachers and were directly related to subject areas and ability levels of students assigned to those teachers.

Virtually every study dealing with the education of gifted children emphasizes the importance of the teacher. Brandwein calls teaching a personal invention, and reports active scientists who relate


the great influence of one or two outstanding teachers as persons, as well as instructors.68 If all of the conflicting opinions about identification, selection, grouping, acceleration, and enrichment could be resolved immediately, the matter of teacher qualifications would be problem enough.

Willard Abraham suggested that those who compile the lists of characteristics deemed desirable for teachers of the gifted just do not realize that "...they are anticipating a kind of perfection to which normal people do not aspire."69 With reference to a two-page list of desirable qualities of teachers, Abraham raised the question as to which paragon of all that's wonderful could measure up or be presumptuous enough to claim to be qualified.70

Even with the clutter of characteristics which have been proposed as desirable, some characteristics appear to be basic. From the point of view of the child, Davis obtained reactions from upper elementary gifted children concerning the qualities they admired in a teacher. The major categories were:

1. Sense of humor
2. Encouragement of responsibility


69 Abraham, op. cit., p. 176

70 Ibid., pp. 176-177.
3. Knowledge of subject
4. Firmness and fairness
5. Understanding of children
6. Enjoyment of teaching

It was conceded by Davis that those qualities could be claimed by a good teacher of any group, but she concluded that "...raising the characteristics of a good teacher to the highest point of development would produce a gifted teacher for gifted pupils."71

In referring to the kind of teacher sought for Hunter College Elementary School, Hildreth offered several "musts:"

1. The teacher must be gifted
2. He must have plenty of imagination
3. He must understand the psychology of the gifted and their special learning problems
4. He must have a breadth of interests, a variety of competencies, and be familiar with various areas of knowledge
5. He must have a broad cultural background and be tolerant and sympathetic to the needs of gifted children73

Other writers have joined Hildreth in the position that gifted

72 Ibid.
children must have gifted teachers, but this writer has encountered none who would venture an IQ requirement for teachers. The giftedness in teachers was related to teaching skills, personal attributes, resourcefulness, and leadership qualities. Here, again, it must be said that all teachers need these qualities, and, as with the children, giftedness is a matter of degree.

In at least one system the teachers, themselves, listed what they considered to be the essential qualities of teachers of gifted children. It was found that the Portland teachers of special classes for the gifted were in greatest agreement on four items:

1. Greater knowledge of the subject
2. Ability and willingness to encourage questions and independent study
3. Willingness to work harder
4. Respect for, and interest in gifted children

A brief summary, then, might well be that a successful teacher of gifted children would likely possess the best attributes of a scholar and a teacher. These are the feelings expressed by Clifford Williams, Director of the Portland program. He emphasizes that a scholar's approach to his special teaching field includes impressive competence in the knowledge and skills of that field, and a drive to increase competence in that field through formal training and informal study.

74 Portland Public Schools, op. cit., p. 107.

The idea of providing an education for each child according to his needs and abilities is an accepted fact in our democratic society. The unique characteristics and needs of more able pupils which set them apart as a group have long been recognized, but have in the last dozen years received increased attention and study.

It is generally agreed that the aims of education for more able children do not differ appreciably from the aims for less able pupils, but the instructional programs which seek to help students realize those aims must of necessity differ in degree, but not in kind. The ultimate responsibility for the differentiated program is that of the administration, from which must come the policies governing identification, selection, and instructional arrangements.

Research substantiates that in meeting the total needs of more able young people, no single method will suffice. Instead, a combination of some kind of grouping, some acceleration, and the very best teaching methods must merge in order to provide the individual enrichment which is the objective of education.

To have the right teacher for the right child is a legitimate wish of all who are concerned about children and their educational growth. Teachers, like children, differ in their competencies and in their personality structure. It is considered to be imperative that teachers of more able children be selected with regard to qualities such as
scholarship, knowledge of the needs of more able children, and the
ability to stimulate and give satisfaction to the inquiring young
mind.
CHAPTER III

THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this study to determine the kinds of educational opportunities offered to more able pupils in white public schools in selected school systems in Louisiana. Three school systems were selected from each of six major geographical areas. The total of eighteen school systems included seventeen parish systems and one city system, but for the purposes of this study, all school systems were referred to as parishes. The areas were Northeast, Northwest, Central, Southeast, South-Central, and Southwest.

In order to obtain sample parishes that were representative of all types in regard to white enrollments, it was decided to select, as far as possible, three adjoining parishes in each area that could be classified as large, medium or small. A parish was classified as large if total white enrollments numbered 10,000 or more; it was classified as medium if total white enrollments were between 3,000 and 9,999; and it was considered small if the total white enrollments were less than 3,000.

Within each of the parishes, the schools were categorized according to type and size. Type referred to its primary organizational structure as either elementary, junior high, or high school. Schools including grades one through eight were considered elementary unless grades seven and eight were separated for junior high activities.
Schools listed as including grades one through twelve were tabulated as one elementary and one high school. Thus, all references and tabulations regarding "schools" were indicative of major departments which were classified locally as being primarily an elementary school, a junior high school, or a senior high school.

Each school was classified as either large, medium, or small. For purposes of this study, a school was considered large if its enrollment numbered 600 or more; it was listed as medium if its enrollment included 300 to 599 pupils; and if a school enrolled less than 300 pupils, it was designated as a small school.

According to the definitions previously cited regarding the size of parishes, it was found that there were eleven parishes in the State, excluding New Orleans, which could be classified as large. This study included five of those large parishes. Thirty-one parishes met the definition of medium. Six of the thirty-one were used in the study. Out of the twenty-four remaining parishes, which were designated as small, seven were included in the study. The total of eighteen parishes used represented 27.2 per cent of the total number of school systems in the State, excluding New Orleans. New Orleans was not considered for the study because of the difficulty involved in contacting the numerous schools, and because its enrollment was so much greater than the other parishes designated as large.

The total white enrollment in the public schools of Louisiana, not including New Orleans, was 440,337, according to the 1962 School Directory, issued by the State Department of Education. This
This study was designed to relate the status of educational opportunities for more able pupils and to report the results by size of parish and size of school. The distribution of schools by parishes will follow.

**Large parishes** (enrollment over 10,000). There were five large parishes with 188 schools included in the study. Those parishes reported total school distribution as follows:

- Elementary: 26 large; 58 medium; 45 small
- Junior High: 16 large; 3 medium; 2 small
- Senior High: 18 large; 5 medium; 15 small

A total distribution of schools in the five large parishes, by size and type of school, will be found in Table I page 45.

**Medium parishes** (enrollment 3,000 to 9,999). There were six parishes with 99 schools included in the medium group. The distribution of schools in the medium parishes was as follows:

- Elementary: 10 large; 17 medium; 34 small
- Junior High: 1 large; 4 medium; 0 small
- Senior High: 4 large; 2 medium; 27 small

The total distribution of schools in the six medium parishes, by size and type of school, is indicated in Table II, page 46.
### TABLE I

**DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN PARISHES WITH LARGE ENROLLMENTS ACCORDING TO SIZE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Junior High Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Senior High Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total by size</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)large enrollment indicates total white enrollment of 10,000 or more
TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN PARISHES WITH MEDIUM\(^1\) ENROLLMENTS
ACCORDING TO SIZE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></th>
<th><strong>Junior High Schools</strong></th>
<th><strong>Senior High Schools</strong></th>
<th><strong>Totals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total by size</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elementary Total** 61  
**Junior High Total** 5  
**Senior High Total** 33  
**All Schools** 99

\(^1\)medium enrollment indicates total white enrollment of 3,000 to 9,999 pupils
Small parishes (less than 3,000 pupils). Seven parishes with 71 schools were included in the small group. The summary distribution of schools within the small parishes was reported as follows:

- **Elementary**
  - 3 large
  - 5 medium
  - 32 small

- **Junior High**
  - 0 large
  - 3 medium
  - 1 small

- **Senior High**
  - 1 large
  - 1 medium
  - 25 small

Table III, page 48, reveals the total distribution in the small group by parish and by size and type of school.

### Distribution summary

There were 18 parishes and 358 schools included in this study. The following is a summary of parishes and schools by size and type:

- **Parishes**
  - 5 large
  - 6 medium
  - 7 small

- **Elementary Schools**
  - 39 large
  - 80 medium
  - 111 small

- **Junior High Schools**
  - 17 large
  - 29 medium
  - 3 small

- **Senior High Schools**
  - 23 large
  - 8 medium
  - 67 small

A summary distribution indicating size of parish, type of school, and size of school is represented by Table IV, page 49.

### II. OBTAINING DATA

There were two major sources of data used in this dissertation. The first was an interview schedule used with parish superintendents for the purpose of obtaining information about the physical setting of the school system, official policies and practices concerning more able children, and needed steps toward new or improved programs for the more able.
TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN PARISHES WITH SMALL ENROLLMENTS
ACCORDING TO SIZE AND ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Junior High Schools</th>
<th>Senior High Schools</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total by size  | 3     | 5      | 32    | 0     | 3      | 1     | 1     | 1      | 25    |

Elementary Total | 40    | 4      | 27    | 71    |

\(^1\) Small enrollment indicates total white enrollment of less than 3,000 pupils
TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF PARISH, SIZE OF SCHOOL, AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Parishes</th>
<th>Number of Parishes</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Junior High Schools</th>
<th>Senior High Schools</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary Totals | 230                |
Junior High Totals | 30                  |
Senior High Totals | 98                  |
Total Schools     | 358                 |
The second major source of data was an interview schedule used with school principals for the purpose of obtaining information about the school staff, enrollment, grades taught, methods of identification and selection of more able pupils, and the administrative and instructional procedures used in connection with any special attention given to the more able children.

The interview schedules used with superintendents and principals are included as a part of this dissertation as Appendices A and B. Descriptions of the responses to items in the schedule for superintendents will follow.

**Interview Schedule for Superintendents**

The interview schedule used in conferences with superintendents was divided into three major parts. The first section was concerned with the physical setting of the school system, including enrollments, number and type of schools, and the urban-rural nature of the school population. Enrollments and school distributions have already been discussed and explained. See Tables I-IV of this study.

Part C of the first section asks each superintendent to describe the pupil population distribution in his parish as either "mostly rural," "mostly town or city," or "about evenly divided." A tabulation revealed that the "mostly rural" heading included 1 medium and 4 small parishes; the "mostly town or city" group included 5 large, 3 medium and 1 small parishes; the "about evenly divided" category included 2 medium and 2 small parishes. A tabular summary is as follows:
Mostly rural  
Large: 0  
Medium: 1  
Small: 4  
Total: 5

Mostly town or city  
Large: 5  
Medium: 3  
Small: 1  
Total: 9

About evenly divided  
Large: 0  
Medium: 2  
Small: 2  
Total: 4

Total  
Large: 5  
Medium: 6  
Small: 7  
Total: 18

The second section of the schedule for superintendents included questions about the status of provisions for more able children in each of the parishes. Questions sought information about official policies governing special attention for more able children, and were designed for "yes" or "no" responses. The questions, A through H, and responses according to type of parish were as follows:

A. Has there been a systematic effort in your parish to study the needs of more able children?

Large Parishes: yes-4; no-1  
Medium Parishes: yes-1; no-5  
Small Parishes: yes-1; no-6

B. Has your school board taken an official position favoring a program for more able children?

Large Parishes: yes-4; no-1  
Medium Parishes: yes-0; no-6  
Small Parishes: yes-1; no-6

C. Has the office of superintendent issued any written directives encouraging more attention to the needs of the more able student?

Large Parishes: yes-4; no-1  
Medium Parishes: yes-0; no-6  
Small Parishes: yes-1; no-6
D. Has your school system arrived at a working definition of the term, "more able," or some other term indicating superior ability?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Parishes</th>
<th>Medium Parishes</th>
<th>Small Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes-4; no-1</td>
<td>yes-0; no-6</td>
<td>yes-1; no-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Does your system have a policy opposing special classes for more able children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Parishes</th>
<th>Medium Parishes</th>
<th>Small Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes-0; no-5</td>
<td>yes-0; no-6</td>
<td>yes-0; no-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Are your schools allowed any funds, materials or equipment intended primarily for enriching the school program for more able pupils?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Parishes</th>
<th>Medium Parishes</th>
<th>Small Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes-3; no-2</td>
<td>yes-1; no-5</td>
<td>yes-1; no-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Is there a person on your central office staff who has been delegated the direct responsibility for knowing how well the needs of more able children are being met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Parishes</th>
<th>Medium Parishes</th>
<th>Small Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes-4; no-1</td>
<td>yes-1; no-5</td>
<td>yes-1; no-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Do you have in operation a parish-wide testing program through which pupils of high ability can be identified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Parishes</th>
<th>Medium Parishes</th>
<th>Small Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes-5; no-0</td>
<td>yes-4; no-2</td>
<td>yes-7; no-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of the questions except "E," the favorable response was "yes." The favorable response to Question "E" was "no." Out of eight questions, the total favorable responses given, as compared to the total
possible favorable responses, were as follows:

**Large Parishes:**
33 favorable out of 40 possible 82.50 per cent

**Medium Parishes:**
13 favorable out of 48 possible 27.08 per cent

**Small Parishes:**
20 favorable out of 56 possible 35.71 per cent

**All Parishes:**
66 favorable out of 144 possible 45.83 per cent

The five large parishes, representing 27.78 per cent of the total number of parishes studied gave 33, or 50.00 per cent, of the 66 favorable responses obtained; the six medium parishes, representing 33.33 per cent of the total number of parishes studied, gave 13, or 19.70 per cent, of the 66 favorable responses obtained; and the seven small parishes, representing 38.89 per cent of the total number of parishes studied, gave 20, or 30.30 per cent, of the 66 favorable responses obtained.

In question "I," the writer asked for a description of the parish-wide status of provisions for more able children. The responses from the five large parishes were as follows:

2 were actively engaged in a parish-wide program
2 were engaged in a limited program
1 reported enrichment opportunities in every class

Responses from the medium parishes were as follows:

1 reported plans for a parish-wide study
2 reported some schools active but not coordinated through central office
4 reported responsibility for such programs was left to individual principals

The small parishes produced only two different types of responses:
1 was already engaged in a parish-wide program
6 left the responsibility to the individual principal

A combined report of all eighteen parishes revealed six types of responses:

3 parishes were already actively engaged in a parish-wide program
2 parishes were engaged in a limited program
1 parish was planning a parish-wide study
2 parishes reported some schools active but not coordinated by the central office
10 parishes left the responsibility to the individual school
1 parish reported enrichment in every classroom

The third and final section of the schedule for superintendents was designed to determine what the superintendents considered to be important next steps toward improving their attention to the needs of more able children. The 18 superintendents made a total of 99 suggestions for improvement of their own schools. The writer categorized the suggestions into 12 major headings, which follow in a frequency-of-mention listing:
16 more time for cooperative teacher planning
16 more time for individual instruction
16 reduced class sizes
15 more resource materials to aid teachers
9 more supervisory personnel
7 more stimulation from central office staff
6 more help from State Department of Education
5 more special teachers or guidance personnel
2 more help from teacher preparatory institutions
3 fewer classes for teachers of more able pupils
3 more faculty studies about the more able
1 parish-wide study of needs of more able

Summary of superintendent interviews. There were 358 schools with a total enrollment of 143,386 pupils included in the study. Of the 18 parishes studied, 5 were mostly rural, 9 were mostly town or city, and 4 were about evenly divided.

The section concerning official policies and practices revealed that of a total of 144 responses, there were only 66, or 45.83 per cent, which could be considered complementary to an active program for more able pupils. It was also noted that only three parishes reported active, parish-wide programs, while sixteen of the parishes had testing programs through which more able pupils could be identified. A majority of the parishes, 10 out of 18, left the responsibility for more able children to the individual schools rather than exercise any central office control or initiative.
In the matter of program improvement, superintendents made a total of 99 responses which included 12 suggestions. Sixty-three of the 99 responses, or 63.63 per cent, suggested more attention to matters of cooperative teacher planning, more individual work with pupils, reduced class size, and resource materials for the classes. Other recommendations by the superintendents called for more help from teacher training colleges, the State Department of Education, and the central office staff.

Interview Schedule for Principals

The purpose of the interview schedule was to guide the writer in determining from each principal the kinds of specific educational opportunities which his school provided to meet the needs of more able children. It was explained that this study was concerned only with opportunities primarily designed for the purpose of providing richer educational programs for more able pupils. Information obtained through use of the interview was tabulated according to size of parish and type and size of school as defined on page 43 of this study.

Among the five large parishes with white enrollments in excess of 10,000 pupils, there were 188 schools with a total enrollment of 98,403. There were 129 elementary, 21 junior high, and 38 high schools included in this group.

Early in each interview, the principal was asked if his school provided any activities, classes, grouping, or other special arrangements
designed primarily to meet the needs of more able pupils. In the five large parishes the total school responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>84.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>73.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete tabulation of the number and type of schools in large parishes reporting special attention to the needs of more able pupils is given in Table V, page 58.

Out of the 188 schools in the large parishes, 139 reported some activity specially designed for more able students. Descriptions of programs in each parish will follow.

**Large Parish A.** All twenty elementary schools and the two junior high schools reported special activities for more able pupils. Since the program in that parish involved grades five through eight, the discussion of the activities has treated the elementary and junior high together, rather than as separate programs. The activities in Parish A were coordinated from the central office, which resulted in standardized procedures. A summary, keyed to the interviews with principals, is as follows:

**II. The Pupil**

A. There is on file a list of 135 pupils each in grades five, six and seven who have been classified as more able.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Junior High</th>
<th>Senior High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
<td>yes/ no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>20/ 0</td>
<td>2/ 0</td>
<td>2/ 2</td>
<td>24/ 2</td>
<td>92.30/ 7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>30/ 3</td>
<td>7/ 0</td>
<td>4/ 0</td>
<td>41/ 3</td>
<td>93.18/ 6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>11/ 11</td>
<td>3/ 1</td>
<td>2/ 10</td>
<td>16/ 22</td>
<td>42.10/ 57.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>7/ 8</td>
<td>0/ 0</td>
<td>2/ 5</td>
<td>9/ 13</td>
<td>40.90/ 59.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>36/ 3</td>
<td>6/ 2</td>
<td>7/ 4</td>
<td>49/ 9</td>
<td>84.48/ 15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>104/ 25</td>
<td>18/ 3</td>
<td>17/ 21</td>
<td>139/ 49</td>
<td>73.93/ 26.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Specific factors used in identifying more able were as follows:
   1. Group intelligence tests
   2. Standardized achievement tests
   3. Previous grades
   4. Teacher judgment
C. Minimum I.Q. of 120 on group test was required
D. Definition of "more able" was not related to percentile groups.
E. Children identified as more able were urged to enter special classes, based on following factors:
   1. Teacher recommendations
   2. Parent recommendations
   3. Health record
   4. Pupil interest
   5. Social and emotional maturity

III. Instruction and programming

A. The following administrative programming devices were used:
   1. High ability groups in all subjects
   2. Special classes located in two schools and composed of 135 pupils each in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades
B. The program was an acceleration arrangement so that material usually covered in grades five through eight could be completed in three years, allowing the student
to proceed from grade seven directly to grade nine.

C. The instructional program was directly related to specific objectives determined as a result of a series of staff and teacher conferences concerning the needs of more able children. Objectives listed as being directly applicable to the advanced group were:

1. To develop techniques for independent study
2. To assist children in setting longrange goals which are commensurate with their high abilities
3. To emphasize that good scholarship is reasonably expected from persons of high ability
4. To develop basic skills and subject competencies upon which to build individual enrichment activities
5. To determine assignments beyond basic skills through careful teacher-pupil planning
6. Special grading or reporting was not an objective in Large Parish A

D. The self-contained special classrooms had special resource materials and had access to the foreign language laboratory.

E. Community resources

1. Visits to weather bureau, research center at an industrial complex, water works, and Chamber of Commerce
2. Personnel from above met with class discussion groups.
3. Studies were geared to operational aspects of industry rather than to factual descriptions only.

F. In-service training of teachers
1. Only the special class teachers were involved in in-service work regarding more able pupils.

2. Regular class teachers were not regularly informed about the activities in the special classes.

3. Teachers did not have the opportunity of visiting other schools and classes to observe programs for more able children.

G. The selection of teachers for more able children was based upon six criteria. Since no priority was given, the writer listed them in order of mention.

1. Master's degree or higher
2. Willingness to work harder
3. High degree of competence in subject matter
4. Respect for and interest in more able children
5. Ability to encourage a questioning atmosphere and independent study
6. A record of successful teaching in a regular classroom

H. Special classes, groups or activities for more able pupils other than those in the accelerated groups in grades five through eight were limited. Two of the four high schools in Large Parish A offered what they called advanced sections in mathematics and science. The basis for selection was possession of a "B" average in previous math and science courses. The other two high schools indicated no special offerings for more able pupils.

I. It was reported that 135 pupils were included in the elementary-junior high program and that 77 were included
in the two high school programs.

J. In response to the interviewer's question with regard to
the number of eligible pupils who were not in a special
class or program, it was reported that such figures were
not available.

Large Parish B. The program for more able children was func-
tioning as a parish-wide effort coordinated through the school board
office. As in Parish A, the procedures were standardized at each level.
Thus, of the total of 33 elementary schools in the parish, the 30 schools
which participated in the program for more able children observed the
same regulations, regardless of the size of the school. For that
reason, no reference was made to school size in reporting the programs
in operation in the elementary schools in Large Parish B. The same
conditions of uniformity existed in the junior high as well as the high
school programs.

Elementary schools in Large Parish B. There were 33 elementary
schools in Parish B, 24 of which included grades one through six, with
the remaining nine organized as grades one through eight. Of the three
schools which reported no activity in regard to the more able, two were
rural schools, grades one through eight, with less than 150 enrollments,
and the other was a neighborhood school with 306 pupils enrolled.

In each of the participating schools there was on file in the
principal's office a list of children identified as eligible to enter
the program for the more able. The factors used in identification
were as follows:
1. Group intelligence tests, I.Q. 120 minimum
2. Achievement tests
3. Reading tests
4. Previous grades
5. Teacher judgment

In order to be eligible to enter the special program, a child must have scored at 120 or above on a group intelligence test. The other factors were secondary.

After the list of eligible pupils was compiled, each child was given the opportunity of entering the special program. His selection was based upon the following criteria, all of which were of equal weight and importance:

1. Teacher recommendations
2. Parent approval
3. Pupil interest
4. Past grades

Provisions were made so that a child could be withdrawn from the special project group whenever there was evidence that he could function better by remaining in the regular class setting. The teacher, principal, or parent could initiate such a request.

The special offerings available in the elementary schools were limited to pupils at the fifth and sixth grade levels. The pupils in those grades who were identified and selected in the prescribed manner were enrolled in a regular class for four and one-half days per week.
and assigned to a special enrichment group for one-half day each week. The central office arranged the half-day blocks of time by transporting children from their regular classes to a designated school where the enrichment classes were held. A total of 635 fifth and sixth graders participated in the program during the 1962-63 school year.

The half-day enrichment program paralleled the offerings in the regular classroom, but allowed a period for extended inquiry beyond that which was possible within a routine school day. In addition to supplementing the regular school units of work, the more able pupils began a two-year cycle of enrichment units which were related to but not a part of the normal school day. All pupils in the enrichment project were held responsible for the assignments in the regular class as well as in the special project. Typical of the special units were the following:

1. Use of the library, with emphasis on the application of research skills
2. Organization and presentation of research materials and data
3. Factors affecting the growth and development of our parish and city
4. Study of community health and medical resources, including local hospital practices
5. Mathematics unit, including short methods, ways of proof, and principles of number systems
6. Geology unit emphasizing conditions conducive to the development of the petroleum industry
In addition to the community centered units, each enrichment group was given a continuous unit in French. The oral-aural method was used, with no written words or reading of the language. Spoken French was a part of each group unit during field trips as well as in portions of the classroom discussions. After a two-year period of pronunciation and vocabulary development through the hear-repeat-speak exercises, pupils were considered ready for formal classroom instruction in French.

The purpose of the special program for elementary children in Large Parish B was enrichment in depth rather than acceleration by reducing the number of years of school attendance. Records of special class activities, including progress reports, became a part of the pupil's cumulative folder. Report card grades, however, were based upon performance in the regular classroom.

The selection of teachers for more able children in the elementary schools was by agreement between the school principal and the central office staff. Criteria upon which the selection was based were as follows:

1. Record of successful teaching in the regular classroom
2. Respect for and interest in more able children
3. Knowledge of a second language (French)
4. Willingness to work harder

The three elementary teachers selected on the basis of the criteria listed above were assigned eight half-day blocks of time per week with eight different groups of children and were allowed two
half-day periods per week for planning and development of resource materials.

It was considered important that all regular teachers be informed about the activities provided for the more able groups. The special class teachers had regular planning sessions with the central office staff and assisted in the preparation of descriptive reports concerning the enrichment program.

A total of 635 pupils participated in the enrichment project in the elementary schools of Large Parish B, with all of them coming from grades five and six. No other grades had specially programmed activities for the more able group.

Junior high schools in Large Parish B. The program for more able children in the junior high schools was coordinated through the central office as was the elementary project. There were 799 pupils from seven junior high schools included in the program.

Through the school testing programs, each principal had on file a list of pupils whose ability levels indicated the need for special attention. Identification of more able junior high school students was based on the following factors:

1. Group intelligence test score of 125 or above
2. Achievement test scores
3. Teacher recommendations
4. Previous grades

The selection and scheduling of junior high pupils into the special sections was considered a prerogative of the school. Parents
were not consulted as was the case with the elementary children.

The special sections for more able children consisted of a half-day block of time each day during which the pupils were allowed to proceed more rapidly than usual in the basic subjects, thus leaving more time for enrichment and extension of interest into areas ordinarily neglected. Enrichment activities included:

1. Attention to talent areas of music and art
2. Special interest projects in science under direction of a resource science teacher
3. Development of a three-year cycle of personal interest enrichment units
4. Extension of subject-centered activities for deeper enrichment and greater competency
5. Periods for conversational French with advanced high school students

A special effort was made administratively to see that the more able pupils associated with heterogeneous groups during the time they were outside the special half-day setting. It was explained to the writer that the philosophy in Large Parish B resisted homogeneous grouping on the grounds that it was artificial and unrealistic, and that provisions for heterogeneity for a part of each day would assist in countering what they called the ill effects of ability grouping for instruction.

The special classes in the junior high schools were located in
extra large classrooms which had adequate cabinet and shelf space for
the preparation and exhibition of long-term individual projects and
experiments.

An important aspect of enrichment at the junior high level was
the use of available community specialists and facilities as resources
in individual and class projects. Some specific examples are as follows:

1. A telephone company engineer was a resource person for a
unit on communications systems.

2. An air base officer assisted in a unit on missiles and
rocketry, including planned trajectory computation.

3. Materials Center personnel presented a unit on research
methods and materials.

4. A visit to the science building of a local college
supplemented a unit in mineralogy.

The selection of teachers for the more able groups in the junior
high schools was based on the following factors:

1. A record of successful teaching in a regular classroom

2. High degree of subject matter competence

3. Mutual agreement between principal and central office staff

Except for a few pupils who were kept out of the program because
of emotional factors or low achievement, all of the eligible junior
high school students in Large Parish B participated in the more able
group. The 799 participants represent 10.09 per cent of the total
enrollment of 7,709 students in grades seven, eight and nine.
Senior high schools in Large Parish B. The senior high schools in this parish were represented by grades ten, eleven and twelve. In the four senior high schools there were 565 participants in twenty-eight classes for more able students. It was the policy of each school that no pupil should be enrolled in more than two special classes at one time.

Because of the departmentalized nature of the senior high schools, there was no attempt to schedule pupils by grade groups into advanced sections. The system of electives was also given as a reason for less emphasis on uniform scheduling of grade groups.

In lieu of central control over the actual class organization and content, the central office and the four high schools agreed upon suggested goals for teachers and pupils in the more able groups at the senior high school level. The goals were reported as follows:

1. To diagnose and strengthen general study skills as well as skills pertinent to special subjects

2. To provide counseling based on an intimate knowledge of the pupils' scholastic strengths and weaknesses

3. To strengthen basic information and concepts for particular subjects

4. To introduce in mathematics those topics of use and interest not ordinarily taught in regular classes

5. To introduce the proper organization and writing of scientific, practical, and literary forms

6. To introduce efficient laboratory techniques to an extent
not generally practiced, and to make use of the project method of teaching

7. To introduce through social studies the concepts and responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy, and the effects of economic and social laws on civilization

The twenty-eight high school classes for more able students included five subject areas. The subjects and number of classes per subject were:

- Mathematics: 11
- English: 9
- History: 5
- Chemistry: 2
- Physics: 1

Eligibility requirements for enrollment in a high school class for more able children were less rigid than for the elementary and junior high pupils. Still, the identification procedure was based upon the four criteria following:

1. Group test I.Q. of 120 or above
2. Achievement tests
3. Academic performance as indicated by grades
4. Teacher recommendations

The flexibility of the admission policy was evident in the composition of each class. A principal would include a pupil of less than 120 I.Q. if the other criteria were met. Other students showing
high interest, high achievement, or other single indications warranting trail in the class were usually given favorable consideration.

Teachers of special classes in the high schools were not selected on the basis of listed criteria. They were selected on the judgment of the principal and by agreement with the central office staff. It was pointed out that the principal considered such factors as experience, competence, and interest before recommending that a teacher be assigned to work with a special group.

Faculty meetings regularly included progress reports from teachers of the more able groups so that all faculty members would be aware of the program and have an opportunity to offer suggestions. There was no rotation of teachers, but the special responsibility was occasionally shifted to different faculty members.

Grades earned by students in special classes were indicated by the usual letter value, but the permanent school records reflected grades which were earned in classes of high ability students.

The 565 high school students enrolled in classes for more able pupils represented 10.09 per cent of the total enrollment of 5,598 in grades ten, eleven and twelve.

Large Parish C

There were thirty-six school units in Large Parish C, including twenty-two elementary schools, four junior high schools and ten high schools. Schools which reported special attention for more able pupils included eleven elementary schools, three junior high schools and two high schools.
Elementary schools. The program for more able elementary pupils in Large Parish C consisted of enrichment activities for one-half day per week for eligible fifth and sixth graders from eleven participating schools. The participating schools were those schools in the urban area of the largest city of the parish. No rural schools reported any special attention to more able pupils.

A total of 170 fifth and sixth grade pupils from eleven schools were identified and transported to a designated school for one-half day each week. They were assembled in groups of approximately twenty-five each. The three criteria for selection were:

1. Achievement at least two grade levels above placement
2. Teacher recommendation
3. Parent approval

The enrichment experiences provided for the pupils selected consisted of three major activities:

1. Refinement of skills in research
2. Development and completion of an independent project
3. Group units which extended but paralleled regular class units

The teachers were selected by mutual agreement between principals and the central office. No special criteria were reported.

It was pointed out that the program was in the experimental stage and therefore limited in its scope. A committee including the special teachers, principals, and representatives of the central office
was to make an evaluation and report to the school board at the end of the school year.

**Junior high schools.** Three of the four junior high schools in Large Parish C reported special provisions for more able pupils. The program consisted of a daily opportunity period (the day included seven periods of equal length) during which pupils with a "B" grade average could participate in an interest group in either science, mathematics, literature or speech. No grades were given even though a faculty sponsor was in charge of each group and had the responsibility of seeing that enrichment projects were conducted. The writer questioned the value of the arrangement as a productive provision for more able students since there was no record of the number of participants and since the activities were not related to specific objectives.

**High schools.** Two of the ten high schools in Large Parish C reported special classes for more able students. Those two high schools were large, comprehensive schools, grades ten through twelve, in the urban area, while the remaining eight were rural units containing grades one through twelve.

The offerings in the two participating high schools were in the form of advanced sections, called Honors classes. Excellence in a particular subject area qualified the student for admission to the Honors class in that subject. Individual subject requirements for Honors participation were:

1. Superior grades
2. High percentile rank on standardized tests
3. Teacher recommendations

4. Prerequisites, if applicable

The subject areas in which Honors classes were offered are listed below with descriptions and prerequisites, if any:

1. English II, III and IV: Each of these classes completes the prescribed work of the regular class but provides depth in comprehension, expression and reasoning. Critical analysis of writers and their works is emphasized. Superior work in previous English is a prerequisite.

2. Civics: Honors civics is designed to challenge and stimulate interest through reduced emphasis on textbooks and more emphasis on reference material, project work, and personal experience units.

3. Algebra II: Honors Algebra II considers the regular work of Algebra II but includes a more careful inquiry into theory of equations, functions, sets, permutations, combinations, and simple probability. Honors Geometry is a prerequisite.

4. Geometry: Honors Geometry was open to students who were superior in Algebra I and includes the principles of plane and solid geometry.

5. Mathematics 12: Honors work in Geometry and Algebra II allows a student to take Mathematics 12, which includes elementary functions, sets, and notations.

6. Biology: This course provides a broader and more comprehensive background in biological principles than is encountered in the regular class. Extensive outside reading and research are required.
Superior work in General Science is a prerequisite.

7. Chemistry I: This includes basic material covered in the regular course, but proceeds more rapidly and goes farther.

It was pointed out that Physics and Chemistry II were not listed as Honors classes since those subjects were self-selective and therefore assumed Honors quality.

All teachers were considered to be subject matter specialists and, as such, qualified to handle Honors classes in their fields of preparation. The special classes were assigned by the principal with no indication of selection according to specific criteria.

In addition to the special classes provided during the regular school year, a four-week summer session in mathematics and chemistry was sponsored by a local bank. The classes were open to the top twenty pupils in the parish in each of the two subjects. Classes were taught by regular teachers and consisted of work beyond that offered in the Honors classes during the school year. Selection of the top twenty pupils in each subject was based on:

1. Percentile ranking on Iowa Test of Educational Development
2. Previous grades in Honors classes
3. Teacher recommendations

The total enrollment in the two high schools which provided Honors classes was 1,757 and the total parish enrollment in grades ten, eleven and twelve was 2,926. There were fifteen Honors classes in Large Parish C with a total enrollment of 280 different pupils. Transcripts indicated grades which were earned in Honors classes.
Large Parish D

In Large Parish D there were fifteen elementary schools, no junior high schools, and five high schools. Seven of the elementary schools reported special provisions for more able pupils and two of the high schools indicated some special consideration. There was no coordination or uniform procedures initiated by the central office. Except for a board-authorized directive from the superintendent to principals in 1957 which encouraged more attention to the needs of highly able children, each school has been independent in initiating provisions for its superior students.

The total white school population in the public schools of Large Parish D was 12,139, including 9,342 children in grades one through eight and 2,797 in grades nine through twelve. None of the schools was organized as a junior high school.

Elementary schools. The eight elementary schools which indicated special attention to the needs of more able children had a total enrollment of 5,158 pupils, or 55.21 per cent of the total parish enrollment. Those schools reported a total of 704 pupils who had been identified by various criteria as being in need of special attention because of their high ability. The 704 pupils so identified represented 13.64 per cent of the total enrollment of the eight schools reporting and 7.53 per cent of the total white elementary enrollment in the parish.

One of the eight schools included only grades one through three, yet the principal insisted that her school provided for more able
children. The bases for her report were the following:

1. A testing program including readiness, achievement, and mental ability

2. Recognition of more able pupils through the testing program

3. Careful attention to permanent records which follow the children

4. Enrichment of the more able pupils through ability grouping in the regular classroom

Concerning that particular school, the writer concluded that even though there was no list of pupils identified by I.Q. or percentile ranking, the school was giving sufficient attention to the accumulation of information for later identification to warrant mention of the school in this study. During the writer's visits to schools in several states, it was observed that the records kept in the first three grades were the basis upon which special programs emerged at the fourth and fifth grade levels.

The other seven elementary schools were varied in their provisions for more able children. Four of the schools used four specific factors in identifying the pupils. The factors were:

1. Group intelligence tests

2. Achievement tests

3. Previous grades

4. Teacher judgment

The other three schools used only the factor of teacher judgment, but explained that the judgment was based on grades and other information
contained in the cumulative folder. In effect, similar information was used in all schools, but in the latter three the teacher was given the sole responsibility of interpreting the information. There was no selection procedure or criteria after identification because there was no special instruction given outside the regular classroom.

Variation in instruction was done through the technique of ability grouping in the classroom. The specific differences or adaptations for more able pupils were called:

1. Enriched assignments
2. Further research

The enriched assignment was explained as requiring more detailed information from several sources, and the further research consisted of written reports in addition to regular class assignments. There was no indication that grades or other school records reflected the level at which the extra work was done.

No special criteria for teacher selection were necessary since all classes were reportedly heterogeneous in their organization and all teachers were responsible for enrichment activities.

Two schools reported special music rooms available to talented pupils for instrument practice. One school made available a reference shelf of special books for advanced pupils. No other offerings were reported.

Junior high schools. There was no school organized as a junior high school.
High schools. There were five high schools, grades nine through twelve, in Large Parish D. Two of those schools reported special attention to the instructional needs of more able pupils. The combined enrollment of the two schools was 2,005, representing 71.67 per cent of the total enrollment of 2,797 in the white high schools in the parish. A total of 246 pupils was reported as having been identified as more able. That number represented 12.26 per cent of the total enrollment of the two schools. School A, with an enrollment of 800 pupils, had identified seventy-eight, or 9.75 per cent of its population. School B, with 1,205 enrolled, had identified 168, or 13.94 per cent of its total enrollment. School A had used a minimum I.Q. of 120 as the lower limit of its group and obtained 9.75 per cent of its population. School B set its limits as the upper fifteen per cent on achievement tests and had actually selected 13.94 per cent of its enrollment. Other factors of selection used by both schools were:

1. Previous grades
2. Teacher recommendations
3. Pupil interest
4. Satisfactory health record

The instructional adaptations in the two high schools consisted of three types:

1. Ability grouping within the classroom
2. Special classes in some subjects
3. Some subjects selective by prerequisite stipulations
The ability grouping within the classroom was reported as standard practice in all classes in both schools. Assignments requiring extensive reading or more difficult manipulation of numbers were given to the more able group.

The special classes composed of only the more able group were offered in the following subjects:

1. English III and IV
2. Algebra I
3. Civics
4. Biology
5. American History

The plan in each of the special classes was to proceed more rapidly in the normal content of the course and then move into project work in related interest areas. Some examples of projects were:

1. A unit on Greek influences in the English language (English IV)
2. Public relations aspects of a school building program (Civics)
3. Comparison of present protective tariff items with the list in 1850 (American History)

The subjects which were selective because of prerequisites were:

1. Physics
2. Chemistry II
3. Solid geometry
4. Advanced mathematics

Teachers of the regular classes in which there was ability grouping were not selected according to any special criteria. They had partici-
pated in no preparatory activities regarding the teaching of more able children. Those teachers of special classes for more able children were chosen on the bases of:

1. Interest in more able children
2. Record of successful teaching as evaluated by the principal
3. Record of participation in mathematics or science institutes
4. Workshop participation in studies regarding the educational needs of highly able pupils. It was revealed that seven of the twelve teachers of advanced classes had participated in either 3 or 4 above.

Parents were not requested to approve a pupil's enrollment in a special class. Report card grades carried no remarks attesting to the difficult nature of the special classes, but the permanent records, including transcripts, did make such indications.

One of the principals had made a proposal that highly able seniors be allowed to enroll in a nearby college for credit in freshman courses in English and mathematics, but at the time of the interview, no decision had been reached.

**Large Parish E**

Large Parish E reported a total of fifty-eight white public administrative school units. There were thirty-nine elementary, eight junior high, and eleven high schools. The total enrollment was 29,605, distributed as follows: elementary, 16,170; junior high school, 7,761; high school, 5,674.

When the writer first contacted the school board office personnel with regard to including Large Parish E in the study, it was immedia-
ately stated by the chief instructional supervisor that the parish had no special program for more able pupils. It was further stated that high ability sections, as such, were not allowed as a matter of policy. However, there was a strong emphasis on quality education for all children through the systematic improvement of teaching at all levels. It was the feeling of the central office staff that a fully qualified teacher could enrich the educational experiences of all kinds of children in her class, regardless of ability levels.

Elementary schools. It has been stated that parish policy opposed special groupings as a device for meeting the educational needs of more able pupils. There were, however, several kinds of opportunities outside the regular classroom which provided enrichment. All schools were able to offer the same kinds of activities which varied slightly according to school needs. There were two major kinds of varied programming:

1. Opportunity, or interest periods
2. Special music periods

The opportunity periods are scheduled two afternoons per week for one hour each. Admission is based upon pupil interest and demonstration of effort in a particular area. The areas of concentration are:

1. Research
2. Foreign language (French or Spanish)
3. Speech
4. Creative writing
Research was open to any pupil who wanted to select and pursue a project which involved the use of research skills. The project varied widely in difficulty and detail, and it was obvious to the observer that the teacher-sponsor encouraged the more able students to select tasks which were challenging.

The foreign language sections were likewise open to any interested student. Most of the pupils had been introduced to simple vocabulary in the regular classroom, but the opportunity classes were directed by teachers who had professional training and, often, native ability.

The speech opportunity involved more than the development of oral communication. Besides interpretative reading and the mechanics of debate, the pupils adapted skits from stories read in their regular work and presented their dramatizations at assembly programs.

Creative writing was an exploratory opportunity in most of the schools. The actual writing consisted mainly of situation completions, construction of plots from pictures, and the writing of original poems.

The writer was allowed to examine the cumulative folders of the pupils in one opportunity class of fifth and sixth graders engaged in research. Of the twenty-two children in the group, the I.Q. spread was: 90–99, 2; 100–109, 9; 110–119, 8; 120–130, 2; above 130, 1. That sampling indicated that the opportunity groups were not based on specific ability levels, but were designed to provide for individual differences at varying levels.

The special music periods were available two periods per week and came either thirty minutes before the school day began or else during
the final half-hour of the school day. A fully certified piano teacher
gives lessons to groups of four and five each period. Music appreciation
classes are also offered.

In none of the opportunity classes was a report card grade given.
The work was for enrichment only, and any tangible results of pupil
efforts were returned to him for presentation to his parents. During
school visitation periods, samples of work from the opportunity classes
were on display along with exhibits of regular class work.

There was no record of the number of more able pupils who participated
in the opportunity periods because of the fact that they were
open to all pupils.

Junior high schools. Six of the eight junior high schools in
Large Parish E reported that they gave proper attention to the needs
of more able pupils. There was no indication of special administrative
arrangements or scheduling, nor was there any ability grouping. The
principals reported only that the individual teachers recognized the more
able pupils and offered them challenging work. There were no systematic
criteria for recognizing the more able pupils, nor were there specific
goals and activities which differentiated between instruction for the
more able and that intended for the rest of the class.

High schools. Seven of the eleven high schools in Large Parish E
stated that special provisions were made for their more able students.
These were large high schools ranging from 686 to 1,667 in enrollment,
with an average population of 912 pupils. The combined enrollment of
the four high schools which did not indicate programs for more able
students was 912 with an average enrollment of 228 pupils.

It was found that the seven high schools did not have programs based on systematic identification, selection, and scheduling procedures. Instead, their program consisted of the usual pattern found in large high schools of a wide variety of elective subjects. A highly able pupil could easily finish with twenty units and still not have taken all of the courses offered in mathematics and the physical sciences. It was the feeling of the principals and the supervisory staff that adequate enrichment for more able pupils was provided through multiple course offerings.

II. MEDIUM PARISHES

The medium parish group included six school systems each of which had white public school enrollments of not less than 3,000 nor more than 9,999. The combined number of schools in the six parishes included sixty-one elementary, five junior high schools, and thirty-three high schools. In the ninety-nine schools in the six medium parishes there was a total enrollment of 30,682 pupils. Of the sixty-one elementary schools, only one indicated activities primarily designed for more able pupils; one of the five junior high schools reported special consideration for the upper group; and four of the thirty-three high schools reported some kind of special attention for their more able pupils. A tabulation of the number and type of schools in medium parishes reporting special attention to the needs of more able pupils is given in Table VI, page 86. A discussion of the provisions by parishes will follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Junior High</th>
<th>Senior High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes  no</td>
<td>yes  no</td>
<td>yes  no</td>
<td>yes  no</td>
<td>yes  no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>0 11</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>2 15</td>
<td>11.76 88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>00 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>2 15</td>
<td>11.76 88.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>0 16</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 22</td>
<td>4.34 95.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>11.11 88.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish F</td>
<td>0 13</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 9</td>
<td>0 23</td>
<td>00.00 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>4 29</td>
<td>6 93</td>
<td>6.06 93.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medium Parish A

Medium Parish A had a total of seventeen white public schools, including eleven elementary, one junior high, and five high schools. None of the elementary schools indicated special programs for the more able group. One junior high school had a limited program as did one of the five high schools.

**Junior high schools.** The one junior high school in Medium Parish A included grades seven and eight with a total enrollment of 643 pupils. Through the school testing program, the upper fifteen per cent in achievement were scheduled for special consideration. The bases for selection were:

1. Achievement at or above the eighty-fifth percentile
2. Report card grades of "B" or better in language arts, mathematics, and social studies.

There were two special sections of twenty-five pupils each in the seventh grade and two similar sections in the eighth grade. The seventh grade group represented 14.57 per cent of the grade enrollment of 343 pupils, while the eighth grade group represented 16.66 per cent of the grade enrollment of 300 pupils. The four sections, totaling 100 pupils, included 15.55 per cent of the total school enrollment of 643 pupils.

The four special sections were grouped daily for half-day core periods which dealt with language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The half day was flexible so that extended periods in
one area could be arranged if interest and project progress indicated such an adjustment. The remaining half day allowed participation in classes and other activities in which no special grouping was used.

The selection of teachers for the four special groups was left to the judgment of the principal. Each of the teachers selected was informed of the nature of the groups and the basis for the selection of the pupils. All four teachers and the principal set the following goals and guides:

1. Rapid progress through graded text materials in language, arithmetic, and social studies.

2. Emphasis on additional group and individual projects which extend the text presentations.

3. Science units and experiments based on class interest and availability of materials.

4. Mastery of computation and interpretation in mathematics, including introductory algebra and geometry.

5. Develop competence in oral and written communication.

There was no plan for continuity of the program into high school. High schools. The one high school in Medium Parish A which made some provision for more able students had an enrollment of 1,078 pupils in grades nine through twelve. There were 210 pupils, or 19.48 per cent of the enrollment participating in what was called high achievement sections. The program was a cooperative effort between the central office and the high school principal.

It was agreed between the school and central office that classes
in higher mathematics, advanced sciences, and foreign languages could be expected to group themselves on the basis of interest and course difficulty. The concentration of high achievement sections was in English and freshman-sophomore level courses. There was one advanced section in each of the following:

- English I, II, III, IV
- Algebra I
- General Science
- Biology

Teachers were selected by agreement between the principal and the central office.

Pupils were assigned to the high achievement sections on the basis of previous high achievement on report card grades and standardized tests. No percentile was given as a minimum level. The sections were reviewed by the teachers, principal, and supervisor at the end of the first grading period for the purpose of adding or removing pupils.

Permanent records, including transcripts, indicated grades which were earned in a high achievement section.

In addition to special offerings during the regular school day, the central office maintained a library of programmed materials, including texts and tapes, which were available for independent study by honor roll pupils. The materials were available in German, Russian, solid geometry, calculus, and trigonometry. Progress was supervised by a teacher-sponsor and by the high school supervisor.

**Medium Parish B**

There were ten white public schools in Medium Parish B, including
six elementary, one junior high, and three senior high schools. None of the schools reported any activity primarily designed for more able pupils. The total school population was 3,213 pupils.

Medium Parish C

There were nine elementary schools and eight high schools in Medium Parish C. There was no separate junior high school. The total population of the seventeen schools was 4,328 pupils.

Special attention to the needs of more able pupils was reported by one elementary school with an enrollment of 705 pupils and one high school with an enrollment of 892 pupils.

Elementary schools. The one elementary school in Medium Parish C which claimed to offer special consideration for more able students reported a total of seventy participating students, or 9.92 per cent of a total enrollment of 705. The offerings consisted of two arrangements:

1. One section each in the fifth and sixth grades composed of twenty-five highly able pupils per section selected on the basis of previous grades.

2. Special permission for twenty pupils talented in music to meet a private teacher at various periods of the school day with a limit of two periods per week per pupil.

The two sections in the fifth and sixth grades were conducted without previously determined goals, but were regarded as classes which could go faster and farther. Each teacher was considered by the
principal to be an excellent teacher who could provide proper enrichment experiences, but no specific examples of enriching activities were explained to the writer.

**High schools.** The one high school in Medium Parish C which reported special attention for more able pupils had an enrollment of 892 pupils in grades eight through twelve. The principal had on file a list of 175 pupils who were considered more able in that they represented approximately the upper twenty per cent (actually 19.50 per cent) in grade achievement. In addition to the percentile ranking, the cumulative folder of each pupil contained the results of the following factors which contributed to placement in an advanced section called an Honors class:

1. Group intelligence tests
2. Achievement tests
3. Teacher recommendations
4. Interest checklists
5. Previous grades

Parents were not consulted with regard to scheduling a pupil into an Honors class.

There were several specific instructional adaptations in the Honors classes:

1. A complete upgrading and broadening of course content
2. A greater demand for competence and accuracy in assignments
3. Use of guest lecturers from area colleges
4. Use of team teaching in science
5. Special interest seminars conducted by pupils

6. Special provisions for individual and group work in music and art

The entire faculty was kept informed of the special program. The principal and others conducted discussions of the Superior and Talented Student Program as sponsored by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. There were regular meetings of teachers of Honors classes, and three of the teachers had visited special classes in other school systems.

No rigid rules controlled the selection of teachers for the Honors classes, but the principal usually looked for:

1. Reputation of competence in subject
2. Interest in more able children
3. Teacher willingness to devote extra time to preparation
4. Record of successful teaching

Through the use of the multi-track curriculum, there were Honors classes in English, higher mathematics (beyond Algebra I), and advanced sciences. An experimental section of advanced General Science was under way. No Honors classes were offered in social studies.

Four pupils had been allowed to withdraw from Honors classes. Two of them were withdrawn because of parental objections to the amount of work involved, and the other two were allowed to withdraw at their own request.

Medium Parish D

The twenty-three schools in Medium Parish D included sixteen
elementary, two junior high schools, and five high schools. Only one of the schools, a high school with an enrollment of 1,312 students, reported any specific programming for more able pupils.

**Elementary schools.** There were no special programs for more able pupils reported by elementary schools of Medium Parish D.

**Junior high schools.** There were no special programs for more able pupils reported by junior high schools of Medium Parish D.

**High schools.** The special provisions for more able high school pupils consisted of advanced sections in English, mathematics, and science. Specific subjects in which advanced sections were offered were:

1. English III and IV
2. Algebra II
3. Math 12 (advanced math)
4. Chemistry

Pupils were selected for the advanced sections on the basis of past grades and teacher recommendations. There were no course descriptions given, but the principal reported that the teachers were instructed to proceed into each subject as far as student abilities would allow.

There were no specific qualifications given for the teachers of the advanced sections. The English teachers were selected because of their interest in highly able pupils, while the mathematics and science teachers were the only teachers available to offer the courses. The same teacher taught the advanced Algebra II and Math 12. The mathematics teacher had an agreement with a nearby college that pupils recommended by her would be exempt from first year college mathematics.
A total of 129 pupils participated in the advanced sections. That number represented 9.83 per cent of the student body.

**Medium Parish E**

There were six elementary schools, no junior high schools, and three high schools in Medium Parish E. The total enrollment in the nine white public schools was 3,804. The only school which reported a special effort to provide for more able pupils was a high school with an enrollment of 299 pupils.

It was determined later that the special provisions were actually provisions of scheduling rather than special arrangements. The principal stated that any child who indicated intention to attend college was scheduled into classes of a college preparatory nature. These classes included:

- English IV
- Algebra II
- Geometry
- Advanced Mathematics (Twelfth grade)
- Physics

There was no further explanation except that those courses were planned for the college-bound child and were taught accordingly. The eighty-five pupils included in those specified courses represented 28.42 per cent of the total high school enrollment of 299 pupils.

**Medium Parish F**

This parish, with 23 schools and 6,583 pupils, reported no programs for the more able.
III. SMALL PARISHES

The study included seven parishes from five geographical areas, with none of the parishes having a white public enrollment of more than 2,999 pupils. The total enrollment in the seven small parishes was 14,501, with an average enrollment of 2,071 pupils per parish. The number and types of schools have already been indicated in Table III, Page 48.

Only one parish in the small group indicated any special provisions for more able pupils. That parish reported that four elementary schools, one junior high school, and one high school had activities primarily designed for more able pupils. The only school not reporting special activities was a small elementary school with 112 pupils enrolled. Thus, six out of seven schools, or 85.71 per cent, participated in a program for more able children. A complete tabulation of the number and type of schools in small parishes reporting special attention to the needs of more able pupils is provided in Table VII, Page 96. The only parish described is Small Parish F.

Small Parish F

The total enrollment in Small Parish F was 2,350 pupils divided among five elementary schools, one junior high school, and one senior high school. The program for more able pupils was known as, "Enrichment in the Regular Classroom", and was offered at all school organizational levels.

The decision to use the classroom enrichment approach was a result of a series of faculty meetings at each school for the purpose of
### Table VII

**Number and Type of Schools in Small Parishes Reporting Special Attention to Needs of More Able Pupils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Junior High</th>
<th>Senior High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes  no</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>yes yes no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish A</td>
<td>0 9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 7</td>
<td>0 16  0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish B</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 7</td>
<td>0 14  0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish C</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 7   0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish D</td>
<td>0 7</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 10  0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish E</td>
<td>0 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0 10  0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish F</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>6 1   85.71 14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish G</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>0 7   0 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4 36</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>1 26</td>
<td>6 65  8.45 91.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determining the different kinds of enrichment activities used for more able pupils. Each teacher submitted examples of enrichment which were then compiled as guides under two headings. The first was "Enrichment Activities for Children in Grades One Through Eight", and the other was, "Enrichment Activities for High School Pupils".

Elementary and junior high schools. The list of activities for more able pupils was prefaced by general suggestions to teachers, including the following:

1. Each child should get a basic foundation in reading, phonics, writing, spelling, use of numbers, listening, and using the English language.

2. Use caution in singling children out for special attention.

3. Give individual work when possible and have children keep records of the work.

4. During drill work, excuse those pupils who do not need such drill.

5. Encourage development of hobbies.


7. Encourage children as they develop difficult ideas. Adjust assignments so that better pupils get the more difficult tasks.

8. Use parents and other community resource persons.

9. Maintain a continuous display of high interest books at all reading levels represented in the class.

In addition to the general suggestions, there were specific activity suggestions, based on the independent study idea, for the areas of art,
language, handwriting, social studies, industrial arts, mathematics, music, spelling, reading and science.

There was no way by which the writer could determine an approximate number of elementary and junior high pupils considered by the school to be more able. There were no I.Q. indications nor were there percentile rankings. The entire program was based on providing enrichment as the classroom teacher indentified the need and supplied the opportunity for the child.

In addition to the classroom enrichment, the school system sponsored continued school activity for more able pupils during the month of June. To be eligible for the tenth month program, a child must have an I.Q. of at least 130 and be recommended by his teacher and principal. The activities continue the regular school program in arithmetic and language, but also include foreign language, and typing. The summer session is held in the mornings only.

High schools. The one high school in the system had an enrollment of 754 pupils in grades nine through twelve. The basis for provisions for more able pupils was the classroom enrichment idea which was a parish policy. In addition to the general suggestions which have already been listed, the principal added that in providing several electives his school separated the more able from the less able in the areas of foreign language, science, and mathematics. He said that since the less able were discouraged from electing chemistry, physics, advanced mathematics, and advanced foreign languages, those courses could be taught at what he called a higher level.
The tenth month program was available for high school pupils under the same criteria as pupils in lower grades, which were: I.Q. 130 or above; recommendation from the teacher; and approval of the principal. Subjects emphasized were advanced math and science. There were thirty students, or 3.97 per cent of the student body, included in the high school summer classes. It was reported that fifty others were eligible but did not attend. The teachers of the two summer classes were selected because of their workshop experience in mathematics and science institutes.
CHAPTER IV

RECAPITULATION AND IMPLICATIONS

It was the purpose of this study to determine the kinds of educational opportunities that were offered to more able pupils in selected white public schools of Louisiana and to describe the activities and arrangements included as special provisions. The study included five large parishes with a total of 188 schools, six medium parishes with a total of ninety-nine schools, and seven small parishes with a total of seventy-one schools. The total of 358 schools considered in the study included 230 elementary schools, 30 junior high schools, and 98 senior high schools.

Data were obtained from parish superintendents and school principals by personal contact through the use of interview schedules, copies of which are appended to this dissertation. Each person interviewed was cooperative and anxious to be of assistance in the study.

I. Recapitulation

Information was sought regarding five major aspects of educational provisions for more able pupils. Those categories were:

1. Official parish policies concerning more able pupils
2. Number of schools and pupils participating in a special program
3. Methods of identification and selection of more able pupils
4. Specific adaptations in goals, instructional procedures, and administrative arrangements
5. Teacher qualifications and responsibilities

The data were obtained according to parish size, and where applicable, according to type of school.

Official parish policies and regulations regarding more able pupils. Responses from the superintendents regarding official policies concerning more able children revealed these facts:

1. Five of the eighteen parishes (4 large and 1 small) had engaged in parish-wide studies of the needs of more able pupils.

2. Five of the school boards (4 large and 1 small) had taken official positions favoring special programs for more able pupils.

3. Five superintendents (4 large parishes and 1 small parish) had issued written directives encouraging attention to the needs of more able pupils.

4. Five parishes (4 large and 1 small) had definitions for its more able group.

5. None of the eighteen parishes officially opposed special attention for more able pupils.

6. Five parishes (3 large, 1 medium, 1 small) provided limited funds for special materials for use with more able pupils.

7. Six parishes (4 large, 1 medium, 1 small) had designated a person on the central office staff to be responsible for the educational needs of more able pupils.

8. Sixteen parishes (5 large, 4 medium, 7 small) reported parish-wide testing programs by which more able pupils could be identified.
The eight items reported above elicited a total of 144 responses from the 18 parishes. A response was either favorable or unfavorable toward special attention for more able pupils. The data revealed that:

33 out of 40 responses from Large Parishes were favorable
13 out of 48 responses from Medium Parishes were favorable
20 out of 56 responses from Small Parishes were favorable
66 out of 144 responses from all parishes were favorable
Thus, 45.83 per cent of all responses were favorable.

Superintendents were asked to suggest factors that would improve provisions for more able pupils. The ninety-nine suggestions from the eighteen superintendents included the following categories:

32 suggestions called for more time for cooperative teacher planning and individualized instruction
31 suggestions mentioned the need for reduced class sizes and additional resource materials
16 suggestions indicated need for more stimulation by personnel from the central office
13 suggestions were for more assistance from specialty personnel such as guidance, State Department, and colleges
7 suggestions were for parish-wide studies regarding more able pupils

Number of schools and pupils participating in special programs. Information was obtained according to size of parish and type of school. It was found that:

1. There were 188 schools with a total of 98,403 pupils in the 5 large parishes.
   a. 139 schools (104 elementary, 18 junior high, and 17 senior high schools), or 73.93 per cent, reported programs for more able pupils
   b. 5,692 pupils out of 98,403 enrolled (5.78 per cent) were receiving special attention
2. There were 99 schools with a total of 30,682 pupils in the 6 medium parishes.
   a. 6 schools (1 elementary, 1 junior high, and 4 high schools), or 6.06 per cent, reported programs for more able pupils
   b. 769 pupils out of 30,682 enrolled (2.50 per cent) were receiving special attention

3. There were 71 schools with a total of 14,301 pupils in the 7 small parishes.
   a. 6 schools (4 elementary, 1 junior high, and 1 senior high school), or 8.45 per cent, reported programs for more able pupils
   b. The 6 schools were all in the same parish and all reported enrichment in the regular classroom. No numbers or percentages were given; therefore, no specific number of pupils could be reported as receiving special attention.

4. In all 18 parishes, there were 358 schools with enrollments of 143,386 pupils. Figures already presented indicate
   a. The 5 large parishes contained:
      52.51 per cent of the schools
      68.63 per cent of the enrollments
      88.09 per cent of pupils in special programs
   b. The 6 medium parishes contained:
      27.65 per cent of the schools
      21.39 per cent of the enrollments
      11.91 per cent of pupils in special groups
   c. The 7 small parishes contained:
      19.81 per cent of the schools
      9.98 per cent of the enrollments
      No report on actual number in special program
Criteria for identification and selection of more able pupils.

An examination of the criteria for identification and selection of more able pupils revealed frequency-of-mention items

1. Of 5 large parishes:
   5 required group intelligence tests
   2 required minimum I.Q. of 120
   5 used standardized achievement tests
   4 used previous grades as a factor
   2 used pupil interest
   2 used reading tests
   1 required evidence of social maturity
   3 required parent approval

2. Of 6 medium parishes, 2 of which had no special program:
   1 required group intelligence tests
   3 used standardized achievement tests
   3 used previous grades
   3 used teacher recommendations
   1 considered pupil interest
   1 required parent approval

3. Of 7 small parishes, only 1 parish reported a special program. That parish left the identification to the judgment of the classroom teacher.

Instructional adaptations and goals for more able pupils. In the five large parishes, there were seven types of special arrangements reported for the purpose of meeting the needs of more able pupils. Included in those adaptations were the following:

1 parish sought acceleration by allowing more able pupils to complete grades 5 through 8 in 3 years instead of 4 years

2 parishes used part-time ability grouping in the regular classroom in the elementary and junior high schools

2 parishes arranged separate classes for more able pupils at the elementary and junior high levels
1 parishes provided advance sections in certain high school subjects

2 parishes provided special summer programs for the more able pupils

3 parishes provided special opportunity periods in non-credit work in the elementary schools (including foreign language, speech, research, and music appreciation)

1 parish reported enrichment at all levels by the regular classroom teacher

Three of the five large parishes had listed a total of seven specific objectives toward which the teacher and pupil were to work. Those objectives were reported as follows:

3 parishes listed improvement of study skills

3 parishes listed the development of competence in the use of research skills

3 parishes listed the development of greater subject matter competence

3 parishes encouraged the development of talent in music and art

2 parishes encouraged pupil acceptance of personal goals commensurate with high individual potential

2 parishes listed the development of independent study projects as a desirable goal of more able pupils

1 parish encouraged more able pupils to gain a comprehensive understanding of citizenship responsibilities in a democratic society

In the medium parishes there was less program participation, fewer specific adaptations, and fewer specific goals or objectives. From the six medium parishes, four of which reported some attention to more able pupils, the following adaptations for instruction were reported:
2 parishes reported advanced sections in junior high and senior high subjects

1 parish allowed use of programmed materials for independent study

1 parish had Honors (advanced) sections in high school classes which involved:

   a. team teaching
   b. guest lecturers
   c. interest seminars led by pupils
   d. special periods for pupils talented in music and art

Only three specific goals were listed by the medium parishes:

1 parish encouraged rapid progress through graded materials in order to prepare for enrichment projects

2 parishes suggested independent studies to parallel school subjects

2 parishes emphasized greater competence in oral and written communication

Of the seven small parishes, only one reported a program for more able pupils. The instructional adaptations in that parish consisted of

   enrichment for all pupils by the regular classroom teacher during the regular school year

   special classes during a four-week summer session for more able pupils in elementary, junior high, and senior high school

Objectives or goals in the one small parish were included in two items:

   a list of general suggestions regarding more able pupils was available to all teachers

   specific suggestions for enrichment were based on the independent study or project idea
Qualifications of teachers of more able pupils. The selection of teachers for more able pupils varied widely. Four large parishes, two medium parishes, and one small parish listed a total of ten criteria for teachers of more able pupils. They are given below with the number and type of parishes listing each criterion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of second language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to work harder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of competence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in more able pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with more able pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of successful teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to principal and supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in institutes or workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College class about more able pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. IMPLICATIONS

This was a study of the educational opportunities arranged specifically for pupils whose abilities were sufficiently high to warrant an instructional program different from that provided for other pupils in the regular classroom.

From the data and descriptions presented, it is evident that educators in the eighteen parishes included in the study had widely
differing views regarding the needs of more able children. They differed in the major matters of general policy, identification procedures, instructional adaptations, and teacher qualifications. The existence of these differences is presented as a statement of fact rather than an indication of strength or weakness.

Based upon the information provided by the parishes, the following implications appear justified:

1. Parishes which made system-wide studies of the nature and needs of their more able pupils
   a. have named specific central office personnel to continuing responsibility in that area
   b. have officially favored special attention to the needs of more able pupils
   c. have established criteria for the identification and selection of more able pupils
   d. have provided specific goals and instructional adaptations for pupils selected
   e. have attempted systematic selection of specially qualified teachers for more able pupils
   f. have a proportion of special program participation which is significantly greater than their proportion of the total enrollment in the eighteen parishes

2. It is evident that the larger a parish was in enrollment, the more likely it was to have special provisions for its more able pupils.

3. It is evident that parishes and schools which paid special attention to the educational needs of more able pupils would likely use some kind of ability grouping for purposes of instruction.
4. Parishes and schools with special programs emphasized the importance of the teacher as the key to the successful use of ability grouping or other special arrangements.

5. It is evident that the school leadership in the parishes studied considered that the improvement of programs for more able pupils depended mainly upon
   a. more time for teacher planning
   b. reduced class size
   c. additional resource materials
   d. more stimulation from the central office
   e. more assistance from outside consultants
   f. more parish studies regarding more able pupils

6. It was clearly shown that a single school can organize and operate a program for more able pupils even if there is no parish-wide program.

7. It is evident that provisions for more able pupils varied according to parish size.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SUPERINTENDENTS

I. Physical Setting

A. Please indicate the total enrollment in the White public schools in your parish.

B. Indicate the number of white schools in your parish in each of the following categories:
   1. Elementary
   2. Junior High
   3. High School

C. How would you describe the population distribution in your parish?
   1. Mostly rural
   2. Mostly town or city
   3. About evenly divided

II. Policies and Practices Concerning Gifted Children

A. Has there been a systematic effort in your parish to study the needs of more able children? Yes_ No_

B. Has your school board taken an official position favoring a program for more able children. Yes_ No_

C. Has the office of superintendent issued any written directives encouraging more attention to the needs of the more able student? Yes_ No_

D. Has your school system arrived at a working definition of the term, "more able" or some other term indicating superior ability? Yes_ No_

E. Does your system have a policy opposing special classes for more able children? Yes_ No_
F. Are your schools allowed any funds, materials or equipment intended primarily for enriching the school program for the more able pupils? Yes__ No__

G. Is there a person on your central office staff who has been delegated the direct responsibility for knowing how well the needs of more able children are being met? Yes__ No__

H. Do you have in operation a parish-wide testing program through which pupils of high ability can be identified? Yes__ No__

I. Which of the following best describes the status of provisions for more able children in your parish? (please check)

1. Already actively engaged in parish-wide program.

2. Engaged in a limited program.

3. Plans under way for a parish-wide program.

4. Some schools have program but are not coordinated from central office.

5. Responsibility for initiating programs is left to the school principal.

6. Other (please state briefly)_____________________

III. Possible next steps

A. Listed below are some possible next steps toward strengthening your current program for more able children or toward beginning a new program. Please add others if you wish. Now rank all of them in order of need. Place a "1" next to the item which you consider most likely to improve your program. Place a "2" next to your next choice, and so on until all items have been rated.

_____ 1. The checks are needed steps toward improving present program.

_____ 2. The checks are needed steps toward a new program.

_____ More special teachers and/or guidance personnel
More supervisory personnel

More resource materials to aid teachers

More stimulation and leadership from Central Office staff

More direction from teacher-preparatory institutions

More assistance from the State Department of Education

More time for teachers to work with individual pupils

Reduced size of classes involving more able children

Fewer classes for teachers of the more able

More time for cooperative planning among teachers
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS

I. The School

A. Please check appropriate blank.

1. Elementary ______
2. Junior High ______
3. High School ______
4. Combined ______

B. Grades included:

Grade ______ through ______

C. Enrollment ____________________________

D. Staff

1. Assistant principal Yes__ No__
2. Secretary Yes__ No__
3. Guidance counselor (check)
   a. full time ______
   b. part time ______
   c. none ______

E. Does your school program include any activities, classes, grouping, or other special arrangements designed primarily to meet the needs of your more able pupils? Yes__ No__

II. The Pupil

A. Does the principal or counselor have on file a list of pupils who have been classified as more able? Yes__ No__
1. How many children are so identified?_______

B. Do you use specific factors in identifying your more able pupils? Yes  No_____

Which ones are used regularly? Add others that apply.

___ 1. Group intelligence tests
___ 2. Individual intelligence tests
___ 3. Achievement tests
___ 4. Reading tests
___ 5. Special aptitude tests
___ 6. Interest inventories
___ 7. Previous grades
___ 8. Teacher judgment
___ 9. Interview data
___ 10. Other (name)

C. Do you use an I.Q. cut-off score to indicate the lower limits of your more able group? Yes  No_____

If so, please indicate which applies.

___ 140  List Tests Used.
___ 135  1. _____________________________
___ 130  2. _____________________________
___ 125  3. _____________________________
___ 120
___ Other (please indicate)

D. If you relate your definition of high ability to a percentile group, which of the following is used?
E. After the child has been found to be highly able, do you try to place him in a special group, class or other activity?  Yes  No

If so, what factors are always considered before placement?

1. Teacher recommendations
2. Parent recommendations
3. Achievement test results
4. Social and emotional maturity
5. Intelligence tests
6. Health record
7. Pupil interest
8. Past grades
9. Other (list)

III. Instruction and Programming

A. What kinds of programming devices are used in providing for your more able children?

1. General enrichment within the regular classroom
2. Ability grouping within the classroom
3. Special class grouping in certain subjects
4. Special periods for pupils talented in music and art
5. High ability groups in all subject areas
6. Non-credit special activities such as seminars, independent study and research activities
7. Certain courses open only to pupils of outstanding ability

8. Other (please state)

Comment: __________________________________________

B. Acceleration

1. May more able pupils be accelerated to a more appropriate grade or subject level? What condition. Yes__ No__

2. May more able pupils take extra subjects each year and complete school sooner? What conditions? Yes__ No__

3. May more able pupils take college-level work at a nearby college? Yes__ No__

4. Are special summer school opportunities available to the more able? (describe) Yes__ No__

C. What instructional adaptations are made for more able children?

1. Are goals different? Yes__ No__
   How? __________________________________________

2. Are assignments different? Yes__ No__
   How? __________________________________________

3. Are teaching methods or techniques different? Yes__ No__
   How? __________________________________________

4. Do school records, transcripts or reports indicate advanced work or achievement of more able students? Yes__ No__
   How? __________________________________________
D. Does your school have special equipment, space and materials available for more able children?

1. Space for experimental and research equipment and materials for science students to use over extended periods of time ____________________________ Yes No

2. A library section for advanced reference materials ____________________________ Yes No

3. Special music rooms for individual and group practice ____________________________ Yes No

4. Space and materials for advanced art work ____________________________ Yes No

5. Foreign language laboratory ____________________________ Yes No

E. Do you use community resources to assist in enriching experiences for more able students:

How? ____________________________

1. Are community specialists used as resource persons in school? What kind? How much? Yes No

2. Are seminars and other out-of-school activities held in cooperation with local business and industry? Explain. Yes No

3. Are part time work experiences used in areas of talent or high achievement? (Laboratory, business, industry, etc.) Explain Yes No

4. Are supervised visitations made to industry, business and other professional settings? Explain Yes No

5. Other (please list) ____________________________

F. Does your in-service training of teachers include study about more able children? Yes No

How? ____________________________

1. Are all teachers regularly informed on activities for more able children? Yes No

2. Are special study sessions held concerning content, methods and materials for the more able? Yes No
3. Do teachers experiment with materials and practices with the more able? How? __Yes__ __No__

4. Are local and outside resource persons made available to help teachers who work with the more able? __Yes__ __No__

5. Do teachers visit other schools and classes to observe programs for the more able? __Yes__ __No__

How many such visits were made in the past year?____

G. How do you select your teachers who work with the more able children? Check any of the items below which apply. Please add others. (assume a valid teaching certificate.)

____ Master's degree or higher

____ Knowledge of a second language

____ Willingness to work harder

____ Background of travel, music, and other culturally up-grading pursuits

____ High degree of competence in subject matter

____ Respect for and interest in more able children

____ Ability to encourage a questioning atmosphere and independent study

____ A record of successful teaching in a regular classroom

____ Other ________________________________

H. Does your school have any special classes, groupings or other activities for more able students in the following areas? __Yes__ __No__

1. English or language arts (please describe) __Yes__ __No__

   a. ________________________________

   b. ________________________________

   c. ________________________________
2. Mathematics (please describe)  
   a. __________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________
   d. __________________________________________________

3. Science (please describe)  
   a. __________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________
   d. __________________________________________________

4. Social studies (please describe)  
   a. __________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________

5. Foreign Language (please describe)  
   a. __________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________

6. Fine Arts (please describe)  
   a. __________________________________________________
   b. __________________________________________________
   c. __________________________________________________

7. Other (please name)  
   a. __________________________________________________
I. How many pupils in your school are included in your special provisions for the more able? 

J. How many of the more able children in your school have not been placed in your special program? 

What reasons for non-placement? 

___ Parents object to program 

___ Child objects 

___ Other 

K. Comments which will help describe the way in which this school provides for the more able.
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