THE EFFECT OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS UPON THE SOCIAL STATUS OF GIFTED STUDENTS

By

WILLIAM GRANT LYTLE II

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1977

THE EFFECT OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS

UPON THE SOCIAL STATUS

OF GIFTED STUDENTS

Thesis Approved:

Paul G Ward
Thesis Adviser

Norma Jo Campbell

Charles J Mackey

Norman N Durham
Dean of Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. Paul Warden, for his valuable assistance in this study as well as for his guidance throughout this student's graduate program. Grateful appreciation is also extended to Dr. Jo Campbell and Dr. Phil Murphy for their contribution of time and effort in serving as committee members. Dr. Campbell deserves special recognition for her major contributions to the design of this research.

The author also wishes to acknowledge Dr. Wayne Richardson, Mrs. Anita Boone, and the fourth-grade teachers and students of the Bartlesville school system whose cooperation and efforts made this study possible.

The author is also grateful to his patient, hard-working secretary, Miss Elizabeth Wegley, for the excellence of the final copy of this manuscript.

Lastly, the author wishes to express appreciation to Miss Ginny Allen for adding the final measure of support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, education in the United States has experienced a growing awareness of and adjustment to differences among individuals. This has brought about an increased interest in providing special educational programs for children with learning exceptionalities. Of all exceptional groups, the gifted have received the least attention. Numerous gaps of knowledge exist concerning this group. Among these, social development appears to be an area worthy of research. Social adjustment has become a matter of central importance in education due to its contribution to self-concept and its role in determining whether or not individuals reach their potential for achievement.

In an attempt to encourage the intellectual and academic development of gifted students, special programs have been designed which remove these children from the regular classroom for at least a portion of the day. Some educational researchers have expressed concern regarding possible negative social outcomes which may result from the segregration of these pupils from the educational mainstream. For this reason, a better understanding of the effects of special programming on the social adjustment of gifted children is necessary in order to enable educators to design good programs which are concerned with all facets of individual development.

Statement of Hypotheses

The general intent of this study was to explore further the relation of social choice to the variables of intelligence and achievement. Specifically, it tests the relationship between social acceptance and group membership and attempts to detect any significant changes in peer perceptions of gifted students as a result of their participation in a special education program. The following hypotheses, stated in the null form, were investigated:

I. There is no relationship between group membership and the number of friendship choices a child will receive.

II. There is no relationship between group membership and the number of times a child will be chosen as a class leader.

III. There is no relationship between group membership and the number of times a child will be chosen as a co-worker on an academic activity.

IV. There is no relationship between group membership and the number of times a child will be chosen for social companionship.

V. There is no significant difference in gain scores between the groups in the number of friendship choices received.

VI. There is no significant difference in gain scores between the groups in the number of leadership choices received.

VII. There is no significant difference in gain scores between the groups in the number of choices received as an academic co-worker.

VIII. There is no significant difference in gain scores between the groups in the number of choices received as a social companion.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, a gifted student is defined as one who is assigned to the special educational program for the gifted and talented. The children in this program spend two hours a week with the special class teacher engaged in various enrichment activities. Achievement levels of these children (as measured by the Science Research Associates achievement tests) range from the 94th to the 99th percentile. The IQ levels of these children (as measured by the Wechsler or Stanford-Binet intelligence scales) range from 121 to 149.

High achieving students, for the purpose of this study, are those children who were tested for but not placed in the gifted-talented program. Their SRA achievement levels range from the 85th to the 95th percentile. IQ levels range from 108 to 132.

The number of times a student was selected by his/her classmates on the sociometric questionnaire represents his/her number of social choices. For the purpose of this study, number of social choices is used as a measure of social acceptance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In attempting to study the social status of gifted children in special programs, it is necessary to know what social characteristics are possessed by this group. It is also essential to determine, through past research, the effectiveness of special programs on their social development. For these reasons, a review of past research was conducted in these general areas:

1) Social status of gifted children.

2) Effects of special programming upon the social status of gifted children.

Literature on the Social Status of Gifted Children

Some of the earliest studies concerning the social characteristics of gifted children show that superior mental ability is usually accompanied by superiority in other areas, including personal and social adjustment (Terman, beginning in 1904; Dolbear, 1912). The Terman study indicates that the superiority of gifted children extends beyond intelligence into such areas as physical and motor traits, social and emotional maturity, and general competence. Terman was first to report a positive relationship between intelligence and social adjustment, and

his work has received much support from more recent studies (Pasternack and Silvey, 1969; Steele, 1971; Renzulli and Hartman, 1971; Keys, 1938; Gowan, 1956; Bonsall and Stefflre, 1955). A very relevant study in the area of sociometric status is that of Johnson (1950). Although his main purpose was to determine the degree to which mentally handicapped students were accepted or rejected by peers, it was interesting to note that his subjects with IQ's of 130 and above received the highest acceptance score and the lowest rejection score of any of the groups studied. Similarly, in his study of average groups, Bonney (1944) obtained results which suggest that the more intelligent a person, the more he tended to be chosen as a friend. Strong support for this contention is seen from the studies of Martyn (1957), Gallegher (1961), and Martinson (1961) who reported that gifted children rated higher in social acceptance by their peers than average students. A study of sociometric status by Miller (1956) shows that mentally superior children were most wanted as friends by their classmates. In addition, the superior group was rated as most popular by their classmates. Several studies report relationships between intelligence and leadership. Terman (1925), Hollingworth (1936), Dressel and Grabow (1958), and Martinson (1961) find that gifted students are often leaders in their school and community groups. The gifted are more often named as leaders in groups in which they find themselves according to a study by Bonsall and Stefflre (1955). However, Hollingworth states that this does not hold true if the IQ discrepancy between groups is too great. In general, a review of the literature does not reveal many difficulties in the social development of the gifted. However, some researchers suggest that it is likely. For example, Hurlock (1951)

warns of the possibility of gifted children becoming lazy and non-conforming. Martens (1933) suggests that the gifted may be socially immature. Zorbaugh (1951) contends that exceptional capacities create problems for people even at the earliest ages. He bases this on the fact that since their ideas differ from average children, they will lose participation of others and find themselves marginal or isolated. Thom and Newell (1945) suggest that the bright child may be mischievous, try to become the center of attention, and be rejected by older children. It seems, however, that many of these reseachers are providing more speculation than hard evidence concerning the possibility of social problems developing in gifted children. Stronger evidence of possible social problems of the gifted is seen in the work of Hollingworth (1926). She finds that the gifted tend to prefer older companions and are often not interested in the games of children their own age. This can be seen as leading to social maladjustment due to rejections from older children. This is debatable, however, in view of results reported by Keys (1938) which show that underage (due to acceleration) college and high school students were more popular and socially successful than the average student. In contrast, Bonsall's (1952) interviews with gifted individuals show that their unhappiest experiences were caused by their peers. The negative impact of peer pressure also concerned Gallegher and Crowder (1957) as they studied gifted students. They felt that some of the children in their study were deliberately restricting their intellectual activity in order to insure their social status. The Gallegher study utilized a sociometric which asked for friendship choices. Results showed the gifted group to be superior in social popularity.

However, the study also points out problems of poor motivation and intellectual rigidity in the gifted group.

There are gaps in our knowledge concerning the social status of gifted children as evidenced by the conflicting results of past studies. Gallegher and Crowder (1957) found it difficult to generalize their findings due to the extreme individual differences among the gifted children they studied. This may explain the lack of agreement among researchers.

Literature on Effects of Special Programming Upon Social Status of Gifted Children

Special programming for gifted students is another area in which there is disagreement among researchers. Conflict appears to revolve around interpretations of what constitutes "democratic educational practice." To some this means the same education for all. To others it means an appropriate education based upon one's needs and capacities. Opponents of special educational programs for the gifted have claimed that the processes of identification, separation from peers, and special treatment involved in such programs will cause gifted children to become contemptuous of their less able peers. Bettelheim (1964) contends that special schooling teaches them to look upon the rest of the population as inferior. Concern over possible ill-effects of special grouping upon the personalities and behaviors of gifted students is also expressed in the works of Burnside (1942), Martens (1933), and Newland (1953). Their major fear is that such grouping will cause the non-gifted to regard the gifted negatively and resentfully, and that the gifted will come to view the non-gifted as inferior.

However, Carroll (1931) reports that placement in special ability groups have helped to prevent the formation of these attitudes on the part of bright pupils. Torrance's (1966) years of experience in working with gifted children convinced him that negative results are not inherent in special programs for the gifted and that the reverse may, in fact, be true. This is supported by follow-up studies of special programs in New York City, Cleveland, Los Angeles and other cities which reveal that participants showed improvements, not only academically, but personally and socially as well (Hollingworth, 1929; Justman, 1951; Martinson, 1961; Barbe, 1965). As early as 1925, Terman pointed out the need for special programs to avoid social problems associated with giftedness. Some studies point out negative effects of keeping gifted children exclusively in the regular classroom (Danielson, 1929; Witty and Wilkins, 1933; Baker, 1944). In this regard, Mann (1957) reports that the regular classroom, where gifted and typical children mingle, did not actually produce relationships significant enough to be classified as friendships. Miller (1956) questions the need for special classes for the gifted based upon his findings which showed them to be socially accepted by their classmates. But this does not account for the academic or intellectual needs of this group. Some of the earliest studies of children with exceptional abilities showed that these persons typically performed far below their capacity (Terman, 1925). Many found their educational experiences frustrating and often felt inferior, inadequate, and insecure with their peer group (Hollingworth, 1942; Zorbaugh, 1951). Severe psychological problems have been found among gifted children, often caused by environments which were insensitive to their needs

(Hollingworth, 1942; Parkyn, 1948; Zorbaugh, 1951).

Summary

It appears that much of the educational disadvantage faced by the gifted lies in external restrictions which prevent satisfying, fulfilling experiences. The overwhelming majority of research gives evidence of the need for special programs for the gifted. Evaluations of such programs have provided strong evidence as to their effectiveness. Further research appears to be necessary to determine the effect of different types of special programs upon the social adjustment of these children.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subject Description and Selection

The subjects in the present study were 31 boys and 35 girls attending the fourth grade in a northeastern Oklahoma community of less than 35,000 population. The social, economic, and educational level of the community compares favorably to others its size.

High achieving, potentially gifted students were identified from the school population on the basis of their composite scores on the SRA achievement test. Approximately 60 students were identified from this procedure and were individually administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised or the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Criterion for placement into the gifted-talented program required an IQ score of at least 135 or an achievement level falling at or above the 95th percentile. Twenty-two students were assigned to the gifted-talented program on this basis. These "gifted students" represent the experimental group of interest in this study. An equal number of students who were tested but not placed in the program were assigned to a second group. This group is designated as "high achievers." Each of these groups consists of 11 boys and 11 girls. A control group was selected on the basis of average achievement as measured by the SRA. Achievement levels of these subjects range from the 40th to the 62nd percentile. A control subject was chosen from

each classroom in which a gifted student was present. The control group consists of 9 boys and 13 girls.

Children in the gifted-talented program spend two hours a week studying foreign languages, social studies, math, creative thinking, and various enrichment exercises. The program coordinator sees its major goal to be teaching children to be self-directed, independent learners, self-accepting, and accepting of others.

Description of Measures Employed

A sociometric questionnaire was compiled for use in the present study (refer to appendix). The sociometric consists of four questions which were taken from previous research (Jacobs and Cunningham, 1969; Pasternack and Silvey, 1969; Gallegher, 1958). The questions are as follows:

1. Write the names of five students in this class who you feel are your best friends.

2. If you could elect a class president, for which (5) students in this class would you vote?

3. Write the names of five students in this class with whom you would like to work with on a class assignment.

4. Write the names of five students in this class who you would like to go to the movies with on Saturday.

The use of a sociometric technique to measure social acceptance appears to be justified in view of their use in past studies. In addition, Jones (1966, pg. 552) states, "choice of friends, playmates and workmates has, unquestionably, considerable face validity with elementary school children." The students were asked to make five

choices on each question because Newstetter, Feldstein, and Newcomb (1938) found that the stability of social choice increased up to five choices but not beyond that number.

Research Design and Procedures

The sociometric questionnaires were administered twice during the spring of 1977. The first administration occurred before the gifted students had begun attending the special program. The questionnaire was re-administered after they had been attending the special class for 3½ months. Three hundred and seventy-five students representing 15 fourth-grade classes responded to the sociometric on both administrations.

Scoring procedures consisted of simply counting the number of times a child was chosen by his classmates on each of the four questions. Only the data pertaining to the subjects in the three groups was analyzed.

In order to test hypotheses I - IV, post test data for all four questions was arranged according to whether a subject was chosen often (7 choices or more), average (4-6 choices), or least often (0-3). χ^2 was used to determine if the observed distribution differed significantly from chance expectancy. On those questions for which a significant χ^2 value was found, the procedure was repeated on the pretest data in order to determine if the finding of significance merely reflected the fact that the groups were not equivalent in social acceptance to begin with.

In order to test hypotheses, V - VIII, "gain" or "difference" scores between the pre- and post tests were obtained for each subject on each question. These scores were then jointly ranked using averages

for ties. The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H test, which tests the null hypothesis for three groups with jointly ranked data, was used to determine if all three groups were equivalent in gain.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Method of Analysis

Pre- and post test data were scored for each gifted, high achieving, and control subject. The mean and standard deviation for each group on each question was computed and is presented in Table I.

In preparing to test hypotheses I - IV, all subjects were grouped according to whether they were chosen often (7 or more choices), average (4-6 choices), or least often (0-3 choices) on each of the four questions. Tables IV through VII (refer to Appendix) present the observed and expected frequencies of social choices for each group on each question. χ^2 was computed and used to determine any significant differences from chance in terms of the number of social choices received. Table II contains the χ^2 values and significance levels obtained from this procedure.

To test hypotheses V - VIII, gain scores for each of the 66 subjects were obtained and jointly ranked for each question. A Kruskal-Wallis H value was obtained for each question by analyses of the ranked data and used to determine if all three groups were equivalent in gain.

TABLE I

GROUP MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
FOR PRE- AND POST TEST DATA

GROUP	PRETEST		POST TEST	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Gifted				
Friendship	4.59	2.6	4.36	2.4
Leadership	5.41	3.1	6.05	3.5
Academics	5.64	3.2	4.96	2.9
Social	4.91	2.8	3.96	2.2
High Achievers				
Friendship	6.77	3.5	5.96	3.1
Leadership	7.50	4.2	7.27	4.2
Academics	7.55	4.0	6.60	3.5
Social	6.41	3.3	5.82	3.1
Control				
Friendship	4.23	2.6	4.32	2.6
Leadership	3.73	2.7	3.23	2.2
Academics	3.50	2.1	3.82	2.3
Social	4.09	2.4	4.82	2.8

TABLE II

DEGREES OF FREEDOM, χ^2 VALUES, AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS FOR HYPOTHESES I - IV

		POST TEST		PRETEST	
Hypothesis	d.f.	χ^2	*p* level	χ^2	*p* level
I	4	3.85	.30	-----	-------
II	4	12.7	.025	12.5	.025
III	4	9.7	.05	17.5	.005
IV	4	8.42	.10	-----	-------

Description of Findings Pertinent to Each Hypothesis

The results obtained from analyses of the data are as follows: Hypothesis I - Table IV presents the observed and expected frequencies of friendship choices for the three groups based upon post test data. A χ^2 value of 3.85 ($p < .30$) was obtained from analysis of this data. Thus, hypothesis I, which states that there is no relationship between group membership and the number of friendship choices received, is retained.

Hypothesis II - Table V-A presents the observed and expected frequencies of leadership choices for the three groups based upon post test data. A χ^2 value of 12.7 ($p < .025$) was obtained from analysis of this data. This indicates a significant difference from chance in the observed distribution of leadership choices received by the three groups. An inspection of Table V-A reveals that more

gifted and high achieving subjects fell in the "often" category than was expected by chance. In addition, more control subjects fell in the "least often" category than was expected by chance.

Pretest data was analyzed by the same procedure. Table V-B presents the observed and expected frequencies of leadership choices for the three groups based upon pretest data. A χ^2 value of 12.5 ($p < .025$) was obtained from analysis of this data. An inspection of Table V-B shows that more high achieving subjects fell in the "often" category than was expected by chance. A majority of control subjects fell into the "least often" category.

These findings of statistical significance at both the pre- and post test levels indicate that the most intelligent subjects (gifted and high achieving) received significantly more leadership choices than was expected by chance. Hypothesis II, which states that there is no relationship between group membership and the number of leadership choices received, is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis III - Table VI-A presents the observed and expected frequencies of choices for co-workers on an academic assignment for each of the three groups based upon post test data. A χ^2 value of 9.7 ($p < .05$) was obtained from analysis of this data. This indicates a significant difference from chance in the observed distribution of choices received by the three groups. An inspection of Table VI-A reveals that more high achieving students fell into the "often" category than was expected by chance. Conversely, more control subjects fell into the "least often" category than was expected by chance.

Pretest data was analyzed by the same procedure. Table VI-B

presents the observed and expected frequencies of choices for co-workers on an academic assignment for each of the three groups based upon pre-test data. A χ^2 value of 17.5 ($p < .005$) was obtained from analysis of this data. An inspection of Table VI-B reveals that more gifted and high achieving students fell into the "often" category than was expected by chance. Conversely, more control subjects fell into the "least often" category than was expected by chance.

This finding of statistical significance at both the pre- and post test levels indicates that the most intelligent subjects (gifted and high achieving) received significantly more choices as co-workers on an academic assignment than was expected by chance. Hypothesis III, which states that there is no relationship between group membership and being chosen as a co-worker on an academic assignment is, therefore, rejected.

Hypothesis IV - Table VII presents the observed and expected frequencies of choices for social companionship for each of the three groups based upon post test data. A χ^2 value of 8.42 ($p < .10$) was obtained from analysis of this data. Thus, hypothesis IV, which states that there is no relationship between group membership and the number of choices received for social companionship, is retained.

Hypotheses V - VIII - Gain or difference scores between the pre- and post tests were obtained and jointly ranked for all subjects on each question. A Kruskal-Wallis H value, corrected for ties, was computed from this ranked data on each question to determine if the groups were equivalent in gain. Table III contains the mean gains and corrected H values for the groups on all four questions. Of the four H values obtained from this procedure, none approached

significance. These findings indicate that no significant differences exist between the groups in terms of gain from pre- to post tests. Hypotheses V - VIII, which state that there are no significant differences between the groups in gain, are therefore retained.

TABLE III

MEAN GAINS AND KRUSKAL-WALLIS CORRECTED H VALUES FOR HYPOTHESES V - VIII

	MEAN GAINS BY GROUP			
Hypothesis	Gifted	High Achievers	Control	Corrected H
V	-.23	-.81	.09	.2366
VI	.64	-.23	-.50	1.0033
VII	-.68	-.95	.32	3.8629
VIII	-.95	-.59	.73	4.0333

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Hypotheses, Method, and Findings

This study investigated the effect of special programming upon the social status of gifted students in the fourth grade. A sociometric questionnaire was used as a pre- and post test to determine the degree of relationship between social choice and group membership (gifted, high achiever, control) and to detect changes in social choices between pre- and post testing. The hypotheses and findings are summarized below:

Hypothesis I

Analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between group membership and the number of friendship choices received. Hypothesis I was retained.

Hypothesis II

Analysis of the data revealed significant relationships ($p < .025$) on both the pre- and post tests. The most intelligent subjects (gifted and high achievers) received more leadership choices than was expected by chance. Hypothesis II was rejected.

Hypothesis III

Analysis of the data revealed significant relationships on both the pre- ($p < .005$) and post ($p < .05$) tests. The most intelligent subjects received more choices as academic co-workers than was expected by chance. Hypothesis III was rejected.

Hypothesis IV

Analysis of the data revealed no significant relationship between group membership and choices for social companionship. Hypothesis IV was retained.

Hypotheses V - VIII

Analyses of the data revealed no significant differences between the groups in terms of gain from the four pre- and post tests. Hypotheses V - VIII were retained.

Conclusions

The most notable findings from this study were that all groups were equivalent in gain on all four questions (hypotheses V - VIII). It is concluded from these results that placement in a special program did not appreciably alter the social standing of the gifted students. An inspection of Table I adds further support to this contention. It can be seen that variation in the mean scores, from pre- to post testing, is quite small. Standard deviations also appear to be quite stable.

Other findings reveal significant relationships between group

membership and the number of choices received as class leaders and as co-workers on a class assignment. In both instances, the most intelligent subjects (gifted and high achievers) received significantly more choices than was expected by chance. Choices for friends and choices for companions to attend a movie did not significantly differentiate the groups.

Implications

A general overview of the results of this study suggests that gifted children, as a group, are well accepted socially by their peers. Specific findings indicate that the gifted are perceived as class leaders and as desirable academic co-workers by their peers. This finding of a relationship between intelligence and leadership is harmonious with the results of numerous other studies (Terman, 1925; Hollingworth, 1936; Bonsall and Stefflre, 1955; Dresell and Grabow, 1958; Martinson, 1961). The finding of significant differences in the number of choices expected and received by each group for academic co-workers indicates a relationship between intelligence and this aspect of social choice.

Friendship choices and choices for social companionship were not found to be significantly related to group membership. This is not in keeping with results reported by Miller (1956) and Gallegher (1958) whose studies indicate relationships between intelligence and friendship or social popularity. However, a closer look at Gallegher's study reveals that he found significant relationships between these variables in grades two, three, and five, but not in two of the three fourth-grade classes in his study. Therefore, findings of the present study

can be seen as similar to those of Gallegher (1958) in regard to fourth-grade students. In another vein, choices of friends and choices for companions to attend a movie appear to be highly related inasmuch as a person would be more likely to make the latter choice based upon friendship. A possible explanation for the results which occurred in regard to these questions could be that these friendship relationships were established beforehand and that the special program had little effect upon them. There was no indication that the gifted group was rejected by their classmates on these questions or that they were viewed less favorably as a result of their attendance in the gifted-talented program. The results merely reflected the fact that choices on these questions were randomly distributed.

Possibly the most significant finding of this study was that all three groups were equivalent in gain from pretest to post test on all four questions. This appears to imply that the gifted-talented program, which was designed to aid gifted students academically, had no negative effects upon them socially. This is most encouraging and supports the work of previous reseachers who favor the provision of special educational programs for gifted and talented students.

It is worth noting that the gifted students in this sample were distributed along all points on the continuum of social status. This observation of wide variations among these individuals in their social standing should alert one to the possible existence of wide variations in other aspects of personality and behavior. Gallegher and Crowder (1957) found it difficult to make generalizations regarding gifted children as a group due to the variety of individual differences they noted in their subjects. The implication for education is that any

specially designed program for children should remain flexible enough to account for such differences among individuals.

Gaps in our knowledge about the effects of special classes on the social adjustment of students served by these classes still exist. Further research into this area would be most valuable, especially in view of recent legislation which mandates free appropriate public education for all handicapped students. The methodology employed by this study could be useful in evaluating the effects upon social status of other special education programs (e.g. learning disabilities). Such information is vital in order to make provisions and adjustments to the present educational system in those areas in which it falls short of stimulating the total development of each child.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Harry J. Introduction to Exceptional Children. Macmillan, 1944.

Barbe, Walter B. Psychology and Education of the Gifted: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Bettelheim, Bruno. Stop Pampering Gifted Children. Saturday Evening Post, 1964, 237, 8-10.

Bonney, Merl. Relationships Between Social Success, Family Size, Socioeconomic Home Background, and Intelligence Among School Children in Grades III to V. Sociometry, 1944, 7, 26-39.

Bonsall, Marcella R. and Stefflre, B. The Temperament of Gifted Children. California Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 6, 162-65.

Burnside, Lenoir H. Experimental Program in Education of the Intellectually Gifted Adolescent. School Review, 1942, 50, 274-85.

Danielson, Cora. A Study of the Effect of a Definite Course of Reading in General Literature Upon Achievement in Content Subjects with Children of Superior Mental Ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1929, 20, 610-21.

Dolbear, Katherine. Precocious Children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1912, 19, 461-91.

Dressel, Paul and Grabow, John. The Gifted Evaluate Their High School Experience. Exceptional Children, 1958, 24, 395.

Gallegher, James J. and Crowder, Thora. The Adjustment of Gifted Children in the Regular Classroom. Exceptional Children, 1957, 23, 306-19.

Gallegher, James J. Social Status of Children Related to Intelligence, Propinquity, and Social Perception. Elementary School Journal, 1958, 58, 225-31.

Gallegher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Gowan, John C. A Comparison of the Achievement and Personality Test Scores of Gifted College Students with Their Classmates. California Journal of Educational Research, 1956, 7, 105-9.

Hollingworth, Leta S. Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture. Macmillan, 1926.

Hollingworth, Leta S. The Terman Classes at Public School 500. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1939, 10, 89-90.

Hurlock, Elizabeth. How to Help the Bright Child. Today's Health, 1951, 29, 68-69.

Jacobs, John F. and Cunningham, Myron A. Creativity and Intelligence: Their Relation to Peer Acceptance. Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 269.

Johnson, G. Orville. A study of the Social Position of Mentally Handicapped Children in the Regular Grades. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1950, 55, 60-89.

Jones, Reginald L., Gottfried, Nathan W., and Owens, Angela. The Social Distance of the Exceptional: A Study at the High School Level. Exceptional Children, 1966, 32, 551-56.

Justmen, Joseph. Obstacles to the Improvement of Teaching in Classes for the Gifted. Exceptional Children, 1951, 18, 41-45.

Keys, Noel. The Underage Student in High School and College. California Journal of Educational Research, 1938, 7, 145-72.

Mann, Horace. How Real are Friendships of Gifted and Typical Children in a Program of Partial Segregation? Exceptional Children, 1957, 23, 199-201.

Martinson, Ruth A. Educational Programs for Gifted Pupils. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1961.

Miller, Robert V. Social Status and Socioempathic Differences Among Mentally Superior, Mentally Typical, and Mentally Retarded Children. Exceptional Children, 1956, 23, 114-19.

Newland, T. Ernest. The Gifted. Review of Educational Research, 1953, 23, 417-31.

Pasternack, Marian and Silvey, Linda. Leadership Patterns in Gifted Peer Groups. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1969, 13, 126-28.

Peatman, John G. Introduction of Applied Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Renzulli, Joseph S.and Hartman, Robert K. Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 243-48.

Steele, Joe Milan and others. Cognitive and Affective Patterns of Emphasis in Gifted and Average Illinois Classes. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 757-59.

Terman, Lewis M. Educational Suggestions from Follow-up Studies on Intellectually Gifted Children. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1939, 13, 82-89.

Thom, Douglas A. and Newell, Nancy L. Hazards of the High IQ. Mental Hygiene, 1945, 29, 61-77.

Werblo, Dorothy and Torrance, Paul E. Experiences in Historical Research and Changes in Self-evaluations of Gifted Children. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 137-41.

Witty, Paul A. and Wilkins, Laroy W. The Status of Acceleration or Grade Skipping as an Administrative Practice. Educational Administrators Supplement, 1933, 19, 321-46.

Zorbaugh, Harvey and others. Some Observations of Highly Gifted Children. In Paul Witty Ed., The Gifted Child. New York: American Association for Gifted Children, 1951.

APPENDIX

TABLE IV

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF FRIENDSHIP CHOICES BASED
UPON POST TEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	5	9	6
AVERAGE	9	10	8
LEAST OFTEN	8	3	8

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	6.7	6.7	6.7
AVERAGE	9	9	9
LEAST OFTEN	6.3	6.3	6.3

TABLE V-A

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF LEADERSHIP CHOICES BASED
UPON POST TEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	10	10	1
AVERAGE	5	8	10
LEAST OFTEN	7	4	11

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	7	7	7
AVERAGE	7.7	7.7	7.7
LEAST OFTEN	7.3	7.3	7.3

TABLE V-B

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF LEADERSHIP CHOICES BASED
UPON PRETEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	6	11	4
AVERAGE	10	8	5
LEAST OFTEN	6	3	13

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	7	7	7
AVERAGE	7.7	7.7	7.7
LEAST OFTEN	7.3	7.3	7.3

TABLE VI-A

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF CHOICES FOR ACADEMIC CO-WORKERS
BASED UPON POST TEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	5	10	3
AVERAGE	11	9	8
LEAST OFTEN	6	3	11

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	6	6	6
AVERAGE	9.3	9.3	9.3
LEAST OFTEN	6.7	6.7	6.7

TABLE VI-B

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF CHOICES FOR ACADEMIC CO-WORKERS
BASED UPON PRETEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	9	11	2
AVERAGE	6	10	7
LEAST OFTEN	7	1	13

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	7.3	7.3	7.3
AVERAGE	7.7	7.7	7.7
LEAST OFTEN	7	7	7

TABLE VII

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED DISTRIBUTION
OF CHOICES FOR SOCIAL COMPANIONS
BASED UPON POST TEST DATA

Number of Times Chosen	Observed Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	1	5	7
AVERAGE	12	14	9
LEAST OFTEN	9	3	6

Number of Times Chosen	Expected Distribution By Group		
	Gifted	High Achievers	Control
OFTEN	4.3	4.3	4.3
AVERAGE	11.7	11.7	11.7
LEAST OFTEN	6	6	6

Write the names of five students in this class who you feel are your best friends. Write your very best friend's name first.

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____

Your Name _____

If you could elect a class president, for which students in this class would you vote?

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____

Your Name _____

Write the names of 5 children in this class who you would like to go to the movies with on Saturday.

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____

Your Name _____

Write the names of 5 students in this class with whom you would like to work with on a class assignment.

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____

Your Name _____

VITA 2

William Grant Lytle

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE EFFECT OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS UPON THE SOCIAL STATUS OF GIFTED STUDENTS

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Purcell, Oklahoma, July 18, 1951, the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Lytle, Jr.

Education: Graduated from Northwest Classen High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in May 1969; received Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Oklahoma State University in 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1977.

Professional Experience: School Psychometrist, Bartlesville Regional Education Service Center, 1975 to present.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma School Psychologists Association; Council for Exceptional Children.