DEVELOPMENT OF A CURRICULUM DESIGN IN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS IN GRADES NINE THROUGH TWELVE

By

BRENDA ROGERS LYONS

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Master of Arts
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma
1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1983

DEVELOPMENT OF A CURRICULUM DESIGN IN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS IN GRADES NINE THROUGH TWELVE

Thesis Approved:

Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express special appreciation to Dr. John J. Gardiner, her thesis adviser, under whose direction this study was conducted. His enthusiasm, scholarship, and encouragement were always welcomed and appreciated. In addition, the writer also wishes to express appreciation to Dr. Thomas Karman, Chairman, and Dr. William Adrian, who served as members of the Advisory Committee. Dr. William Segall, who agreed to serve as a member on very short notice, deserves special thanks.

Appreciation is extended to the many educators who took their valuable time to complete the research instrument. Special recognition goes to Betty Rutledge, of the EAHED office, and to Sharon Phillips, who typed the manuscript. They both provided excellent help and guidance.

Love and gratitude go to my husband, Stan, and to my children, Brad and Stacy. Over three years of their lives were spent helping me pursue this degree; without their help, understanding, and encouragement, this undertaking would not have been possible. Perhaps one day Stacy will understand the importance of her mother's "Dr. It."

Finally, this study is dedicated to my late father, Dewey B. Rogers, who would have been so proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

While American schools have recently shown an interest in the exceptional child and his or her education, until the recent past most of the attention at the federal, state, and local levels was given to the child with problems which handicapped educational development. The gifted and/or talented child at the other end of the educational continuum has often been neglected. While education for the gifted received attention nationally since the introduction of the intelligence test during the early twentieth century, the rights of American gifted and talented children were not stated definitively by the government until a 1971 report to Congress by U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland. This landmark document, Education of the Gifted and Talented, ". . . signaled the beginning of a broad based and sustained interest in developing appropriate educational programs for gifted and talented children" (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 3).

Marland (as cited in Clendening and Davies, 1980) conducted a study to fulfill the following:

1. Determine the extent to which special educational assistance programs are necessary or useful to meet the needs of gifted and talented children.

2. Show which federal education assistance programs are being used to meet the needs of gifted and talented children.

3. Evaluate how existing federal educational assistance programs can be more effectively used to meet these needs.

4. Recommend new programs, if any, needed to meet these needs (p. 382).

The need for a study such as the Marland Report was great. Berger (1980) reported that the U.S. Office of Education identified at least three percent of the 51 million American school aged children, about two million in 1980, as gifted:

> The gifted are found everywhere--in cities and suburbs and on farms all across the country. They are boys and girls, black and white, rich and poor, Christians and Jews, from long-standing as well as culturally different American families (p. 2).

While some of these youngsters received some educational opportunities intended to develop their special talents and abilities, many others never got their needed and deserved special help. For years the prevailing idea was that the gifted were so intelligent that they could learn without extra help. Another equally incorrect idea was that it was not democratic to provide special programs for the gifted. "As a result, the gifted rarely receive the special services they need, and this much-needed resource is being wasted" (Berger, 1980, p. 3).

The Marland Report contained three main points:

1. Even though most people do not realize it, gifted children are often ignored or neglected in the classroom.

2. The full development of the minds and abilities of the young is an important function of government.

3. In order to grow and prosper, society needs the intellectual and creative contributions of its most gifted children (Berger, 1980, p. 3).

Payne (1974, p. 190) concurred that the major objective of public school education was to provide equal opportunity to all youth: "Just as the mentally handicapped are further retarded through the inadequate services of traditional education, the gifted are inhibited in their intellectual growth processes through regular instruction."

Clendening and Davies (1980) summarized the Marland Report findings:

> Differentiated educational provisions for the gifted and talented had an extremely low priority in the competition for the federal, state, and local educational funding. Concern for the program was miniscule.
>
> Minority and culturally different gifted and talented children were scarcely being reached.
>
> Twenty-one states had made legislative or regulatory provisions for gifted and talented children; frequently these provisions were not mandatory and represented mere intention. Only 10 states had full-time personnel in their state educational agencies assigned to gifted education.
>
> Contrary to popular myth, gifted and talented children were not succeeding on their own. In fact, the reverse was true.
>
> Identification of the gifted and talented suffered woefully from inadequate testing, inadequate funds, and in some cases from indifference, apathy, and hostility.
>
> Where differentiated programs for the gifted and talented had been implemented, the effects were measurable.
>
> The federal role in providing services to the gifted and talented was for all practical purposes nonexistent (p. 7).

The quest for appropriate services for the gifted and talented was furthered in October, 1976, when the Office of Gifted and Talented, U.S. Office of Education, commissioned the Council of Exceptional

Children to conduct a state education survey to do the following:

> (1) elicit the current existence, status, and capacity of information systems and data bases within those states as related to legislation, resources, and existence of programs and services to gifted and talented children, and (2) produce currently available data from these sources (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 7).

The following findings were published by the Council of Exceptional Children in April, 1978:

> The Marland Report data was the benchmark from which growth as noted in the CEC survey was measured.
>
> Using the most conservative estimates (3%), there were at least 1,353,915 gifted and talented school-age persons in the U.S. and its territories in 1976-77; this study found that only 437,618 gifted and talented students were actually receiving services.
>
> The Marland Report states that 21 states had legislation governing programs and services for the gifted and talented. The CEC survey identified 33 states with actual statutes and another 10 states with written and adopted policies governing educational services for the gifted and talented; 8 states had neither statutes nor administrative policy.
>
> Without question, the status of gifted and talented education in the U.S. in 1977 was healthier than it was in 1971-1972; all major areas surveyed reflected measurable or assumed growth.
>
> Only 11 states have more than the equivalent of one full-time person in the State Educational Agency designated to work in gifted and talented programs. Ten states still had less than a half-time equivalent; four states had no one at all.
>
> Despite the gains reported, the quality of services provided was unanswered; no data was forthcoming that demonstrated the effectiveness of the present services to the gifted and talented.
>
> The conditions identified in the Marland Report as deterrents were found to be operative in 1977--lack of adequate funding from both federal and state coffers, lack of trained personnel assigned to work with programs for gifted and talented, lack of sufficient training opportunities for those who want to improve their skills, lack of substantiated procedures for identifying

> gifted and talented children, lack of adequate information in program effectiveness, and lack of information from and to all levels of this important enterprise (Clendening and Davies, pp. 7-8).

Need for the Study

As a result of the two aforementioned reports, many states mandated educational opportunities for the gifted and talented. Kirk and Gallagher (1979, p. 61) suggested that most states adopted the categories proposed by the Marland Report: "(1) general intellectual ability, (2) specific academic aptitude, (3) creative or productive thinking, (4) leadership ability, (5) visual and performing arts, and (6) psychomotor ability."

Of course, the initial step in providing programs was proper identification; however, the next step was the element leading to the ultimate success or failure of the program: providing differentiated educational opportunities. The Marland Report established three characteristics for a differentiated program:

1. A differentiated curriculum which denotes higher cognitive concepts and processes.

2. Instructional strategies which accommodate the learning styles of the gifted and talented and curriculum content.

3. Special grouping arrangement which includes a variety of administrative procedures appropriate to particular children; i.e., special classes, honor classes, seminars, resource room, and the like (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 5).

Obviously, for any state, county, or local school system to meet the provisions for a differentiated educational program in any one of the six areas identified in the Marland Report, much less in all of the categories, would be a monumental task, but one which should be

undertaken and fulfilled. According to Dunn (1973) four types of provisions were necessary for any special education program: specially trained professional educators, special curricular content, special methodology, and special instructional methods.

The only way that the suggestions of the Marland Report could be implemented was through the methodological development of curriculum designs for gifted and talented students. The purpose of this study was to develop such a design in the area of high school language arts. While the Marland Report did not identify specific areas of academic aptitude that were to be addressed, in most school systems, language arts, commonly called English, was a required course throughout the four years of high school. Since the area of language arts included reading, composition, speaking, and correct language usage, the development of the gifted student in this area would enhance his or her learning ability in many other areas of intellectual pursuit. Also, since the study of great literature introduced the gifted student to universal values, growth at higher cognitive levels and in critical thinking was enhanced.

Finally, the development of a curriculum design in this area would be helpful to college instructors of curriculum as well as to instructors specializing in the teaching of methods to undergraduate education students. College instructors could use the procedures identified as a basis for developing similar models in other academic areas.

Before developing a curriculum design of this type in the area of language arts, several areas of study had to be considered. Areas of investigation which were reviewed were the exceptional learner, the

gifted learner, curriculum, curriculum for the gifted, language arts, and language arts for the gifted.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to develop a differentiated curriculum program in language arts for gifted students at the high school level. The plan, to be used by college professors of education as well as by secondary language arts instructors, was developed according to the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of gifted learners in language arts according to research literature?

2. What curriculum designs are currently being used to teach gifted learners, especially in language arts?

3. What curriculum designs are being recommended in the research literature for teaching gifted learners in language arts?

4. What content, instructional methods or learning activities, and evaluation techniques would be recommended by instructors of the gifted, especially in language arts, at selected institutions?

5. What content, learning activities, or instructional methods and evaluation techniques could best be adapted to the gifted learner in language arts according to the research literature?

6. What are the aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques of the model curriculum design to use in teaching gifted language arts students?

Definition of Terms

Certain terms and definitions were relevant and important in

achieving the purpose of this study. These definitions appear as they related to the study.

1. Gifted and Talented:

> Gifted and talented children are identified by professionally qualified persons who, by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs in order to realize their contribution to self and society (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 383).

2. Gifted: In the text of this study, the word gifted referred to people who had developed high levels of intellectual ability or those who showed promise of such development. This was distinguished from those of more average mental ability who had specific talents such as creativity, leadership, and visual or performing arts.

3. Differentiated Program: These programs for the gifted and talented included the following:

> 1. A differentiated curriculum which denotes higher cognitive concepts and processes.
>
> 2. Instructional strategies which accommodate the learning styles of the gifted and talented and curriculum content.
>
> 3. Special grouping arrangements which include a variety of administrative procedures appropriate to particular children, . . . (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 5).

4. Curriculum: Curriculum was a course of study which included both the content to be learned and the processes necessary to facilitate that learning (Clendening and Davies, 1980).

5. Curriculum Design:

> Curriculum design most commonly refers to the arrangement of the components or elements of a curriculum. Ordinarily the components or elements included in a curriculum are (1) aims, goals, and objectives;

> (2) subject matter or content; (3) learning activities; and (4) evaluation (Zais, 1976, p. 16).

6. English or Language Arts: English or language arts included both a body of skills to be taught such as writing, speaking, listening, and reading, and a core of content, language and literature.

7. Aims: ". . . curriculum aims are statements that describe expected life outcomes based on some value schema either consciously or unconsciously borrowed from philosophy" (Zais, 1976, p. 306). Aims are often classified into four related categories: value patterns, social organization, social roles, and life style (Zais, 1976).

8. Goals:

> . . . curriculum goals will refer to school outcomes. . . . Curriculum goals will vary as to their degree of specificity, but in general will tend to be long range in nature and, as targets, somewhat removed from what ordinarily is considered immediate classroom assessment (Zais, 1976, p. 306).

Included in goals are generally the learning outcomes of facts, skills, and attitudes (Zais, 1976).

9. Objectives:

> Curriculum objectives are . . . the most immediate specific outcomes of classroom instruction. In general, they refer to the every day business of the operative curriculum, and the degree to which they have been achieved is assessable, at least theoretically, at any given point in time (Zais, 1976, p. 306).

These objectives are stated in terms of the observable behavior expected of students after instruction.

10. Content: ". . . such substantives as information, ideas, concepts, generalizations, principles, and the like" (Zais, 1976, p. 324). Content generally referred to data, concepts, generalizations,

and principles of school "subjects" or disciplines which were organized into bodies of knowledge.

11. Learning Activities: ". . . activities in which students are to engage in order to interact productively with course content" (Zais, 1976, p. 351).

12. Evaluation: ". . . the degree to which pupils attain . . . objectives" (Zais, 1976, p. 370). The evaluation techniques included both formative and summative evaluations of the objectives as presented through learning activities which developed the course content.

Limitations of the Study

It is impossible for any research effort to evaluate all aspects of an area of study. This research had the following limitations:

1. The researcher did not identify specific curriculum materials needed in order to implement the suggested curriculum design.

2. The researcher did not attempt to present a definitive sampling of methods used for the gifted learner.

3. The researcher did not attempt to present all of the possible curriculum designs and/or instructional methods used for teaching the gifted learner.

4. The researcher did not assume that her plan was the only valid method of presenting a differentiated curriculum for the gifted in secondary language arts.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature on the development of a curriculum design for the gifted student in language arts revealed many different approaches to the research problem. This review was divided into six areas: (1) the exceptional learner, (2) the gifted learner, (3) curriculum, (4) curriculum for the gifted, (5) language arts, and (6) language arts for the gifted.

The Exceptional Learner

Most literature identified the gifted/talented child as an exceptional student. Kirk (1972) suggested the exceptional child deviated from the average in several ways: mental characteristics, sensory abilities, neuromuscular or physical characteristics, social or emotional behavior, communication abilities, or in multiple handicaps requiring a modification in school practices. Gearheart (1972, p. 2) suggested that the exceptional child possessed educational requirements so different from the average child ". . . that he cannot be effectively educated without the provision of special educational programs, services, facilities, or materials". Dunn (1973, p. 3) suggested that "The term <u>exceptional</u> describes only that minority of pupils whose educational needs are very different from those of the majority of children and youth." This group included only those who

required special teaching or unusual school services. Reynolds and Birch (1977, p. 9) considered exceptional children as ". . . all those pupils who need some form of special education--part-time or full-time, for short or long periods--at some stage in their sequence of schooling". Gifted/ talented children were usually classified in areas of exceptionality which were often variable according to social criteria. "Variations among people are universal, but society determines which deviations will be considered disabilities or assets, impairment or enhancements of personal worth" (Teleford and Sawrey, 1977, p. 12). In addition, assets and disabilities were dictated by the tasks demanded in a culture and by the meanings it attached to deviations from the norm. As a result, there were many classifications of the exceptional person. Teleford and Sawrey listed six areas: intellectual and academic deviance, sensory deviance, motor deviance, behavioral and personality deviance, social deviance, and problems of the aged. Gardner (1977) suggested three general classes: learning difficulties and behavioral deficits, behavioral excesses, and learning acceleration and creative activities. However, Gardner mentioned that the most-used categories were those of the educational system: emotionally disturbed, learning disabilities, learning dysfunctions and learning disorders, brain damage, slow learners, mentally handicapped, behavioral disabilities, oral communication disabilities, visual disabilities, auditory disabilities, superior cognitive abilities, minimal brain dysfunction, and crippling and health disabilities.

Dunn (1973) classified the exceptional learner into eight categories: superior cognitive abilities, moderate and severe general learning disabilities, mild general learning disabilities, behavioral

disabilities, oral communication disabilities, hearing disabilities, neuromotor and other crippling and health disabilities, and specific learning disabilities. Kirk and Gallagher (1979) presented four groups: mental deviations including both intellectually superior and those slow in learning ability, sensory handicaps such as auditory and visual impairment, communication disorders including learning disabilities and speech and language impairments, and behavior disorders including emotional disturbance and social maladjustment.

Classification systems, while convenient for administrative purposes, posed definite problems. Kirk and Gallagher (1979) suggested the following:

> . . . classification leads to misclassifications and mislabeling, particularly in low-income families, . . . categories do not lead to educationally relevant programs, and . . . categories and labels are detrimental to the self-concept of children so labeled (p. 21).

Gardner (1977) proposed that labeling and categorizing had considerable negative consequences for the child. There was also a problem relating to the predictive relationship which was assumed to exist between the placement of exceptional children and the educational program designed for them. Telford and Sawrey (1977, p. 49) suggested that "There is abundant evidence that assigning a person to a category and giving him a label creates sets of expectations that powerfully influence perception and behavior."

Conversely, others suggested that classification or labeling of exceptional learners was helpful. Smith and Neisworth (1975) cited four examples:

1. arranging what otherwise might appear chaotic;

2. detecting orderly relationships among seemingly separate events;

3. setting the boundaries of the phenomena of concern to a particular science; and

4. discovering 'missing pieces' or discrepancies (p. 144).

However, the same authors conceded that labels could also have a negative effect:

> Current labels generally function to further debilitate rather than help the child; they can thus be viewed as further handicaps that impede the child's development and amplify the number and intensity of his problems (p. 150).

> What we call a person influences how others act toward him, how the person acts toward himself, and what roles he will be expected to fill or not fill. Classificatory labeling can handicap or help. It behooves us to be critical and cautious about the terminology we attach to those whom we are dedicated to help (p. 154).

In summary, Smith and Neisworth (1975) suggested special educational classifications would serve the exceptional child if the following criteria were met:

> . . . identify significant educational problems of children; order educational problems in ways that detect similarities and relationships; and provide nomenclature that promotes communication and research within education (p. 148).

Kirk and Gallagher (1979) presented positive points of classification:

> . . . the purpose of classification is to bring the child with special needs into contact with specially trained personnel who will provide a special program in a special learning environment; . . . categories have aided in focusing the attention of lawmakers on the problems of exceptional children, thereby aiding in obtaining legislation to support special programs; . . . categories allow us to pursue the causes of the handicapping conditions; and . . . categories, when used properly, aid in communication (pp. 21-22).

Obviously, there were valid concerns on both sides of the issue of classification; however, during the last 20 years, there was a trend toward noncategorization which included three large-scale movements. The first was the deinstitutionalization movement of the exceptional learner by transferring a large percentage from institutions to the local community. The second was mainstreaming: the return of children from special classes to regular classrooms. The third was widespread attempts to reduce the deleterious effects of categorizing and labeling deviants by dealing with all deviants noncategorically. Telford and Sawrey (1977) did not agree totally with all aspects of the three movements:

> While we are in sympathy with this general trend, it does have limitations. We have stressed that all the handicapped, and to a degree all deviants, have much in common. However, there are some treatment, educational, social, and vocational problems unique to several of the conventional categories (p. 17).

Dunn (1973) cited four major trends since the late 1960's:

> First, special educators are less inclined to group pupils by traditional handicapping labels orginated by such noneducators as physicians and psychologists. Second, in place of such categories as the gifted, crippled, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and juvenile delinquent, special educators are substituting an educationally relevant classification system that focuses on the special learning needs of these children. Third, special educators are concentrating more and more on pupils with major differences and on quality programs rather than on handicapped children from minority groups who in the past have often been placed in special education programs of undemonstrated effectiveness. Fourth, special educators are becoming much more integrative in their approach, pointing out that much of special education is not very different from general education--with a few exceptions such as using braille with the blind and speech-reading with the deaf (p. v).

The concept of mainstreaming developed as one of the methods of educating the exceptional learner. Telford and Sawrey (1977) listed several reasons for mainstreaming:

> Labeling and segregating the deviants increases their distinct categorization and stigmatization. Consequently, keeping them in the regular classroom will increase the mutual understanding and acceptance of normal and deviant. Public policies and educational practices would encourage not mere tolerance, but a positive valuing of differences. They should encourage respect for individuality and an appreciation of the differing talents of persons who are different physically, mentally, linguistically, and culturally. Current classification systems have fostered stigmatization and have discriminated against the poor and certain minority ethnic groups. It is also assumed that mainstreaming the handicapped will result in the improvement of instruction for all children (p. 113).

Furthermore, Telford and Sawrey (1977) cited the following reasons for implementation of mainstreaming: research studies failed to establish the effectiveness of special classes; medically and psychologically defined diagnostic categories for educational purposes proved inadequate; many educationally and aptitude-relevant factors such as race, social class, personality characteristics, and manageability were used in special class placement; there was a growing realization of the deleterious effects of labeling and categorizing; and there was an increased incidence of court judgments and legislation concerning special education classes. However, these problems related mainly to the exceptional child categories other than the gifted. Hopefully,

> Special education under mainstreaming becomes a set of services facilitating the tailoring and monitoring of educational programs to meet individual needs, rather than a device for sorting children to the degree that they fit existing programs (Telford and Sawrey, 1977, p. 115).

Dunn (1973) agreed that homogeneous grouping was a disadvantage to slower children. In a heterogeneous group, these pupils learned much from the more able classmates. Also, teacher expectancies not only tended to be higher, but teachers spent more time attempting to bring them up to group norms.

Mainstreaming was not, however, without problems. Often special programs were dropped, and students were replaced in the previous situation; massive skill training efforts for teachers were needed; mainstreaming failed if all assessing, sorting, and classifying was abandoned; schools had to provide auxiliary staff to supplement and support regular teachers; administrative problems often were not anticipated and dealt with; and eliminating all special classes was perhaps as big a mistake as eliminating all institutions. The conclusion was that some special classes were needed (Telford and Sawrey, 1977).

The gifted and talented child was one of many classifications of the exceptional student. The characteristics of exceptional students were different in many aspects, however, and the general suggestions for educational improvement of the exceptional child did not always work equally well with gifted students.

The Gifted and Talented Learner

Gifted and talented learners needed special consideration just as the other categories of exceptional learners. The Marland Report stated the following:

> Studies show that gifted children in our schools today are locked in by structural and administrative restrictions that inhibit their development. They are denied open access to advanced materials, a cruel kind of censorship of the mind. They are unsatisfied in their

> mature concern about ethical and moral questions as well as in their intellectual pursuits (Reynolds and Birch, 1977, p. 198).

Correct programming for these learners was a necessity because of new knowledge and technology which spawned large emerging social changes that in turn created many problems.

> In order to direct some of the creative, problem-solving energies of these potential leaders toward society's needs, they must be educated toward responsible attitudes toward their families, their communities, and their nation. They must be taught so they will grow in both social productivity and compassion toward others. Thus it is in society's interest that potentially gifted and talented children and youth be well educated both in content and character, and that none of their capabilities be stunted, lost, or wasted because of weaknesses or omissions in their schooling (Reynolds and Birch, 1977, p. 206).

There were many definitions of the gifted. Historically, the definition concerned students of precocious accomplishment, but recently learners displaying unusual promise of achievement or accomplishment were included. According to Education of the Gifted (1959):

> A talented or gifted child is one who shows consistently remarkable performance in any worthwhile line of endeavor. Thus, we shall include not only the intellectually gifted, but also those who show promise in music, the graphic arts, creative writing, dramatics, mechanical skills, and social leadership (p. 38).

Martinson (1973) provided a less encompassing definition:

> Students with superior cognitive abilities include approximately the top 3 percent of the general school population in measures of general intelligence and/or in creative abilities or the talents that promise to make contributions of merit to society. These students are so able that they require special provisions if appropriate educational opportunities are to be provided for them (p. 193).

Lyon (1981) summarized the special qualities of the gifted:

> The children in this group have an unsual endowment of talent--analytical or creative in an intellectual,

> artistic, or social way or even in some ways that neither schools nor society yet understands. Whatever their special talent, their ranks will produce that small percentage of humans whose work will greatly affect the disciplines they specialize in, the societies they live in, and perhaps all humankind (p. 15GE).

Proper identification was the first step in providing differentiated programs. Reynolds and Birch (1977) listed by preference six identification tools: individual intelligence test scores; earlier achievement, including academic record; teacher nomination based on observations; standardized achievement test scores; scores on creativity tests; and scores on group intelligence tests. However, these were tools, not the definition of the gifted and talented.

> The final word as to whether a pupil is to be provided with a special education program should be made by the responsible teachers and other special education educators. The decision should be based on their objective and subjective appraisal of the pupil, the nature of the special educational program or activity contemplated, the atmosphere in which the pupil lives and goes to school, and the interactions among them. . . . That calls for professional judgment that makes use of test results and other data, rather than allowing the decisions to be made by the data's relation to such arbitrary, preset points as specific scores or grade averages (Reynolds and Birch, 1977, p. 280).

Kirk and Gallagher (1979) suggested that many gifted students passed through school unidentified, especially those from low socioeconomic backgrounds or those from subcultures placing less stress on verbal ability. The three most common methods of identification, according to Dunn (1973) were teacher nomination, group school achievement test scores, and group intelligence test scores. He further suggested that identification needed to include the use of adequate measures, careful interpretation of measures, and complete information regarding special skills, interests, and aptitudes. "Gifted children

tend to be complex, and identification of their many capabilities is an important responsibility" (Dunn, 1973, p. 206).

Ward (1962) listed several major pitfalls to avoid in identification:

> Avoid tight cutoff points since no known instrument is reliable enough to warrant this.
>
> Avoid classifying as gifted the average student who has strong motivation to achieve for the sake of competing or meeting parental goals rather than his own.
>
> Establish procedures to guard against exclusion of culturally deprived children.
>
> Avoid exclusions of the nonconforming, underachieving individual.
>
> Avoid permanent exclusion of the withdrawn, conforming underachiever, and avoid limiting identification to a narrow concept of giftedness (p. 197).

The many differences between one highly intelligent individual and another should not be ignored when considering the gifted as a group.

> To assume homogeneity among the gifted would be to ignore the fact that the restriction of any one variable does not have an equally restrictive effect on other variables, even though they may be highly correlated (Teleford and Sawrey, 1977, p. 170).

However, common traits could be suggested. Terman (1925), in his classic 40 year study of the gifted, listed certain physical characteristics. The gifted exceeded norms for the average in height, weight, general bodily development, strength, energy, and general neuromuscular capacity, while they had fewer physical and emotional problems.

As a group, the remarkably versatile gifted learner achieved highly, making rapid strides in academic areas, especially in the areas of reading, arithmetic, grammar, science, literature, composition,

history, geography, and to lesser degrees in penmanship, shop-work, sewing, arts, etc. They liked to read, played with other children, and spent time in games which required reading and logic rather than physical games. The social adjustment of the gifted tended to be above average, while the majority came from homes of above average socioeconomic levels (Teleford and Sawrey, 1977).

The above stated generalities did not fit all gifted learners, but the understanding of some of these traits helped dispel the image that many had of the gifted as ". . . a bespectacled, frail youngster, ill at ease socially, lost in his or her own world of books and lofty thoughts, usually isolated in some corner tenuously holding onto sanity" (Clark, 1979, p. 16).

As with any group, differences were noted for special areas of concern. Five categories of gifted students presented additional needs: underachieving gifted students, disadvantaged gifted students, culturally different gifted learners, handicapped gifted learners, and gifted females.

Underachieving gifted students fell into two categories: those who underachieved only occasionally, situational underachievers, and those who had a reoccurring pattern, chronic underachievers. In either case, the underachieving gifted student was defined as a student who had shown exceptional intelligence on a standardized measure but who did not perform as well as expected by the measure. Research studies complied many characteristics of these students including the following:

--a finding repeated in most studies is the low self-concept of the underachiever. They are negative in their evaluations of themselves.

--they often feel rejected by their family; they feel that their parents are dissatisfied with them.

--because of a feeling of helplessness, they may take no responsibility for their actions, externalizing conflict and problems.

--they may show marked hostility toward adult authority figures and general distrust of adults.

--they may feel victimized.

--they often do not like school or their teachers and choose companions who have negative attitudes toward school also.

--they may seem rebellious.

--weak motivation for academic achievement has been noted, and they may lack academic skills.

--they tend to have poor study habits, do less homework, and frequently nap when trying to study.

--they are less intellectually adaptive.

--they are less persistent, less assertive, and show high levels of withdrawal in classroom situations.

--they hold lower leadership status and are less popular with their peers.

--they are often less mature than achievers.

--they often show poor personal adjustment and express feelings of being restricted in their actions.

--they may not have any hobbies, interests, or activities that could occupy their spare time.

--they tend to have lower aspirations than achievers and do not have a clear idea of vocational goals.

--they are not able to think or plan future goals.

--they tend to state their goals very late and often choose goals that are not in line with their major interests or abilities. Often the goals they adopt have been set for them.

--in choosing a career, they show preferences for manual activities, business, sales occupations, or anything

> with a strong persuasive trend over more socially concerned or professional occupations (Clark, 1979, pp. 280-281).

Disadvantaged gifted students were those raised by poor, lower class parents, characterized more by poverty than by cultural differences. Since many adults, both parents and teachers alike, assumed that giftedness could not occur in the lower class settings, identification was a problem. Special care was needed to identify these students beyond the normal measures. Clark (1979) suggested the following traits to aid in identification:

--high mathematical abilities

--alertness, curiosity

--independence of action

--initiative, anxious to do new things

--fluency in nonverbal communication

--imagination in thinking

--flexibility in approach to problems

--learning quickly through experience

--retaining and using ideas and information well

--showing a desire to learn in daily work

--originality and creativity in thinking

--responding well to visual media

--leadership ability in peer group

--responsible social behavior

--varied interests

--ability to generalize learning to other areas and to show relationships among apparently unrelated ideas

--resourcefulness, ability to solve problems by ingenious methods

--entrepreneur ability, readily makes money on various projects or activities

--imaginative story telling, language rich in imagery

--mature sense of humor

--responsiveness to the concrete (p. 288)

The third group, the culturally different gifted learners, were raised with different values and attitudes from the ones in the dominant culture. While some subcultures had characteristics which added to the development of giftedness such as the Japanese culture, others created very limiting conditions, especially if coupled with poverty. While culturally different gifted children differed in many ways, they had certain mental traits in common:

--The ability to meaningfully manipulate some symbol system held valuable in the subculture.

--The ability to think logically, given appropriate data.

--The ability to use stored knowledge to solve problems.

--The ability to reason by analogy.

--The ability to extend or extrapolate knowledge to new situations or unique applications (Gallagher and Kinney, as cited in Clark, 1979, p. 305).

Handicapped gifted learners encompassed all types of handicapped students except the mentally retarded and severely developmentally disabled. These students were often placed in specialty classes for their handicap while their giftedness was often overlooked or neglected. Also, gifted programs often refused to include gifted handicapped students. Two major problems concerned the varied types of handicaps and the different rates of growth and development. In addition, many handicapped students had a low self-esteem (Clark, 1979).

The final group of special gifted learners was the gifted female. Because of the male dominant role in the American culture, girls had a different environment as children than boys. In a study by Guttentag (1975), by the age of five, most children were already sexists who thought of boys as strong and fine and girls as weak and silly (as cited in Clark, 1979, p. 315). The female who felt the need to achieve directly contradicted the role expectation of the woman; therefore, women sometimes inhibited achievement motivation. A study by Horner (1968) showed that women responded to success in one of three ways:

1. Show anxiety about becoming unpopular, ummarriageable, and lonely.
2. Feel guilt and despair, show doubt about their femininity or normality.
3. Deny the possibility that a mere woman can be successful (as cited in Clark, 1978, p. 316).

Since gifted children tended to develop more quickly than others, and girls tended to develop more quickly than boys, gifted girls often withdrew as they were accused of being "bossy, unfeminine, and showoffs" when they were only trying to show their ability (Clark, 1979, p. 316). By the time many gifted girls reached their teens, they had successfully hidden their giftedness in an attempt to fit in with the mainstream.

Each of the five areas of concern posed difficult and different problems which required thoughtful analysis. However, if the gifted educational program was truly differentiated and individualized, provisions would be made to provide a sound educational program for each area.

Curriculum

Introduction

Curriculum meant different things to different specialists:

> Curricula often are understood as: (1) the subject matter or content plans which have been prescribed by some authoritative agency, such as a State Education Commission or the local agent of a school administration; (2) a set of materials developed by a group of specialists retained by a commercial publishing firm; or (3) materials developed by a major curriculum development project at the national level, . . . The effective curriculum means planning from advance organizers and the executing of these plans by a specific teacher for a unique group of students in an educational encounter; and the encounter is understood as a behavioral interaction between a teacher or team of teachers and a student or group of students (Frost and Rowland, 1969, p. 5).

According to Posner and Rudnitsky (1978), certain conceptual distinctions were made in definitions of curriculum: process and products or planning, and curricular and instructional matters. A process consisted of one or more events, while a product was the result of a process. Instruction was a process that was a series of events leading to curriculum outcomes; therefore, instruction differed from curriculum since curriculum was not a process. Furthermore, curriculum meant the following:

> A more precise view of curriculum--and the common understanding of curriculum among laymen--is that it is what is taught in school or what is intended to be learned. It does not refer to what is to be done or what is to happen in the learning process. Curriculum represents a set of intentions, a set of intended learning outcomes. Curricular matters, then, have to do with the nature and organization of those things we as course planners want learned in our courses. Curriculum development results in a design specifying the desired learnings. . . . Instructional planning, on the other hand, results in a plan outlining the intended processes of instruction (Posner and Rudnitsky, 1978, pp. 4-6).

Kelly (1977) defined curriculum as the content of a particular subject or area of study or the total program of an educational institution. Hass (1980) defined curriculum four ways: a school's written courses of study as well as other curriculum materials, the subject matter taught to the students, the courses offered, and the learners' planned experiences provided under the school's guidance. Furthermore:

> The curriculum is all of the experiences that individual learners have in a program of education whose purpose is to achieve broad goals and related specific objectives, which is planned in terms of a framework of theory and research or past and present professional practices (Hass, 1980, p. 5).

Scheffler (1960) suggested two types of educational definitions of curriculum: descriptive definitions which were accurate explanatory accounts of acceptable meaning and usage, and programmatic definitions which embodied programs of action or expressed a practical program.

Zais (1976, p. 6) offered several definitions of curriculum. "The word 'curriculum' comes from a Latin root meaning 'racecourse,' and traditionally, the school's curriculum has represented something like that . . . to most people." Until recently, even the most knowledgeable educators regarded curriculum as the relatively standardized ground covered by students. According to Zais, the curriculum could be viewed in six ways: a program of studies, course content, planned learning experiences which included all the experiences of the students offered by the schools, experiences "had" under the auspices of the school such as the invisible or hidden curriculum, a structured series of intended learning outcomes, or a written plan for action.

Once a definition was decided upon, the next step was curriculum development. Tyler (1950) stated four fundamental questions:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these results?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (p. 1).

According to Tanner and Tanner (1980), these four questions represented the sequence of: (1) identifying objectives, (2) selecting the means for attainment of these objectives, (3) organizing these means, and (4) evaluating the outcome.

Taba (1962) presented a seven step curriculum development sequence: diagnosis of needs, formulation of objectives, selection of content, organization of content, selection of learning experiences, organization of learning experiences, and determination of what to evaluate and of the ways and means of doing it. Hass (1980) identified four curriculum planning steps: identification of the content; determination of objectives or setting goals; selection, preparation, and implementation of strategies and alternatives for achieving the intended changes; and evaluation. Unruh (1975) stated the following:

> Curriculum development is a complex process of assessing needs, identifying desired learning outcomes, planning and preparing for instruction to achieve the outcomes, and using the cultural, social, and personal needs and interests that the curriculum is to serve (p. 80).

Posner and Rudnitsky (1978) developed a curriculum design plan which led to the completion of the following products:

1. Rationale for the course including the overall educational goals.

2. List of intended learning outcomes for the course categorized according to type of learning.

3. Conceptual map(s) depicting the relationship among the important ideas to be learned in the course.

4. Instructional plan describing (a) what each unit is about, (b) what learning outcomes each unit is intended to accomplish, and (c) what general teaching strategies could be used in each unit to accomplish the intended learning outcomes.

5. Evaluation plan describing behavioral indicators for each high-priority intended learning outcomes together with a list of some unintended, undesirable learning outcomes to be on the outlook for (pp. 2-3).

According to Zais (1976), curriculum work consisted of three essential processes: curriculum construction, the decision-making process that determined the nature and design of the curriculum; curriculum development, the procedures for carrying on the construction process; and curriculum implementation, the process of putting into effect the curriculum produced by the first two stages. The curriculum had four components: aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation (Zais, 1976). However, before the preceding areas were formulated, an educational philosophy had to be developed. Each component of the curriculum required different methods and tasks; therefore, an in-depth analysis of each was necessary.

Philosophy

A statement of aims, goals, and objectives for any curriculum could not be attempted before a sound basis of educational philosophy was formulated. Because every society shared common ideas, opinions, and desires in order to achieve the optimum lifestyle, it followed

that schools reflected this societal philosophy. As Zais (1976) suggested:

> . . . the curriculum of the schools, whatever else it may do, is first and foremost designed to win the hearts and minds of the young to those principles and ideals that will direct them to wise decisions--i.e., decisions whose consequences lead to the adult conception of the good life (p. 105).

He further admitted that both philosophy and curriculum were just different approaches to the question of what man can become.

Herman (1977) recognized the need for a philosophical basis for the curriculum when she suggested that all educational systems were based on values of society which were reflected in grading and selection practices. Furthermore,

> Education, then, is an expression of society. It is the means by which society teaches its children to assume the roles that it values in order to become the kind of adults that it needs, living what its individual members believe represents a meaningful or successful life. Many of the differences of opinion about educational practices go back to differences in these fundamental values about man, his fulfillment, and his relationship with his fellow man (p. 59).

In order to reach a curriculum philosophy, three realms of philosophic inquiry needed to be considered: ontology (what is real), epistemology (what is true), and axiology (what is good). Three basic philosophical families arose which were based on their ontological foundations. Other-worldly philosophies which placed their reality in supernatural realms exerted considerable influence on American curriculum. The second group of philosophies, earth-centered, assumed that reality was present in the natural world. These ideas, which became more prevalent with scientific advances, were also extremely influential on present curriculum. The third group, and most recent,

suggested that reality resided in human experiences; therefore, it was known as man-centered. While not as influential as the first two on the modern American curriculum, there was influence during the last 50 years from the man-centered philosophers (Zais, 1976).

The second category concerned epistemology, the question concerning what knowledge was of worth. Since curriculum authors dealt with knowledge, this category became especially important. In other worldly philosophy, knowledge was received by revelation or other mystical means, while earth-centered philosophies stated that knowledge was discovered through the powers of reason. Man-centered philosophies believed that relative knowledge was constructed from experience (Zais, 1976).

Axiology, or what is good, the third branch, was divided into two categories: ethics (concepts of right and wrong) and aesthetics (qualities of beauty and enjoyment). According to other-worldly ideas, the absolute good was God or the ideal, while the absolute good in earth-centered philosophies was the law of nature. Man-centered theorists suggested that the relative good was the preferred consequence (Zais, 1976).

Obviously, with such different views of life presented by the three viewpoints, a detailed analysis of each could not be attempted here. However, several authors constructed philosophical foundations of education based on philosophical considerations.

Dale (1972) suggested the following answer to the question of what knowledge was of the most worth:

> By knowledge I mean information, skills, and attitudes incorporated into one's intellectual and emotional habits.

> That knowledge is of the most worth which enables a person to do the best that he can, to be fulfilled, to achieve a sense of his identity. The curriculum of the school must help students attain a sense of their individual and social worth.
>
> That knowledge is of the most worth which generates knowledge. Knowledge which can be turned into effective power has high value.
>
> That knowledge is of the most worth which contributes a sense of joy, delight, exhilaration, poignancy to the life of the learner. This requires in-depth experiences which develop a zest for life, the job of discovery, the Eureka effect, as a continuing accompaniment to life richly lived. That is not a call for more entertainment. Entertainment is too limited a concept. Such emphasis is often upon gratification of the senses, which constantly calls for increasing stimulation. In the end, this results in the dulling of the senses and a constant search for new ways of being bored.
>
> In a world brimming with knowledge it is not enough to ask whether what is learned has worth. We must rather ask, 'What is of most worth?' The greatest value, in my opinion, is a belief in the dignity of man. To dignify man is to honor, to exalt, to make worthy. It is easy to say this, but to translate it into reality is today's greatest challenge.
>
> Many studies show that additional time spent on reflections, on thinking about what we have read, heard, seen or done is highly profitable. Hence, the importance of the knowledge which helps us organize, classify, pattern, structure, rearrange, reconstruct, synthesize, conceptualize what we know. The able teacher helps students develop connections, interactions, relationships, patterns (as cited in Clendening and Davies, 1980, pp. 104-105).

Another statement of philosophy titled "Becoming an Educated Person" was written by the North Hills School District in Pennsylvania:

> Each student will develop competency in basic skills as a level appropriate with his ability and development. He will be able to read with understanding, express ideas effectively in writing, perform arithmetical computations, reason mathematically and

> logically, listen critically, speak effectively, develop perceptual skills and use learning skills.
>
> Each student will develop the ability to understand and respond effectively to people, ideas, objects, and events in the world. He will be able to recognize, explain, evaluate, and respond to these conditions and events.
>
> An educated person is one who has knowledge of social, political, and natural events. He can identify and explain such events; he has the ability to relate these events historically and scientifically to the world in which he lives and to changing conditions. He has acquired valid criteria with which to make judgments. An educated person has the knowledge and experience to understand human similarities and differences and demonstrates respect for humanity and the dignity of the individual. He understands the relationship between the human being and his social, political, and natural environments and seeks intelligent use of the environment.
>
> Each student will grow toward the realization of his own intellectual, emotional, motivational, and physical potential. This goal affirms the belief that each student is a unique individual and has great potential for growth. Furthermore, it assumes that the fullest development of each student is in the best interest of a democratic society; and that the freedom to inquire, to challenge ideas and to examine alternatives, while valuing the freedom of others, is consonant with the idea of individual development and societal improvement (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 104).

Finally, Zais (1976, p. 235) suggested that the "educated man" was one who became an authentic human being, ". . . the individual who maximizes his self by striving to exercise responsible freedom." Furthermore:

> He is no longer the uncritical conformist, the encapsulated herd animal unconsciously dependent on and responding to the ready-made meaning served up by the controlling culture. By dealing consciously and honestly with all men, by turning a critical eye on the cultural beliefs that shape society's (and his own) Weltanshauung, self-reliant man assumes responsibility for his own autonomous meanings and their applicability to his own

> life and times. His existence is at once a response to the Socratic enjoinder, 'Know thyself,' and a model of the democratic ideal (p. 236).

Aims

Before the curriculum development process began, the difference between the three terms of aims, goals, and objectives was clarified, since many authors used the terms interchangeably. However, as stated in the definitions in Chapter I of this paper, Zais (1976) suggested that aims were expected life outcomes based on some type of value schema borrowed from philosophy. In contrast to curriculum goals and objectives, aims did not relate to school or classroom outcomes, but they functioned as targets; therefore, the degree of their achievement was usually not determinable until well after the completion of the school years. As a result, curriculum authors sometimes had difficulty translating these future-oriented aims into more immediate and specific school outcomes which led to the completion of the aims.

Moffett and Wagner (1976) stressed that the statement of aims was essential:

> Stating aims is a very important process, because statement of aims becomes the touchstones to which everything is referred. Means are chosen to fit aims. Materials, methods, plant, personnel, evaluation--all follow from key decisions about what people want (p. 404).

Goals

Zais (1976) defined curriculum goals as school outcomes which referred to either individual schools or entire school systems. In addition, while the goals varied in specificity, they tended to be

long range in nature; therefore, they were not ordinarily considered immediate classroom assessment. The following function of goals was suggested:

> Goals, therefore, will include (among others) enabling students (1) to become aware of the interior basis of their encapsulation, (2) to become conscious of the enculturating effects of society, (3) to assess the relationship of themselves to their environment in self- and social-critical terms, and (4) to develop an openness to experience. Each of these goals summarizes an immensely complex attainment and therefore may appear deceptively simple. It should be clear, however, that implicit in each one is a multitude of subgoals and, in terms of translation to the activities of daily classroom work, literally thousands of possible objectives (p. 239).

Gagne and Briggs (1979, p. 47) suggested that "Educational goals are a statement of the outcomes of education. They refer particularly to those activities made possible by learning, which in turn is often brought about by deliberately planned instruction." In order to identify educational goals which were the outcomes of education, human capabilities prerequisite to the goals had to be identified.

Unruh (1975, p. 252) stressed the importance of philosophical statements which served as guides for the school's program as well as standards, when he said: "Statements of goals may list such desirable outcomes as personal self-fulfillment ,moral responsibility, social consciousness and effectiveness, economic awareness, and acquisition of knowledge and skills." Many goal statements broad in scope served to give directions to policy makers at national, state, and local levels, while goal statements which were lofty served as value bases for curriculum development.

A traditional method of classifying goals was in terms of the learning of facts, skills, and attitudes. Facts referred to the

assimilation of information; skills were the ability to perform a host of processes such as reading, math, writing; and attitudes referred to feelings toward various activities. However, in most learning processes and in most curriculum designs, these three processes were inseparable (Zais, 1976).

Objectives

Once the aims and goals of a curriculum had been formulated, the next step was to state the objectives. This was the first process in preparation for a specific course, since textbook selection, teaching techniques, learning activities, and evaluation techniques derived from objectives. Objectives could be stated in behavioral terminology, or they could be stated in more generalized terms. In either case, objectives were important. As McKeatchie (1978, p. 6) suggested, "The purpose of working out objectives is to facilitate planning, not inhibit it. The clearer you can become about what you're trying to do, the better." He further suggested that it was important to remember that objectives involved educating students; therefore, they were to facilitate student learning, not necessarily ease of teaching.

Perhaps the most important reason for defining objectives was stated by Mager (1962, p. 174), one of the early writers on the topic, when he suggested that "When clearly defined goals are lacking, it is impossible to evaluate a course or program efficiently, and there is no sound basis for selecting appropriate materials, content, or instructional methods."

Gagne and Briggs (1979, p. 118) said that defining objectives met two needs: ". . . the need for communication of the purposes of instruction and the need for evaluation of instruction. Objectives which are precisely defined provide a common technical basis for meeting both of these needs." In order to be clearly and precisely described, objectives must have communicated to another what would have to be observed in order to determine whether a stated purpose had been accomplished. In other words, the objective needed to be operationally defined, and, in addition, because they allowed an evaluator to observe the performance of a student, they were also performance objectives.

Hass (1980) agreed that objectives were important:

> Without having a set of objectives clearly in view, teachers and curriculum planners cannot make sound professional judgments. They cannot use their knowledge of the curriculum bases to make choices of content, materials, or procedures that will further student learning toward intended ends. To choose among curriculum alternatives or instructional strategies, educators must know the goals they are seeking and the bases on which they make their choices. Otherwise, their selections will be little more than random; the decisions cannot be termed professional in the light of today's knowledge or cultural and social forces, human development and learning, and knowledge and cognition (p. 8).

Zais (1976) defined objectives as the immediate specific outcomes of class instruction; they represented short range and visible outcomes. Herman (1977) agreed;

> Learning goals stated in terms of behavior are called behavioral or performance-based. When they are designed as specific goals of instruction, they are most often referred to as objectives rather than goals, however. In essence, behavioral objectives or goals state what it is that the student should be able to do as a result of instruction--how he will behave in

> specific circumstances. They do not specify how or what the student may be thinking or feeling (p. 64).

Not all authors believed that objectives should be defined in behavioral terms. Moffett and Wagner (1976) agreed that objectives were activities specific enough to be assignments, exercises, or test items. However,

> Objectives should express purpose and intention. They are breakdowns, it is true, of main aims, because organizing curriculum requires some kind of breakdowns, but to convert assignments, exercises, and test items into objectives by a wave of the wand, as some educators have done, creates tremendous confusion and disservice. . . . Real aims don't have to be warranted by anything but people's wishes, whereas methods must be validated by experience. Calling exercises objectives allows some interest group's preferred method to become locked into the curriculum on the same footing as true goals for which consensus exists (p. 406).

A currently used and influential classification of educational objectives was developed by Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964). The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives divided objectives into three principle domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. This herarchy of learning levels could be used effectively to construct objectives. Because the teaching of academic subjects was confined mainly to cognitive and affective goals, the psychomotor goals were not considered here.

The cognitive domain had six levels: knowledge was the simple recall of facts or information; comprehension dealt with the ability to grasp the meaning of materials, and it represented the lowest level of understanding; application referred to the use of information and concepts in new situations; analysis was understanding of organization and the structure of material; synthesis assumed the learner could

reassemble the component parts to form a new whole; and evaluation referred to judgmental ability concerning the value of a material.

The affective domain contained five levels: receiving referred to a learner's sensitivity to attend to a certain event; responding was paying active attention or showing interest in a subject; valuing concerned the worth or value a learner attached to an event; organization was arranging the values into an organized system; and characterization occurred when values were integrated into some kind of value system which had controlled the learner's behavior for a certain length of time (Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964).

Maxwell (1973, p. 72) noted that a behavioral objective stated the following: ". . . that, upon completion of a certain set of curriculum materials and activities, a student will be able to do something he could not do before such work." Therefore, a behavioral objective had three parts: a condition, an action, and an evaluation component. The behavioral objective, as a result, was student centered, not teacher centered, since it stated what the student would do, not what the teacher did.

Perhaps the emphasis upon the components of behavioral objectives which required such detailed observation brought forth criticism concerning them. Because of this controversy, a brief review of both pro and con arguments was helpful.

Maxwell (1973) stated that administrators favored behavioral objectives because the public could readily understand them. Too, many department chairmen and teachers found that writing and using objectives that stated clearly the goals to be accomplished proved of value in clarifying each individual's role in the curriculum. Also,

". . . many observers have noted that the advantage of behavioral objectives is their capacity to increase clarity and thereby communicability of curriculum objectives not only among professionals but also to students and the public" (pp. 76-77).

Herman (1977) listed the following reasons in favor of behavioral objectives:

> Clarity - One of the best reasons for using behavioral objectives according to the behaviorists, is the increased clarity they provide and the corresponding advantages that result when teachers and students both know exactly what a teacher is going to teach and what exactly it is that a student is supposed to learn.
>
> Better Teaching - One of the effects of clarifying a teacher's goals is that it should increase the probability that these goals are actually achieved. The reasoning is that when a teacher has specified exactly what goals he is trying to achieve, his course plans will be clarified as well, leading to more effective teaching and to more learning on the part of the students.
>
> Improved Communication - A third argument for using behavioral goals is the claim that they enable teachers to communicate more accurately to other teachers, to other schools, to parents, and to students themselves.
>
> Precise Measurement - Another claim for behavioral goals is that their accomplishments can be measured quite precisely while such concepts as understanding, or learning, or other mental concepts in their untranslated forms cannot. Accurate measurement of learning goals is a great advantage in education since it makes possible to know when and how much progress has been made, or when no progress has been made at all (pp. 79-82).

The following reasons against behavioral objectives were presented by Herman (1977):

> Too Limiting - There is some research that indicates that students given limited and specific goals do better in relation to them than students not given such objectives. . . . Opponents of behavioral goals suggest that spelling things out in terms of goal behaviors encourages teachers to teach and students to learn

> for the test but fails to broaden learning abilities in general.
>
> Lack Flexibility - People who fear that behavioral objectives are too narrow usually fear as well that they lack the flexibility necessary for a changing society. . . . When a society is in flux, when much of what students are taught can be out of date within ten years of graduation, are behavioral goals too rigid?
>
> Not Based on the Real Learning Process - Behavioral objectives are based on the assumption that learning brings about observable changes in behavior. Some educators are disturbed, though, by behavioral goals because learning is not always immediately manifested in observable behavior. Research in latent learning has demonstrated that people can learn all sorts of things that do not show up in behavior until some time later, sometimes even years later.
>
> More Nonsense - Some behaviorists have argued that using behavioral objectives will inevitably reduce the trivia that so often pervades our classroom by exposing it--by making it so patently clear to anyone with a modicum of common sense that what a teacher is pursuing is obviously ridiculous uselessness that it will be dropped from the curriculum. The opponents of behavioral goals suggest that this happy possibility is not what actually occurs. Teachers go blithely on teaching nonsense but because they are using behavioral goals, the nonsense is given an aura of scientific respectability and so is even less apt to be recognized for the ridiculous trivia it is (pp. 83-85).

While the question of behavioral objectives was a debatable one, most educators agreed that objectives of a general nature were a necessary component of the curriculum. Whether they were stated in behavioral or general terms was best decided by the particular school and educational situation.

Content

The selection of content was the next step in the curriculum development process. Zais (1976) suggested that:

> It is the special function of the curriculum of formal education to select and arrange content so that the desired curriculum aims, goals, and objectives are most effectively achieved and so that the most important and desirable knowledge of the race is effectively transmitted (p. 322).

This was a formidable task because many difficult questions were posed.

> What is content? Does all content constitute 'knowledge'? Which content (from the overwhelming store that has been amassed by man over the centuries of recorded history) should be included in the curriculum? What criteria are the most valid ones to use in the selection process?
>
> Are there some things that everyone should know? Some things that only some students need to know?
>
> In what sequence should the selected content be presented? What criteria should be used in determining sequence? (pp. 322-323).

Saylor and Alexander (1966) defined content as the following:

> . . . those facts, observations, data, perceptions, discernments, sensibilities, designs, and solutions drawn from what the minds of men have comprehended from experience and those constructs of the mind that reorganize and rearrange these products of experience into lore, ideas, concepts, generalizations, principles, plans, and solutions (p. 160).

Hyman (1973) divided content into three areas:

> . . . knowledge (i.e., facts, explanations, principles, definitions), skills and processes (i.e., reading, writing, calculating, dancing, critical thinking, decision making, communicating), and values (i.e., the beliefs about matters concerned with good and bad, right and wrong, beautiful and ugly) (p. 324).

Zais (1976) suggested that some authors did not make a distinction between content and knowledge, while others saw a distinct difference.

> For those who make the distinction, content generally is defined as the record of knowledge (symbols, graphics, recorded sounds), independent of its potential for

> interaction with the human organisms; knowledge, on the other hand, is viewed as the increased and deepened meaning that accrues to the individual as a consequence of his transaction with content (pp. 324-325).

Kaplan (1977) defined content as the body of knowledge presented to the student:

> Emphasis is placed on the assimilation of concepts and generalizations within the body of knowledge rather than on the specific facts of the subject. The intra-relationships of information within a content area and the interrelationships between disciplines should be reinforced in the development of the curriculum. The content can be either the means for learning or the end result of a learning experience. As the means for learning, the content becomes the vehicle for the student to acquire and/or develop specific skills. As the end result of learning, the understanding and absorption of content becomes the prime objective for the learning experience (p. 94).

As instructors select content, the basis for selection must be the aims, goals, and objectives written for the particular program. In order to select the best content, Zais (1976) suggested that four commonly accepted standards for selection have been determined. Significance was the determination of how essential or basic the content was to the discipline. Utility dealt with the usefulness of the content in the performance of adult activities. Another area of concern was learners' interests, an area that was often criticized because of the immaturity of the learners. Last was human development, ". . . content [which] centers on inquiry into moral values and ideas, social problems, human emotions, effective thinking processes, controversial issues, etc." (p. 347). These four areas grew out of two broader criteria, however: "(1) effectiveness in fostering present awareness of self in society, and (2) growth toward the increasing exercise of responsible freedom" (p. 239).

Glatthorn (1980) suggested curriculum content should be selected with the following suggestions in mind:

1. The content of the written curriculum should be focused and restricted; the written curriculum should concern itself only with the heart of the subject, the so-called mastery elements.

2. The content should reflect a syncretic orientation, drawing from analyses of the four substantive orientations: the cognitive processes, the social setting, the subject itself, and the student.

3. The content should make an adequate response to such internal requirements as state mandates, standardized tests, and community expectations.

4. The content should be research-based, reflecting our best knowledge about the subject and the student.

5. The content should be comprehensive and articulated: all important skills and concepts should be included in a sequence that makes sense (p. 27).

Macmillan (1982) presented a philosophical approach to content selection:

> It is a small point, perhaps, but nonetheless one worth making: when we teach, we want what we teach to make a difference in the lives of our students. If not this, then the activities (not to say the occupation) of the teacher seem futile--a set of actions which merely spin wheels with no long term significance. In the hubbub of making the decisions that have to be made in determining content, methods, and goals for educational practice, the point is too often overlooked in the discussion of curriculum specialsts and others concerned with teaching. For we can select things to each which do not touch the students ultimately, which leaves them as they were, but only more so (p. 369).

Zais (1976) suggested that the curriculum planner selected content based on what the content meant to him personally; in other words, content was determined by what knowledge was to the planner.

> Thus, awareness that content tends to be selected in terms of its meaning as knowledge for the curriculum planner provides him with an additional critical

> perspective, and consequently, a less distorted and more intelligent basis on which to make his selection (p. 325).

Also, curriculum planners had to be aware that the learner was different in maturity and experience from the adult; therefore, the curriculum had to be chosen with the learner's needs foremost in mind. Dewey (1916) said that content became more than just information when two conditions existed: the content was related to a question of the learner, and it was then assimilated into the learner's direct experience in order to increase and deepen its meaning. To summarize, Zais (1976) suggested that:

> . . . a sound basis for content selection cannot avoid (1) awareness of one's own state of knowledge with respect to the content, and (2) awareness of the potential for knowledge that inheres in the content in terms of the learners and their experience (p. 326).

Macmillan (1982) suggested that there was no single reason for content selection:

> Various types of reasons are at work when we make curricular choices, ranging from the relatively shallow appeal to tradition, through appeals to the nature of the subject taken as a more-or-less structured whole, through a whole range of pedagogical ideas about the appropriateness of a particular item given the nature of the students, the background, and so forth. Finally, of course, there are the economic, social, and political reasons--we choose some subjects because of their value in preparing students for the type of economic and social lives they are likely to lead in the future, from the crassly vocational through the socially decorative. . . . There are other types of reasons that go beyond these, however--reasons that I would call 'educational' because they deal so much with what the individual students become, with what they take and make their own lives to be (pp. 373-374).

Zais (1976) presented a final word on the type of content to be selected: it should be useful to the learner as an educated human being, and it should be readily learnable. Curriculum specialists

generally called the useful ideas, generalizations, concepts, etc. that were useful to the educated human being disciplines; i.e., mathematics, history, language arts, chemistry, etc. Phenix (1964, p. 330) suggested that the discipline was a unit "definite and significant enough to serve as the basis for the organization of knowledge." Agreeing with Phenix was Forshay (1968, p. 331), who suggested that "A discipline is a way of making knowledge. A discipline may be characterized by the phenomena it purports to deal with, its domain; by the rules it used for asserting generalizations as truth; and by its history." For centuries, from Aristotle through Descartes to the present, the relationship between the disciplines had been questioned, and as Zais (1976) suggested:

> The more knowledge we acquire, the clearer the interrelationships between the disciplines become. . . . It seems clear that relationships between disciplines must be a factor to consider as curriculum planners select and organize content (p. 335).

Two elements considered in content selection were scope and sequence. Scope, the breadth and depth of the content, raised the following considerations:

> Should the curriculum include content from both the disciplines and informal sources? What content would all students be required to learn? What content should be included in an elective mode? And what content is outside the providence of the school and should be entirely excluded? (Zais, 1976, p. 338).

American schools divided the curriculum into required or common content and elective or special content. Language arts curriculum as part of the common content, or general education, ". . . tends to suggest the desirability of a shared corpus of content through which

members of a social group come to distinguish themsleves as a community with a common culture" (Zais, 1976, p. 338).

Kaplan (1977) stated that depth of learning was the sequence and logic of learning experiences which were determined by acknowledging the characteristics of the learner, assessing their individual growth patterns, identifying student interest and needs, and recognizing goals and objectives. Depth was characterized by the following: "Comprehensiveness of data to be learned, level of difficulty and complexity of material, learning abstract ideas, and the type of thinking process required" (Kaplan, 1977, p. 105). Breadth, the extension of the curriculum, was determined by the needs of the learner, the needs of society and educational institutions, and principles of learning. Breadth was characterized by the following: "Transfer of learning into other subjects, integration of ideas, concepts, principles; tangential learning opportunities, and application to personal and social development" (Kaplan, 1977, p. 105).

Sequence was the order in which curriculum content was presented. The following questions were considered:

> What criteria should determine the order of succession of the materials of instruction?
>
> What follows what and why?
>
> What is the most desirable time for learners to acquire certain content? (Leonard, as cited in Zais, 1976, p. 340).

Smith, Stanley, and Shores (as cited in Zais, 1976) suggested four principles of sequence: simple to complex, prerequisite learnings, whole to part, and chronology. In addition, Piaget's (as cited in Zais, 1976) four intellectual stages of development were considered:

sensory-motor, pre-operational, concrete operations, and formal operations. Gagne and Briggs (1979) suggested that the basis for correct sequencing was generally based on a common-sense logical ordering in which one wanted to be sure that any prerequisite intellectual skills and verbal information had been presented. However, they also suggested that Bruner's idea of a spiral curriculum was relevant. The spiral curriculum systematically reintroduced content topics at periodic intervals; and as a result, the previously-learned knowledge was reviewed and retained, and the topic was elaborated upon which, in turn, led to broadened understanding and learning transfer.

Learning Activities

Learning activities, the next step in the curriculum development sequence, was closely related to content, and in a functional curriculum, content and learning activities existed as a unity.

> When students engage in studying, learning, constructing, analyzing, feeling, thinking, etc., they must utilize content; i.e., they study something, learn something, think something, and so on. Conversely, students cannot in any way deal with content unless they are engaged in some activity (Zais, 1976, p. 353).

However, separating content and activity was a way of dealing with curriculum design since it was possible for desirable content to be applied with poor learning activities or a trivial or inappropriate content to be taught with highly effective activities. Also, it was important that the criteria for content selection be kept separate from the learning activities criteria (Zais, 1976).

The term "learning activities" did not always exist in educational literature; teachers presented content and students demonstrated their

knowledge by recitations and examinations. However, with advanced knowledge in psychology and the growing importance of John Dewey's philosophy, increased emphasis was placed on learner's activities. While many educational writers used the term "learning experiences" instead of "learning activities," Zais (1976) suggested "activities" best described this component of the curriculum process while learning experiences were considered in the evaluation process.

The importance of learning activities could not be overemphasized.

> Good intentions, fine goals, and objectives, excellent content, flawless evaluation procedures, then, are all for naught if the learning activities in which students engage do not provide them with experience whose consequences are educational (Zais, 1976, p. 350).

For years, learning activities concerned only those areas of reading, listening, and responding to teacher's questions, but an alternative method was the active exploration of ideas, a discussion activity which enabled students to discover personal meaning (Zais, 1976).

As noted previously, the criteria for content selection started with the aims, goals, and objectives; the same was true of learning activities. However, care was taken to avoid the ". . . accepted notion that ends of purposes are termini lying beyond the activity which is directed toward them" (Zais, 1976, p. 356). It was not adequate to select a learning activity because it led to the fulfillment of an objective, and in order to avoid this problem, some writers advocated the selection of activities which led to multiple goals and objective attainment. Zais (1976) suggested that while this was an improvement over single-objective learning activities,

> . . . unless allowances are made for noting the unforeseen plural effects that flow from all learning activities, selection will still be rather narrowly bound

> by the propensity to look only for those consequences (goals) deliberately projected (p. 357).

The obvious advantage of multiple-range objectives was economy, since curriculum planners could consolidate a wide range of learning outcomes into a single activity. Another advantage was the encouragement of varied and broadly conceived learning activities' selections (Zais, 1976).

Potential learning activities were evaluated in terms of the following questions:

> Will the activity move the student closer to an undistorted view of his society and culture?
>
> Will the activity move the student toward a rational-critical posture toward society without alienating him from it?
>
> Will the activity help the student to clarify the conditions of his own existence?
> Will the activity have a tendency to broaden or constrict students' perceptions?
>
> Will the activity help students to develop an openness to experience?
>
> Will the activity enable students to tolerate ambiguity?
>
> Will the activity help students to deal with change? (Zais, 1976, p. 358).

Since learning activities' assessment could not be considered without content consideration, the two were in reality a unity. Perhaps, however, the most important criteria was the students' experience; this experience could be viewed as experience as ability, experience as culture, and experience as interest. The following two sets of data were used in designing ability-appropriate activities: "(1) learners' present experience and (2) the thought-forms and skills needed to move them from their present condition toward desired, more

sophisticated levels" (Zais, 1976, pp. 360-361). The second criteria, experience as culture, dealt with the problem of life experiences of children as opposed to the culture-value dimensions of schools. As Taba (1962) suggested:

> The more heterogeneous or deviate the background or the social learning of the students, the more important it is that there be a variety of bridges between what is now understood, the current concepts and meanings, and that which is to come (p. 283).

The third criteria, experience as interest, was related to learners' experience, but learning activities appealing to interest did not necessarily mean that whims of the learners were in control. "Interests merely reveal one aspect of the learners' present experiential status; they do not tell us the direction he should take in his educational development" (Zais, 1976, p. 363).

Learning activities could be organized either vertically or horizontally:

> The vertical organization refers to the sequencing of learning activities as students progress through the curriculum. . . . The horizontal organization of learning activities refers to the relationship of activities carried on at a particular level of the curiculum (Zais, 1976, p. 366).

Tyler (1950) listed three criteria for the organization of learning activities: continuity, the vertical reiteration of major curriculum elements; sequence, which demanded that not only did an activity reiterate, but that it progressed from the simpler to the complex; and integration, which suggested that activities at any given point in the sequence related in such a way to provide a unified and integrated experience for the learner.

Hoover (1980) suggested that while it was not difficult to formulate performance-based learning experiences for the lower cognitive levels, development at the higher levels was more difficult. Three phases were followed: first, emphasizing the learning of basic concepts, principles, and theories (reading and writing activities which dealt with the knowledge and comprehension levels of Bloom's taxonomy); second, helping students derive meaning and significance to the basic knowledge acquired in the first phase (small-group work and practice dealing with Bloom's application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation levels); and third, taking the student into the realm of individualized performance activities which utilized the basic learning developed in phase two as the student put the concepts into practice (all the higher cognitive levels).

An instructor could undertake many kinds of learning activities. Hoover (1980) discussed small-group techniques, the seminar method, questioning strategies, discussion methods, lecture methods, simulation techniques, and role-playing.

The small group, composed of about five people, gave an opportunity for face-to-face communication between individuals. Procedures utilized included buzz groups (groups of four to six which interacted for 15 to 20 minutes, then reported to the class); small-group clustering (three students who discussed their own creations with the others before an assignment was due); tutorial groups (selected students who mastered a method, then tutored a small group); and brainstorming (a small group accumulated a variety of possible solutions to an immediate problem) (Hoover, 1980).

The seminar method, used primarily in higher education, was becoming more popular at the high school level.

> Basically, the seminar is designed for those courses of experiences where an organized body of content does not exist. Its most basic function is to provide a forum for reflection on, or discussion of, problems. Both problems and essential information are usually identified and pursued by students themselves. Preliminary reading of text materials and other common sources is assumed; sometimes this information is briefly summarized during the seminar. In short, students assume basic responsibility for their own learning (Hoover, 1980, pp. 85-86).

In addition, students chose reading and writing experiences and shared the results with other class members. Some of the seminar techniques included a round table discussion (the seating arrangement discouraged the use of lecture techniques); brainstorming; panel discussions; symposiums (a series of talks given by guest speakers); dialogue (a conversation between two people); a colloquy (experts questioned by a subgroup); and oral reports (Hoover, 1980).

As learning experiences were formulated, questioning strategies needed to be assessed relating to the levels of cognition desired. Questioning procedures guided critical thinking as well as performing centering and expansion functions.

> The centering or focusing function is used to converge student thinking on a particular topic or aspects of a topic. . . . The expansion function is used to extend student thinking to the higher levels of cognition (Hoover, 1980, p. 104).

There were five basic categories of questions: recall questions which had only one correct answer which required the learner to recall information; comprehension questions which required the learner to manipulate information (interpretation, summarization, example, and definition); analysis questions which involved judgments, opinions,

personal reactions, and criticisms based on stated criteria; and problem questions which were open-ended ones which implied a change from the status quo (Hoover, 1980).

Discussion methods were another important type of learning activity. "Class discussion is designed to develop group agreement through talk and reflective thinking. Its purposes are to stimulate analysis, encourage interpretations, and develop or change attitudes" (Hoover, 1980, p. 121). The four types of discussion problems were fact problems which were concerned with discovery and evaluation of factual information; value problems which concerned value judgment; advocacy problems which focused on finding one specific solution; and policy problems which dealt with matters requiring decisions or actions. While people discussed problems with others in casual attitudes, effective classroom discussions needed to be carefully planned and executed (Hoover, 1980). Two types of class discussion were entire group participation and panel discussions.

McKeachie (1978) suggested discussion techniques be used when the instructor wanted to do the following:

1. Use the resources of members of the group.
2. Give students opportunities to formulate application of principles.
3. Get prompt feedback on how well objectives are being obtained.
4. Help students learn to think in terms of the subject matter by giving them practice in thinking.
5. Help students learn to evaluate the logic of, and evidence for, their own and others' positions.
6. Help students become aware of and formulate problems using information to be gained from readings or lectures.

7. Gain acceptance for information or theories counter to folklore or previous beliefs of students.

8. Develop motivation for further learning (pp. 35-36).

In order to have effective discussions, developmental discussion techniques needed to be followed. The four steps included formulating the problem, suggesting hypotheses, getting relevant data, and evaluating alternative solutions. Three methods were suggested for starting effective discussions: starting with a common experience, starting with a question, or starting with a controversy. The instructor needed to be aware of the following barriers to effective discussion: inadequate information, fuzziness and ambiguity, lack of summaries, the instructor's tendency to tell the students the answer, agreement, and instructor criticism which smothered the discussion. Finally, students learned the following skills from discussion: clarification of the group process, development of a willingness to discuss individual ideas and listen and respond to others, planning, building on others' ideas to increase motivation, sensitivity to feelings of others, and evaluation skills (McKeachie, 1978).

In summary, discussion techniques placed the focus on student-centered rather than instructor-centered teaching.

> From the standpoint of theory, student-centered teaching in its more extreme forms might be expected to have some serious weaknesses, at least in achieving lower level cognitive goals. With the instructors' role as information giver reduced, their role as source of feedback virtually eliminated, and their opportunity to provide organization and structure curtailed, it is apparent that a heavy burden falls upon the group members to carry out any of these functions (McKeachie, 1978, p. 52).

However,

> The choice of instructor-centered vs. student-centered

> discussion thus appears to depend upon your goals. The more highly you value outcomes going beyond knowledge acquisition, the more likely you will prefer student-centered methods (McKeachie, 1978, p. 63).

Another method of presenting material is the lecture method. Two types of lecture included the formal or extended lecture, lasting an entire class session, and the informal lecture or lecturette, a short presentation to inform or clarify points. Hoover (1980) suggested six instances when lectures were preferred:

1. When the needed background information is not readily accessible to students.
2. When the facts or problems are conflicting or confusing in nature.
3. When the unique experiences of an individual will substantially contribute to clarification of issues.
4. When time is of the essence and the sources of data are widely scattered.
5. When a change of pace is needed. Many oral reports and demonstrations fall into this category.
6. When the best way to understand a topic is through oral presentation. Movies and demonstrations, for example, are often informative. Sometimes viewing material is the best way to understand it (p. 176).

In order to make the lecture most effective, various visual aids such as the chalkboard, pictures, transparencies, diagrams, etc., were effective.

Another effective learning activity was simulation techniques.

> Simulations . . . are learning exercises that place students in roles similar to real world roles and, in playing the game, require them to make decisions as if they were part of those real world situations. [Simulations] are fun and students enter eagerly into the world of not-so-make believe. Within the classroom this imitation of reality can teach important things about the real world, because we all learn from our experiences (Heyman, as cited in Hoover, 1980, p. 225).

McKeachie (1978, p. 147) suggested the chief advantage of games and simulations was that students became actively involved instead of just being passive observers: "Students must make decisions, solve problems, and react to the results of their decisions."

Three techniques used in simulations were role playing, sociodrama, and simulation games:

> Role playing provides practice in how to behave in selected situations. . . . Sociodrama involved acting out a situation in order to find a solution to the problem it poses. . . . A simulation game is an artificial, condensed representation of reality (Hoover, 1980, p. 226).

As instructors planned learning activities, encouraging creativity needed to always be a consideration. At least two distinctive ways of thinking were identified: convergent thinking which

> . . . emphasizes reproduction of existing data and adaptation of old responses to new situations in a more or less logical manner, [and divergent thinking which is] characterized by flexibility and originality in the production of new ideas (Hoover, 1980, p. 252).

Divergent thinkers or creative individuals possessed the following basic attributes: originality (the ability to produce ideas, solve problems, or use things in an unusual manner); persistence (devotion of long hours to a task); independence (those who look for the unusual and unexpected); involvement and detachment (becoming immersed in a problem, yet able to detach themselves to see the problem in a total perspective); deferment and immediacy (able to defer judgment); incubation (putting aside a problem to let the unconscious mind take over); illumination (a sudden flash of insight), and verification (verifying solutions through conventional objective procedures) (Hoover, 1980).

While creativity was an individualized process, the instructor needed to guide students into creativity by searching for as many alternatives as possible in the group process. Individualized assignments could provide many alternatives. Students needed to discover both problems and solutions with active seeking of original ideas while the class environment both accepted and reinforced new ideas. The instructor let the student seek out information instead of presenting fact or theory. Students were encouraged to develop self-direction. These various individual techniques, along with effective group techniques, encouraged creativity in the classroom (Hoover, 1980).

Callahan (1978) suggested the following considerations concerning the teacher's encouragement of creative production by the student:

1. Provide a nonthreatening atmosphere.
2. Refrain from becoming the judge of the worth of all products in the classroom.
3. Model creative thinking and/or introduce other individuals who are able to illustrate the creative thinking process to the students.
4. Attempt to integrate activities and questions that encourage divergent production and evaluation into as many content areas as possible.
5. Make a conscious effort to remind students to be creative, to be original, to try to think of new ways to solve a problem, etc.
6. Systematically reward novel production.
7. Provide stimuli for as many of the senses as possible.
8. Make use of warm-up activities when moving from highly structured convergent or memory type activities into activities requiring students to engage in creative production.

9. Incorporate activities into the class instruction that require students to generate a large number of correct responses.

10. Instruct students in the principles of brainstorming, but incorporate strategies for self-evaluation of the quality of ideas.

11. Be a participant in the actions.

12. Encourage students to express positive self statements about their creativity and avoid negative self evaluations.

13. Attempts to incorporate published material into the curriculum are dependent on the understanding and commitment of the teachers who are using the curriculum.

14. Whichever strategies are adopted for classroom use must be evaluated within the particular classroom with your particular students and teaching style (pp. 71-72).

The final consideration in planning learning activities was the knowledge of learning theories. As Zais (1976, p. 244) suggested, "Clearly, a sound and effective curriculum depends heavily on a well-founded theory of learning . . . ." While much research into the nature of learning had been conducted, conflicting theories of learning emerged, leaving curriculum workers

> . . . faced with the necessity of identifying, understanding, and assessing the various theories of learning generated by research and psychologists, and selecting from these components that best serve our curricular purposes (Zais, 1978, p. 245).

While no universally accepted definition of learning existed, Zais (1976) presented three well-known ones. Hilgard, Marquis, and Kimble (as cited in Zais, 1976, p. 246) defined learning as "A relatively permanent change in response potentiality which occurs as a result of reinforced practice." Gagne (as cited in Zais, 1976, p. 246) stated that "Learning is a change in human disposition or

capability, which can be retained, and which is not simply ascribed to the process of growth." Hilgard and Bower (as cited in Zais, 1976) defined learning as:

> . . . the process by which an activity originated or is changed through reacting to an encountered situation, provided that the characteristics of this change in activity cannot be explained on the basis of native response tendencies, maturation, or temporary states of the organism (p. 247).

Hass (1980) suggested that understanding how learning occurred was of central importance for planning the curriculum, and especially the learning activities. Four major families of learning theory prevailed. "Understanding of each of the four families is important for the curriculum planner and teacher, because each group defines the curriculum differently, and each leads to or supports different teaching practices" (Hass, 1980, p. 145). The four theories were stimulus-response conditioning, the field theories, Freudian theory, and social learning theory.

> Teaching and curriculum practices may include ideas from each of these families of theories because of the needs of different learners, because there are different kinds of learning, or because there are different kinds of knowledge to be learned (p. 145).

Stimulus-response (S-R) association viewed learning as a conditioning process by which a person acquired a new response. Thinking both began and ended outside the individual learner, and learning was viewed as a rewarded response. Transfer, the ability to perform a general act as the direct consequence of having performed a related act, was a major part of the theory. S-R theorists felt that teaching should emphasize particular elements of the learning tasks (Hass, 1980).

The field theory of learning, also called the Gestalt-field, cognitive field, perceptual field, was concerned with the idea of wholeness. Learning began with the total aspects of a situation, then moved to particulars. In other words, the whole was greater than the sum of its parts. Generalizations, principles, and organization in learning were as important as the significance of self-concept and personal meaning. The individual acted, originated, and thought, providing the source of learning (Hass, 1980).

The works and ideas of Sigmund Freud provided the basis of the third family of learning theories. Awareness (freedom or self-understanding), identification, and imitation were the basic units of learning. Another important premise was self-knowledge with the idea that when students became aware of their own thoughts and feelings, effective learning would take place (Hass, 1980).

The fourth family of learning theories was developed by sociologists, anthropologists, and social psychologists. Human beings had an unlimited capacity to learn; however, this capacity was limited and/or confined by social expectations and behavior patterns expected by the immediate social environment. The learning process was primarily social, and the basic unit of learning was the dyadic relationship which occurred between two people. However, in describing the learning process, social learning theorists used the basic unit of learning referred to in the other families such as rewarded responses, transfer, self-concept, etc. (Hass, 1980).

A combination of concepts from each of three learning theories was used in curriculum planning and teaching. The following were included:

1. Identification. Children learn by and through identification with others, including their parents, peers, and teachers. Thus, it is important that they have good models.

2. Discovery. Obtaining knowledge for oneself by the use of one's own mind frequently has advantages for motivation, organization or what is learned, retention, and meaningfulness.

3. Empathy. Openness, trust, and security in human relationships free intelligence and enable boys and girls, and teachers as well, to learn more and to be successful in activities in which they are jointly engaged.

4. Culture potential. Anthropological studies have emphasized that different societies and cultures cultivate different qualities and capacities. Learning experiences that build on the cultural capacities of individuals and groups are particularly successful.

5. Knowledge about learners. Research has shown that students learn more when teachers know them as individuals.

6. Methods of increasing transfer. When the teacher points out the possibility of transfer and develops and applies generalizations with the learner, transfer is more likely to occur.

7. Zeal for learning and knowledge. Students learn to like learning from teachers who love knowledge, from communities that provide resource for learning, and from a home environment that supports the search for knowledge by example and by providing materials (Hass, 1980, p. 148).

Of course, it was difficult if not impossible to suggest what particular learning theory to follow in curriculum planning or in the development of learning activities. Zais (1976) suggested that an individual's philsophical assumptions about the nature of reality and/or man determine his choice of theories. Too, some principles of learning applied in all situations, while others applied only in specific circumstances; therefore, curriulum planners should be eclectic in their choice of learning theories. Hilgard and Gower (1966)

developed a list of learning principles that were widely accepted by all schools of learning theory. "These generalizations provide the curriculum worker with a body of information about learning that he can be reasonably sure is sound and which he can use as a basis for curriculum planning" (Zais, 1976, p. 291). Hilgard and Bower's (as cited in Zais, 1976) commonly accpeted principles of learning included the following:

1. The learner should be active, rather than a passive listener or viewer.

2. Frequency of repetition is important in acquiring a skill such as typing, playing the piano, or speaking a foreign language.

3. Repetition should take place under conditions in which correct responses are rewarded (reinforcement).

4. Motivational conditions are important for learning.

5. Conflicts and frustrations in learning situations must be recognized and provision must be made for their resolution or accommodation.

6. Learning problems should be presented in a way that their structure is clear to the learner.

7. The organization of content is an important factor in learning and is an essential concern of the curriculum planner.

8. Learning with understanding is more permanent and more transferable than rote learning.

9. Goal setting by the learner is important as motivation for learning.

10. The learner's abilities are important, and provisions should be made for differential abilities.

11. The learner should be understood in terms of the influences that have shaped his development.

12. The anxiety level of the individual learner is a factor affective learning. With some kinds of tasks, high-anxiety learners perform better if not reminded

> of how well or poorly they are doing, while low-anxiety learners do better when interrupted with comments on their progress.
>
> 13. The organization of motives within the individual is a factor that influences learning.
>
> 14. The group atmosphere of learning (competition versus cooperation, authoritarianism versus democracy, etc.), will affect satisfaction in learning as well as the products of learning (pp. 291-292).

Evaluation

The final component of the curriculum development process was evaluation, or as Zais (1976, p. 369) suggested: ". . . the most narrowly viewed aspect of the educational enterprise." Most curriculum books discussed evaluation in terms of student achievement in connection with assigning "grades" or "marks." This type of evaluation process was called "product evaluation." While there was another type of evaluation--the comprehensive curriculum evaluation--the product evaluation was of concern in this particular view of the curriculum, since evaluation techniques used to evaluate the attainment of specific curriculum objectives were the focus.

Before discussing specific evaluation techniques, the difference between measurement and evaluation were distinguished.

> Measurement data are basically descriptive in nature and usually are expressed in numerical terms in order to avoid the value connotations that are connected with words. . . . Evaluation, in contrast to measurement, constitutes a value judgment. . . . [W]hile 'measurement' and 'evaluation' are distinct in meaning, they are decidedly related terms. Measurement comprises a substantial part of the more inclusive part of evaluation (Zais, 1976, p. 370).

Hoover (1980) also stressed the difference between measurement and evaluation, and he suggested that teachers use a variety of

measuring instruments to evaluate a student's progress. Tests provided reliable data for some purposes, while observation in other areas provided reliable results.

> Through measurement, a quantitative amount of some experience is assembled, as in the case of test scores. Evaluation, on the other hand, attempts to assess the value of the quantity to be measured. Measurement in and of itself is meaningless; it can no do more than facilitate the ends of evaluation (Hoover, 1980, p. 287).

Obviously, written tests provided the most common type of measure for product evaluation. However, these tests, groups of questions, or tasks which learners responded to, were not the only measurement technique. Other tools included teachers' responses on checklists and rating scales relating to achievement.

> Tests constitute a particular kind of measurement that can provide useful data for curriculum and learner evaluation, but when they are overemphasized, they can distort curriculum evaluation and even unintentionally influence curriculum goals and outcomes (Zais, 1976, p. 371).

Zais (1976) suggested four standards for product evaluation: the absolute maximum standard was an arbitrarily set level of achievement which all students were evaluated against; the absolute minimum standard was usually set low enough to ensure success for virtually all students, and those who did not achieve mastery were retaught until mastery was achieved; the relative standard judged each student against the relative performance of the group (the normal curve), and was highly competitive; and the multiple standard dealt with the individual growth of each student from the beginning of instruction to the evaluation point. While each of the four standards had its positive and negative points, there was no easy answer concerning which one was the best procedure.

> While the absolute maximum standard is probably not defensible in any situation, conditions usually call for some combination of the other three. Evaluations which utilize a variety of standards tend to reflect most accurately the multidimensional richness of human learning (Zais, 1976, p. 376).

There was a real difference between grading and evaluation.

> Grading . . . is a kind of shorthand system for recording and reporting the evaluation of individual student achievement. Grading is convenient to the degree that mass education involves keeping achievement records and periodically communicating educational progress for large numbers of students (Zais, 1976, p. 377).

However, product evaluation was much more complex.

> An effective evaluation that would constitute a comprehensive representation of a student's educational progress would include, among other factors, measurement and other relevant data; an analysis of the student's interests, capabilities, and achievement; and conclusions based explicitly on appropriate combinations of minimum, relative, and multiple standards (Zais, 1976, p. 377).

While grading did not necessarily constitute an evaluation, it did influence curriculum outcomes. The traditional "ABCDF" system had been called punitive and discouraging, so new methods were suggested. One was the ABC no-entry system which simply did not count work not satisfactorily completed. Another method was the pass-fail system which reduced the five-point system to a two-point one. However, anxiety was still produced while superior work was not rewarded. Some reformers called for abolishing grades.

> But recent calls by school reformers to abolish grades have not seemed to take into account the distinction between grading and evaluation. . . . To abolish evaluation would be unthinkable, if not impossible. Even if we could operate without making judgments about the value of what we were doing in curriculum, it is doubtful that intelligence would permit such a course. With respect to our present systems of grading, however, abolition might be a real possibility. The reason is that the systems not only fail to communicate student

> evaluations reasonably clearly, but their side effects are punitive, threatening, discouraging, and in a gen-sense, antithetical to much of what we are trying to achieve in education (Zais, 1976, p. 377).

Hoover (1980) stated that measurement and evaluation techniques were the weakest aspect of the instructional process. Pointing to the general poor quality of many teacher-made tests and the frequent arbitrary use of grades, he too mentioned that many instructors called for the abolition of grades and tests. However, when measurement and evaluation techniques were not of poor quality, they were indispensable. "When instruction is based on basic concepts and predicted behavioral outcomes, measure and evaluation become an integral part of the instructional process" (Hoover, 1980, p. 277).

As was pointed out, the learning objectives based on the aims and goals of the curriculum set the focus for all instructional and evaluational activities. Therefore, evaluation had to be based on the learning objectives. As evaluation measures were devised, the cognition levels anticipated were taken into account, and the result was hopefully a valid test, one which measured what it was designed to measure. The test also had to be reliable; the items were trustworthy or consistent. Another consideration was the objectivity of test items; each item had to be clearly stated. Also to be taken into account was the difficulty range; this was based upon whether the test was criterion-referenced (student achievement was assessed in terms of individual behavior or performance), or norm-referenced (achievement was evaluated in terms of an individual's position in relation to other class members). Time limitations of a test needed to be formulated since two types of tests could be given with respect to time:

power tests which provided students ample time to respond to the items and speed tests which limited the time involved (Hoover, 1980).

There were basically four types of tests. The pretest was used to measure the learner's readiness for the material to be learned. Tests designed to improve learning and given at intervals during a unit were called formative tests. Diagnostic tests measured learning while attempting to discover common student errors. Tests given at the end of a unit, summative tests, were usually given for the purpose of assigning a grade (Hoover, 1980).

Herman (1977, p. 143) defined summative and formative evaluation slightly differently than Hoover: "Evaluation used to describe learning is called summative; evaluation used to increase or guide learning is called formative." Summative evaluation took place after instruction was completed in order to test and summarize overall learning achievement, replacing the traditional norm-referenced tests. "Its purpose is to assess the total summary of the student's learning achievements in relation to a substantial unit of work in the curriculum" (Herman, 1977, pp. 143-144). Formative evaluation provided feedback but was not used as a test. "Its primary purpose is to guide instruction by providing relevant information to identify special learning needs, abilities, or difficulties of the students, or instructional flaws in the teacher's lessons" (Herman, 1977, p. 144). Because formative evaluation consisted of frequent practice quizzes or questions to check progress but not to affect a grade, it hopefully was not anxiety-ridden.

Herman (1977) suggested that whether teachers wanted to or not, few could avoid giving tests to evaluate their students' learning.

> They are asked to give grades, make out report cards, suggest remediation, promote, pass, fail, encourage, admonish, provide feedback, and even occasionally improve their own instruction. All these activities are--or should be--guided by test results (p. 138).

A redirection from ranking students' achievements in relation to each other to using testing as a teaching tool was the most important reason for testing, since feedback and evaluation were an important part of the learning process. Therefore, criterion-referenced tests were preferable to norm-referenced measures.

Norm-referenced tests, as mentioned previously, compared the individual to the group. Based on the assumption that a normal curve represented different learning aptitudes of individuals, tests based on the normal curve reflected this distribution of smart, average, and below average learners. While these tests had their place when information about student achievement relative to the group was necessary in order to select students for placements, scholarships, or training opportunities, they did not belong in a regular classroom, according to Herman (1977). While they stressed group-pacing rather than self-pacing, they were also designed to spur competition and motivation. However, the tests did not tell what the student had learned, just how fast or how well he learned something. This type of test had a built-in failure ingredient because it dictated that in every group a certain number of students must be at the bottom. Students often became so motivated to get a good grade that very little real learning occurred. In conclusion:

> The purpose of norm-referenced grading is to enable students, teachers, parents, and employers to identify individual capabilities and relative achievements. It is meant to help the student make realistic decisions about what he can do, and help educators and employers

> select those individuals who are most capable for further education and highly-skilled jobs (Herman, 1977, p. 142).

However, the schools needed to shift their responsibility to teaching all of their students, and to do this, criterion-referenced grading was employed.

Criterion-referenced evaluation compared the individual not against the group, but against some fixed standard or criterion of mastery; therefore, it reflected the extent to which the student achieved the instructional goal. The focus was on each student achieving the goals, given enough time, and it did not require that any students be placed on the bottom. Criterion-referenced testing

> . . . is based on the assumption that learning goals can be specified and tested in terms of prespecified behavior, and that, given sufficient time, with practice and reinforcement, almost every student can achieve all the learning objectives the teacher has set up. As such, it is based on instruction which to some extent at least is individualized and self-paced, and it is based on a skewed learning curve (Herman, 1977, p. 142).

Proponents of criterion-referenced evaluation believed that it eliminated failure without eliminating or reducing learning ability. The following attributes were listed for criterion-referenced evaluation:

> -- . . . it is a much more constructive approach than the built-in failure of norm-referenced grading.
>
> -- . . . it encourages learning more effectively by giving positive feedback to every learner whatever his learning pace.
>
> -- Instead of encouraging students to compete with each other for a limited number of grades, evaluation for mastery changes the emphasis so that students can help each other without fear of jeopardizing their own good grade.

> -- . . . criterion-referenced grading will clarify the communication to the student himself and to others about what a students has learned, instead of simply communicating where the student stands relative to his group (Herman, 1977, pp. 144-145).

Herman (1977) suggested that certain questions needed to be considered when deciding which type of grading system to use. "Will everyone benefit?" It was possible that some students operated better under one type while others operated better under the other type. "Is competition necessary?" Some suggested that because in criterion-referenced grading there was no standard for excellence, standards would be reduced, and the most gifted individuals would not be challenged. However, proponents suggested that those gifted students who reach goals quickly would be challenged to set even higher goals. "When do we need information about the norm?" There were instances when this information was needed. For example, criterion levels for mastery evaluation were derived from information about what the average student could learn. Some schools and universities needed this information as well as students who were making career choices. It was up to the individual school system and instructors to answer these questions, but they needed to be addressed.

As mentioned earlier, there were many different types of tests which could be given. Hoover (1980) suggested a systematic plan to follow when making test items. The learning objectives were first redefined as terminal behaviors and modified based on the actual instructional experience. Then, using Bloom's taxonomy as a frame of reference, the unit goals were listed from simple to complex. The next step was to develop a table which related the behavioral outcomes to the basic concepts of the unit. Then the instructor selected the

type of test item to be employed in relation to goal achievement. Different test items could be broadly related to the six levels of Bloom's taxonomy. If this procedure was followed, a valid and reliable test was the result.

According to McKeachie (1978) there were two time-consuming parts of testing: constructing and grading the examination.

> Unfortunately, it appears to be generally true that the examinations that are easiest to contruct are the most difficult to grade and vice versa. Essay examinations that can be made up in a few minutes require hours to grade. Multiple-choice examinations, which can be constructed by an experienced item builder at the rate of 3-5 items an hour, can be corrected at the rate of about 20-30 seconds for a 60-item test. Short-answer examinations fall somewhere between these two extremes (p. 155).

While the time element was an important consideration as well as the number of students, the educational goals were the final consideration in the selection of test items and types. The following were the most-used test types: short-answer, essay, true-false, multiple-choice, fill-in or completion, and matching.

Short-answer items usually aimed at informational outcomes and the recall of a specific fact. Students usually perceived these items as fair ones which permitted adequate coverage of assigned materials. In order to overcome the tendency to deal with informational outcomes, the short-answer question could ask students to solve a problem or propose a hypothesis related to information learned (McKeachie, 1978).

The essay question,

> . . . unlike other test item types, . . . may elicit a detailed written response, involving the making of complex relationships, the selection and organization of ideas, the formulation of hypotheses, the logical development of arguments, and creative expression (Hoover, 1980, p. 195).

Herman (1977) expanded the definition.

> In an essay test, the student is asked to discuss a topic, problem question, or area of inquiry determined by the teacher. He is expected to use his own words, and develop his position logically, coherently, in a well-organized and comprehensive manner. The essay may be relatively long, or quite short. It may be written in class or taken home to be worked on for a day, a week, a semester, or even a year or more. The teacher may make general demands indicating only the general area in which the student should address himself or may make quite specific and structured demands (p. 150).

In addition, since essay exams were the least prestructured of all standard exams, the student had to be able to independently organize the material. Essay exams enabled instructors to assess complex learning development while at the same time provided highly motivating and rewarding learning experiences (Herman, 1977). While these exams took relatively little time to write, students studied for them in a more effective manner than for objective tests (McKeachie, 1978). Furthermore, the educational values were important. While Herman (1977) suggested that essay tests were most appropriate when the higher levels of learning such as synthesis or evaluation were being tested, McKeachie (1978) stressed the overall educational value.

> Particularly where the tests can be returned with comments, essay examinations may give students practice in organized, creative thinking about a subject and an opportunity to check their thinking against the standards of someone with more experience and ability in the field. Moreover, they may . . . orient students to work toward objectives beyond memorization of details (p. 156).

However, there were problems with the essay test as a valid and/or reliable measure. "The essay item is particularly vulnerable to unreliability, especially in terms of how it is scored. To some extent, a student's mark is dependent on the reader rather than on the

actual quality of a response" (Hoover, 1980, p. 295). Herman (1977) mentioned additional problems: they were time-consuming; extraneous factors such as student's names, handwriting, grammar, and spelling sometimes influenced out of proportion; research indicated that teachers would often give the same essay graded on a different day a different grade; students learned to write around material they did not know; and it was difficult to set norms for determining what a well-written essay test was.

The problems associated with essay testing could be eliminated. Hoover (1980) suggested that the essay item could be more reliable if it elicited an application of learnings to new or different situations. Also, giving directions concerning the structure of the answer would improve test reliability. Finally,

> In evaluating the essay item, the teacher must be open to divergent thinking, unanticipated insights and thought patterns that are appropriate to the questions but do not match the answers developed on the scoring key. Due credit must be allowed for such divergent responses (p. 295).

Herman (1977) also had several suggestions for improving essay test grading:

> First, this is one kind of test where length does not usually lead to better grading but to worse, and so, especially in the beginning when you are just learning to grade essay questions, you should probably concentrate on asking very short essays. Secondly, concentrate on asking relatively highly structured questions that have clear and specific answers. . . . Third, delineate specific criteria for students' answers before you start grading. Make a list of points which must be included in a good answer and how much each point is worth. Decide whether you will deduct points for inaccurate information, and how much extra credit points may be gained for inclusion of relevant material which you have not listed as absolutely essential. . . . Fourth, have your students put their names on the back of their answers where you can keep them

> firmly and permanently out of your sight until all the grading is complete. Fifth, if you give more than one question for each student to answer, grade all of the answers to each question at one time. Sixth, if the grades to the essays are important, or if you are unsure of your grading procedures, check your grading by setting the papers aside for a sufficient length of time to forget the grades you have already assigned. This may be for more than an hour or two. Then regrade a random selection of the questions without looking at your original grade and see how well your two different grades match. If there is a wide divergency in the grades, you need to develop more specific guidelines, and perhaps in the future, to concentrate on asking shorter and more structured questions (pp. 151-152).

On true-false tests which were simple to write and score, students were expected to evaluate the accuracy of statements, but these tests had serious limitations. Herman (1977) listed two major problems: first, it was difficult to write true-false statements that were not subject to misinterpretation; and students had a 50 percent chance of getting an answer right just by guessing. Another problem was the tendency to emphasize isolated facts of slight validity in relation to course objectives. In addition, the brighter student was often penalized because he or she was more likely to think of an exception which could alter the entire meaning. Furthermore, test writers often made more items true than false, and used specific determiners and textbook language (Hoover, 1980).

True-false items could be improved to serve a useful function. Herman (1977) suggested two possibilities: requiring a student to write a statement explaining his evaluation and asking students to state why they thought the statement was true or false. Hoover (1980) suggested that even while emphasizing broad concepts and alternatives, it was also important at times to test for specific data; and the true-false test was useful since the student applied a minor concept

or generalization. Another improvement was to have the student correct all incorrect items. However, "Students can usually figure out reasons why any particular item can be either true or false. Because of this, the true-false test tends to enhance the frustration which is inherent in the test-making situation anyway" (McKeachie, 1978, p. 157).

Another type of test was the multiple choice test in which the student completed a partial statement from several possible answers. Herman (1977, p. 154) stated that "Multiple choice tests are currently the best method of compromise most often used by examiners in need of a test that can be scored objectively and that also tests subtleties of learning." Hoover (1980) pointed out that multiple-choice items were related to the problem-solving situation:

> Experience over many years has convinced test developers of the generally superior versatility and convenience of multiple-choice items. Although other forms can be used effectively in special situations, the multiple-choice is more widely applicable and generally effective (p. 293).

In addition,

> When they are well-constructed, multiple-choice tests can be used to test a student's ability to solve problems, perceive logical relationships, apply a principle, evaluate an argument, or analyze ideas better than any other kind of objective test. . . . It is a popular form of test because they can be scored quickly and fairly, and at the same time can be used to test all levels of learning suggested by . . . Bloom's taxonomy (Herman, 1977, p. 155).

One problem of multiple-choice items was that they were difficult to write. In general, the possible answers would include the preferred answer; another one, a distractor, which was almost the correct answer; and another which was clearly incorrect. Other answers fell

between the two extremes (Hoover, 1980). Herman (1977) suggested the following guidelines to writing good multiple-choice questions: the stem, whether in the form of an incomplete sentence or question, should state as much of a meaningful problem as possible; all the possible answers should be about the same length, agree gramatically with the stem, and sound somewhat plausible; the correct answer should not consistently be put in either the first or second place; the foils should be checked to make sure there is only one correct answer; and the problem in the stem should not be stated negatively.

McKeachie (1978) presented several suggestions for constructing multiple-choice items:

1. Teacher's manuals that are provided for many textbooks contain multiple-choice items. You will not be able to rely on a manual as the source of all of your questions, because it will not often contain enough good questions of this sort.

2. A second source of such items is the students themselves. This is not a particularly satisfactory source of test questions because only about 10 percent of the items thus received will be usable.

3. Item analysis may be useful in improving the questions, but I have found that the best suggestions for improvement came from students themselves in their discussion of the test.

4. If you have a problem, but no good distractor, give the item in short-answer or essay form and use the students' own responses for alternatives for a later use of the item in multiple-choice form.

5. Multiple-choice questions typically have four or five alternatives.

6. For measuring understanding, I like questions that require the student to predict the outcome of the situation rather than those that simply ask the student to label the phenomenon (p. 158).

There were several reasons why students made inappropriate selections on multiple-choice tests: they misunderstood the base item or distractors; they interpreted the question in a unique way, or they did not possess a proper understanding of the concepts (Hoover, 1980).

Another type of exam was the fill-in or completion exam in which the missing word or words were supplied in paragraphs or sentences:

> Depending on the length of the answer required, fill-in exams resemble full-fledged essay exams or bona-fide objective exams. When an entire paragraph must be written to answer the question, the completion test approaches the essay exam with its relative advantages and disadvantages. When the answer to be filled in is not more than a word or two, the completion exam closely resembles the other objective tests (Herman, 1977, p. 152).

Hoover (1980) suggested the completion test had been overemphasized:

> Like the true-false item, its answer is easy to defend merely by referring the student to a particular page in the textbook. As a consequence, specific details and, all too often, meaningless verbalisms are emphasized. The objectives of the course often are forgotten when tests are being constructed. The inevitable result is a tendency to gear the entire instructional process to memorizations. Students, realizing they will be tested in such a manner, tend to study only specific details and terminology and often cram for tests (p. 297).

The short-answer or fill-in exam was easier to score than the fully-developed essay. As in the essay exam, the student produced an answer, not just recognized it. However, the major problem was trying to construct items which tested complex learning rather than memorization. To improve this area, the items needed to be written so that there was a single correct answer and a minimum of blanks with few unnecessary hints (Herman, 1977).

The final test type, the matching item, asked students to pair items in two columns with each other. While easy to compose and score, these tests seldom measured much more than memorization and seldom tested the more advanced kinds of learning (Herman, 1977).

Two other methods of evaluation techniques were rating scales and checklists. Rating scales evaluated situations or characteristics that were present in varying degrees. Because a scale was a graduated measurement, it worked best when judging behavior or products. Because of their subjective nature, they generally supplemented evaluations of other types or were used when more objective instruments were not available. A checklist's chief function was to call attention to the items rather than to evaluate the dimensions.

> It is often used when some standardized sequence of operation is involved, such as in a laboratory experiment. Sometimes, it is used to note certain characteristics, such as the qualities of some finished product, or to record the completion points of some class project. . . . (Hoover, 1980, p. 298).

No matter what kind of test was given, "To provide information that is worth anything, that is something more than an arbitrary justification for a grade . . . tests--all tests . . . must be fair, and to be fair, they must be both reliable and valid" (Herman, 1977, p. 159). Reliable tests gave consistent results, while valid examinations tested what they were supposed to be testing. Because there were limitations to the reliability and validity of teacher-constructed tests, there were several steps which could be taken to insure some measure of both elements:

Step 1: Plan frequent formative tests.

Step 2: Build a table of specifications. A specifications table is based on your behavioral goals

> and task analysis, and states 1) the content of learning to be evaluated, 2) the level at which it is being evaluated, and 3) the percent that each unit contributes to the final learning evaluation.
>
> Step 3: Design your test. . . . Since the kinds of information provided by different kinds of tests--essay, take home, various objective exams, term papers--complement each other, it is a good idea to mix the kinds of tests you use as well as to use different kinds of items in a single test. Once you select the kinds of tests you are going to use and are actually designing the items themselves, the following rules will help you construct items that are valid, reliable, and provide you with the kind of feedback that is most helpful toward guiding the learning of your students. Focus on essentials. Use fresh examples. Construct at least two items for each unit in your task analysis. Clarify ambiguous items.
>
> Step 4: Cue your students.
>
> Step 5: Administer the test. The conditions under which you administer the test will depend on the kind of test you have selected, on the number and ages of your students, on facilities and time you have available, on the subject matter being tested, and on the particular needs of your students.
>
> Step 6: Score and analyze the test. After the test is scored, you are ready to proceed with an item analysis [in order to identify unreliable or invalid test items, identify areas of poor instruction, and analyze student learning].
>
> Step 7: Assign grades (Herman, 1977, pp. 163-169).

Since tests could and should be used as learning devices, each test given, with the exception of a final exam, should be graded and discussed with students as soon as possible, with students having copies of the test as well as their answers. Another suggestion was to break the students into small groups of five to eight for discussion of the test. Unresolved questions were referred to the instructor

after the group discussed them, and this method helped aggressive student attitudes (McKeachie, 1978). Hoover (1980) suggested that rather than an item by item review of a test, analysis of general areas of difficulty was better.

McKeachie (1978) listed several devices for reducing student aggression concerning tests. To reduce the frustration of taking tests, the students' long-range goals in relation to the course were emphasized. Therefore, the first step in test construction was to list the course goals, remembering that not all could be measured by a test. While some students were interested in examinations emphasizing fact recall, the students learned that tests measuring thinking abilities would be of the most use. Students could be asked to contribute items for a future test, making sure that they related to course objectives. "Admittedly it is more difficult to devise measures of the more complex, higher level objectives. Yet the very effort to do so will . . . have an influence on student motivation and learning" (McKeachie, 1978, p. 152).

Obviously, evaluation was an important part of the curriculum process, but an extremely difficult one. Hoover (1980) listed several reasons for evaluation:

> Evaluation is a valuable communication link between teacher and student as well as between teacher and parent. It may be the only major communication link between parent and teacher. Evaluation enables learners to ascertain how well they compare with the rest of the class. Although evaluation can precipitate numerous psychological traumas, most individuals need such information in coping with the realities of the school environment. The best form of evaluation enables learners to assess progress and to improve their record. Evaluation can be systematized to include both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced measures. Evaluation of students may necessitate teachers' examining

> their own teaching efforts in an effort to create a better learning situation (p. 327).

In addition, he mentioned several limitations of, and problems with evaluation:

> Evaluation at best is somewhat subjective. Unfortunately, evaluative judgments, reflected in marks and letter grades, have an important bearing on the learner's future.
>
> Norm-referenced evaluation may be self-defeating to poor students if assessment is made solely on the basis of class performance.
>
> Criterion-referenced evaluation is still rather arbitrary in many respects. How well criteria have been achieved ulitmately rests with the evaluator. A poor student may interpret inadequate achievement as indicative of personal inadequacy.
>
> In classes where norm-referenced evaluation predominates, able students may not be sufficiently challenged to do their best work.
>
> Evaluation, to a marked degree, depends on the values of the teacher involved. Thus, grades in different classes are not fully comparable. This may create considerable misunderstanding between student and teacher (p. 328).

In conclusion, the instructor had to approach student evaluation with the objectives of the curriculum fully in mind, as well as the needs of the students, if effective evaluation was to occur.

Curriculum for the Gifted

Goals and Objectives

The basic curriculum development processes outlined provided the basis for a curriculum design for the gifted but with various adaptations and additions. However, before an in-depth view of these

special areas was undertaken, the goals for a gifted program were assessed.

Kaplan (1977) suggested that both goals and objectives for a gifted program should be based on the following philosophical considerations:

> The goals and objectives of an educational program for the gifted and talented should stress the development of the self as the top priority. Objectives which are open-ended allow for student determination in the learning process. Goals and objectives which are student written are consonant with the concept of self-direction and self-evaluation. Goals and objectives which stress the attainment of learning skills such as research, inquiry, and problem solving are conducive to teaching students how to learn.
>
> The goals and objectives should be designed to free the gifted and talented learner from the requirements which prohibit his entry into learning experiences appropriate for him. Ability rather than tradition should govern what is available for these students.
>
> The goals and/or objectives of the program should outline the possibilities for learning while allowing students to pursue individually what they wish to learn and do.
>
> The goals and objectives of the program should specify the learning of generalizations rather than fact. They should encourage problem solving and inquiry as a strategy for using and evaluating what has been learned.
>
> A goal and objective for the program must be that the student develop a personal philosophy which is representative of both his value system and his knowledge of the nature of man. Goals and objectives should incorporate affective learning with cognitive learning.
>
> The goals and objectives should provide for rudimentary learning.
>
> The goals and objectives must provide for the attainment of skills in communicating through multimedia and multimodel sources. Also, the goals and objectives should be stated so students can be taught how to cooperate and live with other people (pp. 22-24).

Gold (1980) suggested the following items:

> Intellectual development, including a demanding body of knowledge and critical thinking skills (in inquiry, discovery, experimentation, research, and evaluation) as well as a sense of intellectual freedom, responsibility, and power.
>
> Development of fundamental human values with a sense of social responsibility for using one's unusual gifts and talents.
> Development of creative thinking and expression. Development of aesthetic awareness and ability to express oneself in a variety of art forms. Development of ability for self-appraisal, identification of special abilities and interests, finding oneself by try-out; in short, goal setting and self-concept building.
>
> Development of social relationships and skills in interaction with other people and groups (pp. 37-38).

Clark (1979) said that the primary goal of a gifted program was to meet the needs of gifted learners which could not be met in the regular classroom. These needs, often found in content, process, or enrichment, did not begin with curricula or varied learning structures, but with the different needs.

> With this understanding, we may say that, generally, a gifted program should
>
> --provide opportunities and experiences particularly suited to the needs of the gifted learners and through which they can continue developing potential.
>
> --establish an environment that values and enhances intelligence, talent, affective growth, and inquisitive ability.
>
> --allow active and cooperative participation by the gifted students and their parents.
>
> --provide time, space, and encouragement for gifted students to discover themselves, their powers and abilities, and to become all that they can be.
>
> --provide opportunities for gifted students to interact with children and adults of various abilities, including the bright and talented, to be challenged

> to know and revere humanity for its uniqueness and its connectedness.
>
> --encourage gifted students to find their place in human evolution by discovering what abilities and in what areas they wish to contribute (Clark, 1979, p. 138).

Curriculum Differentiation and Content

Haring (1974) presented certain concepts agreed upon by most authorities in the field:

> (a) learning and thinking of the gifted are not facilitated through traditional or regular types of classroom instruction, and (b) if specific types of programs are designed, some conscientious plan and effort must be put forth to encourage learning and thinking. In other words, any type of conscientiously applied program for the gifted is better than nothing (p. 200).

Clendening and Davies (1980) presented the following differences in the gifted curriculum as opposed to the regular curriculum:

> Gifted and talented students, because of their special abilities, require opportunities which encourage: the development of abstract thinking; the sharpening of reasoning abilities; practice in creative problem setting and solving; higher cognitive processing; i.e., analysis, synthesis, and evaluation; and in the case of particular talents, educational settings which allow them a full range of expression. Curricula for the gifted and talented often include activities which focus on interpretation of material being investigated, summative skills, creativity, divergent thinking, decision making, and independent inquiry. While instructional units for both the gifted and talented curriculum and regular curriculum can be similar, the breadth, depth, and intensity of learning activities within the gifted and talented curriculum mark it as distinctive (p. 65).

While teachers were usually responsible for curriculum design and implementation, students could share in the responsibility.

> It is important to emphasize that curriculum for these students should not be a predetermined route which all must follow. Curriculum is a framework for individual learning alternatives. As such, it should be flexible

> enough to meet the needs of both pupils and teachers (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 65).

The curriculum should fit student learning modes; the teacher should become a director of learning rather than a data conduit. Four curriculum alternatives included the subject or skill area which provided the substance for curriculum direction; the core subject, a generalized theme or topic with application to several subject areas; the basic question which sought the answer to some topical question; and the process which concerned particular thinking skills applied to selected topics or themes (Clendening and Davies, 1980, pp. 65-66).

Programming for the gifted was based on three levels. The mildly gifted (120-140 IQ's) could be placed in a regular classroom with a resource room and teacher available. The moderately gifted (141-160 IQ's) were adaptable; they could be placed in special groups within the classroom, spend more time in the resource center, or be placed in special core subject programs. The most highly or severely gifted (IQ's over 160) could be exposed to private tutoring, acceleration, mentor programs, and individualized instruction (Clark, 1979).

Kirk and Gallagher (1979) suggested three basic dimensions in the educational system that could be changed for the gifted: content, certain skills or processes, and the learning environment. In the area of content, ideas and concepts at the child's level of understanding, not several levels below it, could be presented. Also, the content could be the result of more organization and unification of complex ideas, not the piling on of more facts. Content could be expanded by emphasizing the structure of the subject matter and basic concepts, while at the same time developing more curriculum which

emphasized basic principles and theories underlying each content field as individual facts became less important. Emphasis was placed on how information was derived rather than on what information was derived. Method rather than process could be stressed, and the curriculum could be expanded, both in breadth and depth (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979).

Johnson (1981) agreed that content must be differentiated. In a study done in an Ohio high school, 58 percent of the school's students were underachieving, and a substantial number were truant and/or creating discipline problems. Another study of Iowa schools concluded that 45 percent of all students with IQ's over 130 had grade averages lower than C. In addition, 14 percent of high school dropouts had IQ's over 130. Obviously, many gifted students had not only academic but also social and emotional problems, and many of these were related to their giftedness. "Possessing active inquisitive minds, bright students want to be challenged and want to explore areas that interest them intellectually" (Johnson, 1981, p. 27GE). As the call for the back to the basics movement was heard and began to dominate the content, the gifted student became bored and frustrated, since he was already knowledgeable in these areas.

Ward (1962) presented suggestions for curriculum content:

> Any curriculum or method should . . . involve no greater pressure and evoke no greater anxieties than do educative processes in general for children across the full span of abilities. It is a fearful condition, however, that can sometimes be felt in high pressure school-added requirements, higher grading standards, closely divided school days, and all these occurring under the threat of heightened competition for college entry. All this is most improper, and indeed, potentially dangerous in that such an unwise accumulation of pressure and nonconstructive conditions can effectively mitigate against the optimum development of sensitivities

> and subleties equally important or more so than the products being sought in the over-compacted routine (p. 170).

In an earlier work, Gallagher (1964) reflected on the importance of skills or processes:

> The ability to generate new information through the internal processing or available information is one of the most impressive and valuable skills of mankind. . . . It is the ability to recombine the bits of this information into new meanings that sets mankind apart from the animals. It is the ability to perform these thinking processes well that sets the gifted student apart from the student with average ability (p. 201).

Learning environment changes required administrative decisions usually made by the school system or a higher level in the hierarchy. The reason learning environment changes were made was to modify the environment in some way necessary in order to accomplish differentiated instructional goals in content and skills development (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979).

Reynolds and Birch (1977) proposed four principles of curriculum for the gifted. The teacher could make sure all the gifted acquired both the skills and content of the standard curriculum. Next, the students were encouraged to go ahead in the regular curriculum. By scheduling electives strategically, the scope of the standard curricular offerings could be expanded. Last, any personal inclination to reach outside the standard curriculum could be assisted in all ways by the teacher. The authors suggested six curriculum process principles: students needed to become efficient at independent study; they needed to invoke and apply complex thinking processes such as creative thinking, critiques, pro and con analyses, etc.; pupils were encouraged to press discussions to the decision-making stage, and then communicate their plans, status, reports, or solutions based on the decisions;

students would establish human interaction skills necessary to work smoothly with all age groups and all levels of cognitive development; the gifted needed to gain respect for all other humans, regardless of gifts and talents; and finally, pupils needed a positive expectation about their careers and lives as adults that would optimize their talents (Reynolds and Birch, 1977).

Programming Modes

Payne (1974) suggested that three programming modes were generally used for the gifted: enrichment, acceleration, and ability grouping. Enrichment involved some adaptation of the educational procedure without separation from their peers. This was, of course, mainstreaming for the gifted. Both horizontal enrichment, which provided more educational experience at the same level of difficulty, and vertical enrichment, which provided higher level activities of increasing complexity, could be provided. In some enrichment programs, students met daily or weekly in resource rooms with special teachers.

> When the gifted students are clustered together for part or all of a day, specially trained teachers can be assigned to the program, rather than expecting the classroom teacher to stimulate those children (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979, p. 90).

Gardner (1977) broadly defined enrichment as grouping a few gifted in the same class, offering additional courses, using a special teacher consultant, providing seminars, special interest groups, etc.

Acceleration was administratively moving the student through traditional programs at a faster rate or starting a very young identified gifted student in school earlier. "There the research seems clearly favorable," suggested Getzels and Dillon (1973, p. 717), "but

programs of this type meet with criticism and disfavor." Clark (1979) listed the following advantages of acceleration:

1. Gifted students are inclined to select older companions because their levels of maturity are often more similar. Neither the method nor the age of acceleration appear to be of consequence.

2. Acceleration can be used in any school.

3. Acceleration allows capable students to enter their careers sooner, resulting in more productivity.

4. By spending less time in school, the gifted's educational costs are lowered.

5. Accelerated students do as well or often better than the older students in their classes.

6. There is less boredom and dissatisfaction for the brighter student.

7. Social and emotional adjustment are generally high, in most reports above average, when accelerated.

8. In general, teachers and administrators are opposed to acceleration, while parents and students, especially those who have experienced acceleration, are for it. Some possible reasons given for the negative attitudes of some educators are: convenience of lockstep, chronological grade placement, ignorance of research, discredited belief in social maladjustment, state laws preventing early admission (pp. 143-144).

In ability grouping, the gifted were separated into homogeneous groupings such as special classes or ability tracks. According to Bettelheim (1959, p. 254), "Ability grouping has met with some resistance because of the argument that such practices establish an intellectual elite." Especially with the emphasis on mainstreaming of the exceptional child, this type of differentiated programming was controversial. However, ability grouping was often the most effective curriculum programming method.

The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals (as cited in Clendening and Davies, 1980) stressed the following points in response to the criticism of elitism in gifted education:

> . . . there is no such thing as 'mass education.' Every use of the phrase is a denial of a vital reality; education is a wholly individual process. Our devotion to equality does not ignore the fact that individuals differ greatly in their talents and motivation. It simply asserts that each should be able to develop to the full, in his own style and to his own limit. . . . This means that there must be diverse programs within the educational system to take care of the diversity of individuals, and that each of these programs should be accorded respect and stature.
>
> To urge an adequate program for the gifted youngsters is not to recommend favoritism. They do not need more attention than other children--in some situations they may even need less. They need a different kind of attention.
>
> Children of high academic talent . . . should be given the opportunity to move more rapidly. There should be various forms of grouping by ability from the earliest years of school; and every effort should be made to provide enrichment for the gifted student (pp. 84-85).

The supporters of ability grouping answered the critics by stressing that it was indeed as democratic as many other school practices. Miller and Miller (1980) commented that:

> One wonders why the critics of ability grouping of gifted students feel that such a separation is undemocratic. No comparable complaint is aired when schools separate students for remedial reading, speech correction, music, art, drama, vocational programs, and varsity athletics.
>
> If it is reasonable to believe that learning is enhanced when students feel they are in comfortable, supportive surroundings, would not placing students in an atmosphere in which they felt a kinship with their peers make sound educational sense? (p. 5).

Finally, the authors suggested the following:

> New student leadership emerges in the regular classes as these students begin to look to themselves rather

> than to the faster students for answers. Slower students are no longer ashamed to participate in class for fear of revealing their inadequacies. Given the freedom to work at their own speed, gifted students are stimulated to go beyond the regular curriculum, to explore individual interests. On each level, minds are stretched (p. 5).

Gardner (1977) identified several groupings: provisional special subject matter area sections, secondary advanced classes, modifying classes so that the child could attend regular class part of the day and ability-defined class the other part, self-contained classes, or special schools.

Several studies in the 1950's supported homogeneous grouping. Hildreth (1952) found that gifted children who remained in regular classrooms tended to be idle and often neglected, and their classmates adopted unfavorable attitudes toward them. A curriculum designed for the gifted could be developed; and acceleration in learning, not in grade placement, could be provided. Also, separate classes for the elementary gifted would prepare them for special class work at higher school levels, and a congenial school life could be provided in separate gifted classes. In addition, teachers should be especially chosen and trained (Hildreth, 1952).

Dunlap (1955) studied the effectiveness of a program in which gifted children were maintained in regular classes 90 to 95 percent of the time and given specialized and individual instruction in groups of 8 to 10 by teachers of the gifted for two 45 minute periods per week. The results showed clear support for the program in which the gifted students were separated from regular classes.

Mallis (1956) grouped high school English classes in a seminar format arranged for those high in achievement and ability. He

concluded that: ". . . the seminar approach to gifted students is the most feasible method of spurring such youngsters to developing their greatest potential on their own" (p. 178).

Karnes (1963) tested two groups of gifted students: one in homogeneous classes and the other in heterogeneous classes with students ranging from dull normal to gifted. The gifted underachievers in the homogeneous classes gained more in academic achievement and became more fluent in creativity than those in the heterogeneous grouping.

> The results suggest that there may be advantages to the homogeneous grouping of the gifted, as opposed to their placement in regular classes. It is possible that the added stimulus provided by being surrounded by achievers is an important factor in increasing the educational progress of gifted underachievers as well as gifted achievers (Karnes, 1968, p. 185).

A 1982 study on ability grouping supported the earlier research efforts. Kulik and Kulik (1982) performed a meta-analysis of grouped studies located through computer searches of educational literature. The following results were found:

> Meta-analysis showed that only one type of grouping has clear effects on student achievement. This is the type in which students of high ability are put into a special honors class for enriched instruction in their secondary school subjects. Studies of this type usually report significant results, and they usually report effects on achievement that are medium in size. High ability students apparently benefit from the special curricula that grouping made possible (p. 621).

Gallagher (1964, p. 73) suggested that "Ability grouping makes possible many teaching and learning experiences which cannot be accomplished in the typical classroom." Dunn (1973) also supported grouping:

> Such pupils appear to be more stimulated by and to learn more from their intellectual peers. In addition, in such settings, teachers make the curriculum more demanding and challenging. In the United States, currently, when teachers of heterogeneous groups of pupils are pushed to the limit and must make choices and so neglect some children, their compassion generally leans to limited learners. They work with them to the neglect of the gifted (pp. 45-46).

Kirk and Gallagher (1979) suggested several grouping methods: elementary children could be grouped within a regular class; special subject matter sections could be organized in upper elementary schools; offering advanced courses for superior secondary school students was convenient; honors courses for superior college students could be offered. Other grouping ideas included resource rooms with itinerant teachers, special classes, special schools, and out-of-school programs.

Kough (1960) listed advantages and disadvantages of the three administrative programs for the gifted. Enrichment required few, if any, additional expenditures; it allowed gifted students to stimulate others; and the gifted child would feel more comfortable and democratic if not advanced physically and socially. In addition, it was a first step toward individualized instruction for all students. There were three major disadvantages: it forced both bright and slow into an average pattern; it could develop a sense of superiority in the gifted because of the ease to excel; and it caused a teaching burden because more time was still spent with the slower students.

Kough (1960) suggested that grouping was an effecient way to facilitate learning. Teachers were easily trained in in-service which led to better teaching. Activities were adapted to the individual; therefore, individual instruction was facilitated in a group with

common abilities and interests. Finally, because curriculum planning was simplified, the teacher was able to intensify and enrich an area of learning. The disadvantages included the fear of the development of an elitist class; the chance of loss of stimulation for those with less ability; students could become overly concerned with achievement and competition; personal and social growth could be threatened; and grouping required additional rooms, materials, and specially trained teachers.

Advantages of acceleration included the following: the gifted were encouraged to develop at their own rate; since they matured physically, emotionally, and socially faster, the lag in the educational process would be helpful; and there was less expense to parents, schools, and communities. The disadvantages included the concern that perhaps the child would not be mature socially and emotionally; the student could be deprived of development of leadership qualities; there could be serious gaps in academic areas; and creativity could be exploited (Kough, 1960).

Learning Activities

No matter which administrative program was selected, the learning activities were planned with the special needs of the gifted in mind. Five learning principles formed the basis for the learning activities. The subject-related curriculum was related to an activity from which both thinking and doing could be initiated. The process-oriented curriculum called for learning activities which emphasized thinking skills and process development rather than just the acquisition of information. A doing-centered curriculum had learning activities

which focused on tasks producing active involvement from the learner. An open-ended application curriculum allowed for personalized and varied responses in the learning activities. Finally, the student-selected curriculum provided options for individual differences (Kaplan, 1977).

Another consideration when planning learning activities for the gifted was the process or methods of thinking emphasized.

> Thinking skills can be classified according to the teaching/learning strategies of problem solving, creativity, inquiry, and higher levels of cognitive operations. Each strategy incorporates specific skills and operations which can be taught and practiced (Kaplan, 1977, p. 94).

Problem solving skills included defining the problem, locating evidence, hypothesizing, validating, and evaluating. Creativity components involved producing many responses, producing varied responses, producing new or original responses, and elaborating on a response. Inquiry skills involved observing, experimenting, criticizing, and evaluating. Higher cognitive operations were Bloom's familiar levels of analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating (Kaplan, 1977).

Evaluation

Because many gifted students did not have the self-confidence to direct their own learning, they often developed a lack of confidence in their abilities. They had doubts concerning whether they had done their best, since perfection was not reached. These students needed freedom from stress in order to develop their creativity, and if not given this freedom, the student could have repressed his creativity or become a behavior problem. "In short, these bright, creative

students are often more sensitive to criticism than other students; they may stop taking risks once they are burned" (Johnson, 1981, p. 29GE). Teachers need to be aware of these problems as they plan evaluation techniques for their gifted students. Gowan (as cited in Johnson, 1981) made several recommendations for teachers who wanted to help gifted students achieve their best. Teachers could do the following:

> Support their students' creative efforts and not emphasize their failures.
>
> Accept students who experiment with new ideas.
>
> Help gifted students grow more independent of their classmates' opinions by pointing out that, given time, their peers will come to understand and accept their ideas.
>
> Permit talented youngsters, who usually like to work independently, to develop projects on their own (Gowan, as cited in Johnson, 1981, p. 19GE).

Clark (1979) suggested that in order to understand the grading problems for gifted students, one must first understand the problems of grading itself. While grading did not in itself contribute to the learning process and could even inhibit and impede learning, several reasons were given for the grading process:

> --they provide a convenient communication of the student's academic program to parents, administrators, other teachers, and the student.
>
> --they provide motivation for performance.
>
> --they help the school gain the cooperation of the parents in pursuing educational goals.
>
> --they establish an overall academic pattern of the students for other teachers, counselors, and administrators.
>
> --they establish data for educational research (p. 274).

Research efforts, however, produced the following generalizations:

1. Grades have no inherent stable meaning, and are low in reliability.

2. Grades do not predict success in careers, in living, or in level of ability.

3. For most students, grades do not motivate learning.

4. Evaluation without grades is facilitating to the learning process (Clark, 1979, p. 274).

Stress on grades could produce various results for the gifted student. While a few successful students were motivated by good grades, many bright students failed to risk venturing into new areas or areas in which they might not succeed.

> Boredom, irrelevant assignments, repetition, meaningless or unrealistic subject matter, and lack of opportunity to build skills all contribute to low grades. Grades have been shown to be poor indicators of student learning. Short term memorization, cheating, and other coping strategies result directly from grading practices; learning does not (Clark, 1979, p. 276).

Furthermore, grades provided special problems. In homogeneously grouped classes, the gifted earned significantly lower grades than when in heterogeneously grouped classes, and often these grades became a part of the permanent record with special notations. Students in pullout classes often were penalized for missing classes. While some schools adopted the policy of requiring accelerated classes to give all A's or, in some cases, A's and B's, this was sometimes threatening to teachers. In addition, parents often caused the schools to reevaluate their grading procedures as their gifted children were selected for scholarships, graduation honors, and membership in honor societies based on grade point averages (Clark, 1979).

In order to improve evaluation of gifted students, emphasis needed to shift from grading to true evaluation.

> Allowing students the knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses while giving them support and opportunities to develop their skills is important to learning. Providing an environment where mistakes are valued as learning experiences promotes exploration and increases areas of knowledge. Reducing anxiety promotes long term retention and higher quantities of knowledge gained. Evaluation, a continuous process, can use many sources for data collection. In evaluating, the teacher is the facilitator who helps the students discover their strengths and weaknesses and their interests and abilities, and who guides their growth toward greater fulfillment of their potential (Clark, 1979, p. 276).

One method of evaluation for the gifted was the conference method, but it involved more work. However, instructors who used it felt that since it was diagnostic in nature, it clearly reflected the students' achievements. Parents, though, often impeded the usefulness of this evaluation technique, as they wanted to know how their child compared to others, what his weaknesses were, what the grade could be, etc., instead of being aware of areas of needed guidance (Clark, 1979).

In summary, grades, while a quick way to categorize and group children, were often damaging to the self-esteem of both the bright and the less bright child, as well as being unfair, misleading, and meaningless at times.

> They create pressures and anxieties for both the teacher and the students. They neither motivate nor contribute to learning. They communicate information on a par with chance estimates; at best, what they say is neither explicit nor constructive (Clark, 1979, p. 277).

Programs could be built without grades with learning viewed as functional and evaluation just one part of the learning process. With

this end in mind, many gifted programs had cooperative evaluation plans and diagnostic profiles.

One further aspect of the evaluation for gifted students was self-evaluation. By letting students evaluate their own work, they became involved in the self-diagnosis process without the negative effects of grading.

> Even when you must ultimately record a grade, self-evaluation can be an important part of the process. It is possible to evaluate constructively, and if learning is our goal, the effort is really worth it (Clark, 1979, p. 277).

In summary, Smith and Neisworth (1975) suggested the following recommendations for evaluation of exceptional gifted children:

1. Regard achievement, intelligence, and aptitude tests as global measures of the student's current status.
2. Supplement the formal achievement tests with your own informal assessments of each child's competence. . . .
3. Identify and measure social behavior critical to the smooth functioning of the educational program.
4. Decide on how on-task, formative evaluation will be accomplished.
5. Consider the various options for collecting data.
6. Finally, review the possibilities for help in conducting evaluations of students (p. 223).

Individualized Learning

It was obvious that curriculum must be differentiated for the gifted in all areas: aims, goals, objectives, content, learning activities, and evaluation. A basic element of curriculum differentiation

was individualizing learning which incorporated independent study and the use of mentors.

> If one goal of education is to help students develop the ability to continue learning after their formal education is complete, it seems reasonable that they have supervised experience in learning independently, experience in which the instructor helps students learn how to formulate problems, find answers, and evaluate their progress themselves. One might expect the values of independent study to be greatest for students of high ability with a good deal of background in the area to be covered, since such students should be less likely to be overwhelmed by difficulties encountered (McKeachie, 1978, p. 86).

Sellin and Birch (1980, p. 90) agreed: "One means of widening a gifted and talented adolescent's prospects is to encourage individual initiative for learning through one's own investigations." In order to help the student at the secondary level achieve this goal, the teacher or mentor had at least two primary objectives. The first was to help the student refine research and investigative methods and skills, as well as help in communicating clearly and effectively the results and implications of their findings. The second objective was to build and then strengthen a personal commitment to bettering learning management. As students first acted upon their curiosity in research, then managed it, they became good problem finders.

Independent study combined the operations of searching, assimilating, and reporting. Searching involved technique development as well as introduction to materials to develop "learning to learn" skills. Assimilating was simply the process of "digesting" acquired information. Reporting was the formalized outcome or expression of the learned information. The goals of searching included access to varied people, ideas, written materials, experiences, and environments with

the ability to evaluate the information as to its importance. Assimilating goals included, "Experiences at various levels of conceptualization, including memory, translation, interpretation, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation" (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 341). Finally, the goal for reporting was the ability to apply this information to the reality of life.

Villapando and Kolbe (1979) suggested a six-step process in formulating independent classroom projects: defining a topic, deciding on project design, questioning, gathering information, display and sharing, and evaluation. While these steps seemed simple, they provided a basic foundation for projects in many different areas and of varying degrees of difficulty. The authors further suggested that student-designed independent projects provided practice in decision-making. In addition, the skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation became especially important. Another important component of the process was creative thinking processes development: originality, fluency, curiosity, flexibility, imagination, elaboration, risk-taking, and complexity. When these creative components were combined with the higher cognitive components, the outcome was a blending of many important learning skills.

Gagne and Briggs (1974) suggested five types of individualized instruction:

1. Independent study plans, in which there is agreement between a student and a teacher on only the most general level of stated objectives to indicate the purpose of studying.

2. Self-directed study, which may involve agreement on specific objectives, but with no restrictions upon how the student learns.

3. Learner-centered programs, in which students decide a great deal for themselves, within broadly defined areas, what the objectives will be and when to terminate one task and to do another.

4. Self-pacing, in which learners work at their own rates, but upon objectives set by the teacher and required of all students.

5. Student-determined instruction, providing for student judgment in any or all of the following aspects of the learning: (a) selection of objectives; (b) selection of the paticular materials, resources, or exercises to be used; (c) selection of a schedule within which work on different academic subjects will be allocated; (d) self-pacing in reaching each objective; (e) self-evaluation as to whether the objective has been met; and (f) freedom to abandon one objective in favor of another one (pp. 268-269).

According to Rinkel (1975), five dimensions were required in setting up an individualized learning program:

a. both teacher and learner are highly active and involved in a nonthreatening atmosphere;

b. the main outcome of learning is the development of responsibility;

c. creativity and critical thinking are integral parts of the learning process;

d. learning activities provide alternative responses, many ideas generated;

e. flexibility (in behavioral changes, materials, approaches, etc.) is the key feature (p. 32).

Choice, challenge, and cognition were the three components of individualized learning according to Pomerantz (1975):

> Providing choice by offering a variety of interest and learning methods and levels is important because every student has a right to participate in his own curriculum and to build on existing skills and develop lagging ones. Challenge is important to an individualized program because mastery of a particular subject should require genuine effort on the part of a student. After all, everyone has a right to a real sense of accomplishment. Cognition, involving a basic understanding of

> how the intellect works, asks for the right to 'learn how to learn' (p. 47).

Clark (1979) suggested using a learning contract in individualizing learning. While the contract could be very simple, it could also be a rather complex document which detailed the course of the study. While usually only the student and the instructor negotiated the contract, if certain conditions were present, the parents could become part of the process. The contract would only be written after the student had made preliminary inquiries into the project. While determining the actual contract, the following considerations would be made: objectives, resources, possible learning activities, manners of reporting, and evaluation for both self-assessment and teacher assessment. The final consideration was that the terms were always negotiable to make room for modifications necessary during the investigation.

Teachers needed to discuss the goals and functions of the independent study program in detail so that students would understand their responsibilities. The teacher would then become available at the disposal of the students.

> Teachers actively involved in an individualized program find themselves busy with many things--responding to individual needs, dealing with many different problems in one class period--where in the past a period could easily have been given over to one topic taught with a common approach. The demands put on teachers are increased, and they can no longer feel secure in the possession of a carefully prepared lesson plan. The variety of activities taking place during any one period demands that teachers be alert to different needs, conscious of the range of activities, and competent to provide assistance in a number of areas (Kelleher, 1975, p. 30).

Mentors provided an important part of the independent study project if specialized areas needing expertise were chosen. According

to Klopf and Harrison (1982), mentors served the following purposes:

> Mentors serve as teachers, advisors, counselors, sponsors, and models for associates, with both mentor and associate gaining insight, knowledge, and satisfaction from the relationship. The mentor's role differs from other educators', however, in that the relationship with the associate is more comprehensive, generally including all these educational roles and perhaps something else. Mentoring incorporates such processes and is the most important in a continuum of significant relationships. When only some of these processes or functions are present, the role being enacted is not mentoring (p. 34).

In summary, individualized instruction had as its purpose allowing teachers to respond to student needs, to challenge each student's potential, and to encourage the process of learning. These purposes provided skills essential for future growth and development in our complex modern world (Kelleher, 1975).

As differentiated content was selected, as learning activities were planned, and as overall evaluation was considered, the instructor realized that assimilation of knowledge was not the only part of the learning process. Often gifted students did not have the positive self-concept which enabled them to function as fully or as well as they could. The instructor needed to be aware of these types of problems and help the students deal with them. Alvino (1981) posed the following guidelines for instructors' help in guidance problems:

1. Accept and treat all students as unique persons, not as objects or as raw material.

2. Build on your students' trust by being honest, supportive, and open with them at all times.

3. Set up situations and experience for encouraging student self-discovery, awareness, and understanding of their needs, desires, values, and anxieties.

4. Advocate and cultivate student self-determination and freedom in varied contexts.

5. Help liberate students from oppressive and unrealistic external and self-expectations, such as pressure from parents to succeed.

6. Give students an opportunity to set goals for themselves and practice decision-making skills in all facets of school life.
7. Help students understand what is involved in making ethical judgments, as well as the impact and consequences of their actions.

8. Help students come to terms with their responsibilities to others and to themselves.

9. Enhance possibilities for greater student acceptance and productivity (p. 65).

Without doubt, the gifted student needed special educational curriculum provisions. While the gifted were included in the exceptional child category, the instructional and curriculum methods for the other exceptional children categories did not always provide the best methods for the advanced learner.

Language Arts or English

Introduction

Language arts or English is a valuable and necessary component of the high school curriculum, and it is a complicated and complex offering.

> That part of the secondary school curriculum which helps students understand and use the system of symbols, gestures, and sounds which man has developed to communicate by means of a spoken and written word, including gestures, and facial expressions, is commonly termed language arts. It consists basically of a description and discussion of how and why we talk and write the way we do, but should also include differentiation between the two major uses of language--referential (informing or stating facts), and emotive (moving or swaying the emotions) (Becker and Cornett, 1972, p. 308).

Sellin and Birch (1980, p. 133) had a simple definition: "The language arts include reading, writing, listening, speaking, and perceiving." Alpren (1967) expanded the definition:

> English as a subject discipline encompasses the primary skills of reading and writing and primary content of language and literature. As a skill it also includes the secondary areas of critical thinking and the mass media (p. 109).

According to Fowler (1965), English was difficult to define:

> English is a central humanistic study in the schools during the child's educational career from elementary school through college. It is taken by children of all ages, abilities, backgrounds, and goals. The study of their own language and literature is, for American children, the doorway to all other subjects in the curriculum. Yet one of the exasperating things about this central subject is the difficulty of agreement about its definitions (p. 6).

Fowler (1965) suggested that English teachers accept the definition of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Board: the three central subjects of the English curriculum were language, literature, and composition.

Kitzhaber (1967) suggested that there was disagreement concerning exactly what English was:

> It is true that, at a minimum, the English course does include some characteristic content--literature (but of widely varying kinds and quality), and grammar or usage, or an indiscriminate mixture of the two. At a minimum, the English course tries to foster certain skills--reading (though explicitly only in the early years) and writing (though often more by precept than practice). But English may also include a fantastic variety of other subject matter--journalism, play production, study of the mass media, forensics, advice on dating, public speaking, career counseling, orientation to school life. And it may accept responsibility for developing such other skills as library use, elementary research technique, proper study habits, use of the telephone, procedures for filling out forms and taking standardized examinations, choral reading, group discussions, and parliamentary practice. It is noteworthy

> that, although 'English' is the most generally taught of all school subjects, it is always possible to get a warm argument started, even among English teachers, by asking what exactly 'English' is (p. 5).

In addition, there were four main causes for the confusion concerning English content. First was the vagueness of the word "English," which meant different things to different people. Second, since English was taught to all children, it was easy to reach these students with an instructional item that a certain group, administrator, textbook author, etc., thought was important; therefore, English texts did not show a strong sense of identity. The third cause was the teachers themselves, since their training was uneven. Many teachers were not English majors, and those who were, often had greatly varying backgrounds with emphasis in literature, not grammar, or the opposite. Finally, the lack of clarity was influenced by educational theorists who did not agree in basic theories (Kitzhaber, 1967).

Bennett (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that the English curriculum was more than a set of skills and more than a humanistic study, but a combination of both which provided the student with both competence and awareness needed to achieve his full potential.

> While keeping clearly in mind the unity of English, teachers in planning the curriculum must analyze each phase of the program for its contribution to the whole. The goals of the curriculum will only be achieved if each of the parts is taught individually in a developmental sequence meaningful to the student and at the same time is taught in such a way that all the parts reinforce and support each other (p. 29).

In addition, Bennett (as cited in Hipple, 1973) stated that the English curriculum was a product of the past, reflecting both prior training and experience of the instructors. Because effective use of language in speaking and writing dated back to the beginning of

civilization, the content was concerned with the study of an evolving language. Through literature, the student learned about the great ideas which formed the heritage of our culture. However, even in light of the great role of the past in the English curriculum, students also learned to live in the present. The English curriculum must prepare students to communicate effectively and to respond perceptively to language and literary experiences in the future. In order to reach this goal, curriculum designs must be continually evolving and flexible, built on accumulated knowledge, recent innovations, and studies into the future. "From the heritage of the past and the scholarship of today, the English curriculum must be developed to meet the requirements of the citizens of tomorrow" (Bennett, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 29).

According to Sellin and Birch (1980), the language arts curriculum should be a program of substance, not an added-on program. In order to achieve this, the following guidelines should be followed:

1. Define the purpose and scope of the language arts as a subject area.

2. Establish expectations that are appropriate and individually matched to the needs of pupils.

3. Adopt a rational (e.g., philosophical or theoretical) basis or frame of reference that describes the content, skills, and expected products and achievements consistent with purpose and expectations (p. 133).

Three conflicting conceptions were reflected in the current trends of English instruction:

> Teachers who value an academic orientation base their instruction on what scholars are doing in the field. Those who think of education as personal growth attend to a pedagogy associated with oral expression, projects, popular media, contemporary literature, and

> social commentary. Those who think of English as a set of mechanical skills in language use are focusing directly on reading, spelling, and writing (McNeil, 1977, p. 245).

Gill (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that three major curriculum movements were competing on the American education scene in the English curriculum. First was the knowledge-centered academic plan which specified that the content was from the areas of language, literature, and composition. The premises underlying this curriculum were the following:

1. It sets as the primary educational goal the cognitive development of a learner whose significant qualities are the intellectual ones.

2. Knowledge is seen as the way to make sense out of the chaos of life. Knowledge can be created and it does exist; it not only explains, but it also predicts and controls.

3. Knowledge becomes the real stuff of education--not knowledge narrowly construed as fact and information, but more broadly defined as the concepts, the structures, and the methods of discovery peculiar to each of the scholarly disciplines. Knowledge in any discipline is accessible in some respectable form to learners at all stages of development.

4. The teacher, who is seen as a special kind of scholar, acts as a mediator between the structures of the field and the learning processes of the student. In so doing, the teacher is likely to use academic modes--lectures, books, laboratory, inquiry, and maybe even media and activity.

5. The student who is most successful is the one who has academic talent, who goes on to contribute to the creation of knowledge; he is particularly successful if the contribution relates to national purposes. The student tends to be seen as an object with certain useful learning characteristics--memory, ability to organize, linguistic versatility.

6. Language, literature, and to a lesser degree, composition, represent the legitimate academic areas

for disciplined inquiry; hence, they are the legitimate sources for content in English.

7. Sequence for instruction derives first from the inherent logic of the subject (Gill, as cited in Hipple, 1973, pp. 31-32).

The second curriculum, the functional curriculum, was built upon skills and behaviors which the student was expected to learn rather than to display. The aspects of this curriculum included the following:

1. The primary goal of education is the development of certain demonstrable behaviors and skills by a learner whose significant quality is his ability to learn to respond in predictable and desirable ways.

2. Knowledge must be defined in terms of operations, in terms of behaviors the mastery of which is desired, in terms so that mastery can be proved. Matters not easily defined in these terms become less valuable or not important at all.

3. Teaching is the selection of efficient, effective means to induce the desired behavioral changes which have been selected by reference to an existing or extrapolated world.

4. Learning involves the exploitation of the subtleties of stimulus-response principles; motivation becomes a reward for the desired behavior, or, at least figuratively, 'hunger.'

5. Technology looms large in carrying out strategies, in assessing behavior modification, virtually in doing the teaching.

6. The content of English involves the four language skills--listening, speaking, writing, and reading.

7. Sequence in curriculum derives from the most efficient learning order (Gill, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 33).

The newest curriculum movement was the individual fulfillment model.

> The goals of English are directed toward personal development, valuing personality over mind, purporting to prepare the individual for life instead of college.

> The order of English class experiences seems to be improvised in terms of the student's maturity level and expressions of interest (Gill, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 34).

The following characteristics were found in this curriculum:

1. The basic goal of education is not knowledge nor skill development but rather is the maximum personal development of the individual according to the idiosyncratic pattern which he discovers in and for himself.

2. Knowledge is defined in terms of the meaning which experience has for each person. One person's experience is as good, as valuable, as another's.

3. Teachers provide a rich, appropriate learning environment and stimulate a variety of experiences; they are helpful, companionable, and supportive, not talkative or demanding.

4. Learners, in the final analysis, determine what they will learn--as well as the pace and the sequence of their learning. They are seen to be capable of directing their own learning. Motivation arises from innate curiosity and a native desire to learn what is meaningful and interesting.

5. The full realization of the human potential requires an emphasis on the affective side of human development. Human beings are seen as being by nature positive-tending and self-actualizing, if their emotional development is not blighted.

6. The content of English is experience as gained and filtered through language. Language is a strongly-deterministic factor in the quality and direction of life experience.

7. This general curriculum model is particularly applicable to English since the human qualities in the traditional disciplines of English are readily applicable to the individual fulfillment model (Gill, as cited in Hipple, 1973, pp. 36-37).

Gill (1971, p. 38) suggested that English teachers did not have to choose one package and reject the others but instead synthesize these ideas and develop their own curriculum, ". . . that will encompass the knowledge of the discipline as well as the direct experience

of the learner, the skills with language as well as the search for identity through experience with language."

Logan and Logan (1967) presented several principles underlying the language arts program which should be considered in the curriculum development process:

> The development of the creative potential of every child should be the paramount concern in the language arts program. Standards for proficiency at each educational level should be determined.
>
> Continuous evaluation is essential for growth in the skills of communication.
>
> Language learning is imitative (pp. 36-37).

Smith (1977) offered the following steps in language arts curriculum planning:

> First, objectives are formulated which tell the purpose for the school. . . . Next, planned experiences are selected to fulfill the objectives that tell the purpose for the school. . . . Third, an organizational plan is devised which makes possible the experiences that meet the objectives that tell the purpose for the school. . . . As the fourth step in curriculum planning, evaluation devices are applied to check the organizational plan that makes possible the experiences that meet the objectives that tell the purpose for the school (p. 15).

These were the same steps suggested by Tyler (1949) in the curriculum section.

Aims, Goals, Objectives

Miller (1967) stated the aim of the English curriculum:

> Reduced to its barest terms, the English curriculum . . . should have as its primary aims the education, development, and fullest possible extensions of the linguistic imagination. The construction of the curriculum should emphasize the primacy of creativity and imagination in learning to live as a full participant in the vital world of language (p. 157).

In other words, the English course should contain imaginative reading and creative composition.

Since the definition of English varied so greatly, it followed that the goals for a successful English program varied also. Beckner and Cornett (1972, p. 309) proposed that developing experimental and innovative programs in language arts were based on rather simple goals: ". . . clear, thoughtful, and correct speech and writing; intelligent listening; critical thinking; and development of a life-long devotion to literature as a guide to cultural understanding and individual development." Obviously, this could also be considered an aim of the English curriculum. If these concepts were pursued, they would lead to a program which ". . . will raise questions, stimulate students to observe and generalize about their own experiences, and build concepts, instead of being confined to teaching rules and definitions" (Beckner and Cornett, 1972, p. 309).

Alpren (1967) listed primary and secondary objectives which fit the criteria for goals. Skill area objectives were to read with comprehension, understanding, and critical insight; and to write with clarity and effectiveness. Content area objectives included the ability to know and understand important literary works of the past and present, and to understand the structure of the English language. Four secondary objectives were suggested:

> (1) to speak with clarity and effectiveness, (2) to listen with attention and critical understanding, (3) to think logically and critically, and (4) to learn from, enjoy, appreciate, and evaluate the mass media (Alpren, 1967, p. 84).

Caffyn (1970) suggested that in order to reach language arts teaching goals, desired adult competencies in the four language arts

areas--listening, speaking, reading, and writing--should be formulated. These competencies were the following:

> listen (eagerly, courteously)
>
> attend (community meetings, clubs, concerts, lectures)
>
> participate (in discussion, conversation, government)
>
> discuss (issues, beliefs, new knowledge)
>
> converse (with poise, imagination)
>
> explain (with clarity, patience)
>
> seek (unassigned knowledge, interesting side issues)
>
> choose (some challenging reading, stimulating dialog, some drama and poetry)
>
> read (variety, for various satisfactions)
>
> share (experiences, humor)
>
> habitually use (preferred language forms, appropriate degrees of formality)
>
> employ (colorful language, interesting vocal and bodily expressions)
>
> relate (new knowledge to old, different areas of learning)
>
> show (language courtesy, curiosity, emotional control)
>
> demonstrate (thought through considered language rather than through violence or profanity)
>
> respond (to sensitivity, beauty, fine distractions) (Caffyn, 1970, p. 72).

Moffett and Wagner (1976) divided language arts goals into communication goals and language arts goals. First were the communication goals:

> It is at this level that goals can interrelate media, subject areas, language arts, and other arts to create a common ground for an interdisciplinary curriculum.
>
> 1. Heed signals from all sources.

2. Gain access to all sources of information, inside and outside oneself.

3. Overcome the amnesia toward the past and the anesthesia toward the present caused by pain and socialization and open all channels to memory, perception, and feeling.

4. Find out what the environment shows, what other people know, what records store, and what media conveys.

5. Discriminate different sources and abstraction levels of information and understand what each is worth.

6. Enlarge to its fullest the range of what one can conceive, transmit, and respond to and of how one can conceive, transmit, and respond.

7. Find out what various media can and cannot do--language, body expression, graphic arts, movies, and television, competing with and complementing each other.

8. Become familiar with all roles--sender, receiver, subject--and with the varying distances and relations among them--communicating to oneself, to known individuals, remote audiences, for example, or communicating about oneself, firsthand subjects, abstract subjects, and so on (p. 23).

The language arts goals, according to Moffett and Wagner (1976):

> . . . further specify, in the medium of language only, what many of the goals for information and communication stated more comprehensively. At this point, traditional curriculum might rely on the categories language, literature, and composition for secondary school. . . (p. 23).

The following goals covered the verbalization level which included composition and comprehension:

1. Make language choices wisely--how to put things and how to take things (composition and comprehension).

2. Expand to the maximum the repertory of language resources one can employ and respond to--from vocabulary and punctuation, phrasing and sentence structure, to style and dialect, points of view and compositional form.

3. Extend to the maximum the fluency, facility, pleasure, and depth with which one can speak, listen, read, and write (the target activities of language learning).

4. Expand to the maximum the range, depth, and refinement of the inborn thinking operations--classifying, generalizing, inferring, and problem-solving (Moffett and Wagner, 1976, pp. 23-24).

Goals, of course, led to objectives for the program, and as noted previously, the question of behavioral objectives was a controversial one. Because English was usually classified as a "humanistic" study, it was difficult to reduce learning to observable events, which was one of the prerequisites for writing good behavioral objectives. According to Maxwell (as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 72), the Commission of English Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English went on record, ". . . not against behavioral objectives, but against a less than rigorous approach to writing them for English." Some suggestions made by the Commission were to do the following when obligated to write behavioral objectives:

(a) make specific plans to account for the total English curriculum;

(b) make an intention to preserve . . . the important humanistic goals of education; and

(c) insist on these goals regardless of whether or not there exists instruments . . . for measuring the desired changes in pupil behavior (pp. ix-x).

One of the most outspoken critics of behavioral objectives for English was Moffett (1970). He suggested that "As an exercise in clear thinking, it might be a helpful thing for English teachers to write behavioral objectives--and then throw them away" (p. 111).

In a recent publication, Moffett and Wagner (1976, p. 407) suggested that "The more specific the objectives, the more numerous they

must necessarily be. If objectives stipulate exercises and test items, the sheer quantity of them so bureaucratizes a classroom that actual learning is seriously crowded out." They said that in order to overcome the problem of so many objectives, educators resorted to one of three actions: restrict the range of language arts because if students read, talk, and write across the entire range of discourse, it would be impossible to write specific objectives; ignore individual variation and make all students do the same thing; or resort to programmed instruction which obliterated the distinction between teaching and testing. Furthermore:

> Objectives for democratic schools must be either general enough to apply to all students or specific enough to fit all students individually. If general enough, they will have to cut off just above the level of once-only assignments. . . . If specific enough, they have to specify so many particular assignments that different students may take on different specific objectives to the same general goals (p. 410).

Maxwell (as cited in Hipple, 1973) presented several arguments against behavioral objectives for the English classroom. First concerned the insistence of measurability in behavioral objectives which could lead to the loss of important goals. While some areas of English could be observed (spelling, handwriting, punctuation, etc.), areas such as composition were difficult to defined as "good" or "poor." Also, while some aspects of literature such as recognizing specific literary terms, listing plot outlines, and similar factual matters could be observed, many outcomes of literature instruction just could not be measured. Perhaps this dilemma was best explained by Hoetker (as cited in Maxwell and Tovatt, 1970), who characterized learning as can-do, may-do, and will-do behaviors. May-do behaviors

were those at the so-called cognitive domain higher level such as application of abstractions in new situations, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. These behaviors obviously occurred, but there were few techniques for determining the quality of work performed at these levels. Even though teachers constantly evaluated these higher cognitive skills, the reliability of the evaluations was hardly constant. Will-do behaviors were those which would occur sometime in the future. Questions concerning continued reading, quality literature choices, pleasure in language, responsibility toward others, and positive participation in society were all very vague as well as dependent on the values of the observer. Too, they occurred in the students' lives long after they left school, and only hints that these qualities were going to be reached were found while the student was actually in the school setting. "Whether he will, indeed, manifest those behaviors simply cannot be known, at least not within the present schemes for evaluating the attainment of behavioral objectives" (Maxwell, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 77). Of course, the can-do behaviors, those which covered skills and knowledge, were the only behaviors which lent themselves to observation.

Maxwell (as cited in Hipple, 1973), alluded to the treasured response of the "gleam in a student's eye" which resulted from English instruction. This reaction was certainly not measurable in behavioral terms, but the problem, ". . . for the production of response to literature may be what brought him into English teaching in the first place and continues to be a major object of his work" (p. 79).

Hembree (as cited in Hipple, 1973) agreed concerning the problem for behavioral objectives in English. He felt that English, as well

as the humanities in general:

> . . . does not fit the stereotype of the round peg that fits into the square hole of accountability. To shave the peg to fit would be to alter, i.e., eliminate, some or all of the worthmaking characteristics of the content of English (p. 81).

The following reasons led to the inhibition of implementation of English behavioral objectives. First, the idea of behavioral objectives put English teachers on the defensive because it had not been proven empirically that meaningful results had been achieved in English classrooms. Next, trivial behaviors were the easiest ones to write as objectives. Also, the insistence upon measurability was in direct opposition to English aims, and it was difficult to measure pupil behavior in the arts and humanities. Finally, peripheral learning outcomes could be overlooked.

Because many desirable outcomes in English dealt with the affective domain, there were some conclusions which should be reached by English teachers and curriculum planners.

> First, the charge is fact that very real limitations exist in terms of the blanket application of behavioral objectives to English. Second, not only are the problems of identifying peripheral outcomes real, but overcoming the inherent tendency to operationalize trivial behavior will require extreme caution. In addition, teachers and curriculum writers must recognize that even though not all outcomes are measurable, they nevertheless may be worthwhile. In this connection, the affective domain with which English teachers are concerned has not been defined sufficiently to guarantee measurable achievement (Hembree, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 84).

Moffett and Wagner (1976) suggested that objectives could be written of a general nature and broken into discourse and literacy objectives.

> Discourse Objectives - The following objectives divide all discourse into nine kinds. Each kind can be practiced by speaking, listening, reading, and writing.
>
> 1. Word Play (riddles, puns, tongue twisters, much poetry).
> 2. Labels and Captions (language joined with pictures or objects, graphs, maps, and so on).
> 3. Invented Dialogue (improvisation and scripts).
> 4. Actual Dialogue (discussion and transcripts).
> 5. Invented Stories (fiction, fables, tales, much poetry, and so on).
> 6. True Stories (autobiography, memoirs, biography, reportage, journals, and so on).
> 7. Directions (for how to do and how to make).
> 8. Information (generalized fact).
> 9. Ideas (generalized thought) (p. 24).
>
> Literacy Objectives - In order to read and write at all in any kind of discourse, students need to spell out speech sounds and to sound out spellings--the old two r's. For reading, this means recognizing spoken words when written. For writing, this means spelling, punctuation, and handwriting.
>
> 1. The student will be able to sound out with normal intonation any text that he can understand if read to him.
> 2. The student will be able to transcribe whatever he can say or understand orally. (Transcribe covers both spelling and punctuation) (p. 25).

While all English teachers might not agree with Moffett and Wagner's (1976) objectives, it was interesting to note that objectives could be written in general terms, not behavioral terms. And, if a teacher was required to write in behavioral terminology, Maxwell (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that

> The [NCTE] commission has left the door open for responsible development of behavioral objectives but has warned that it is not a task to be undertaken

> lightly nor by lightweights. Writing behavioral objectives for English is a demanding intellectual task because of the complexity of the subject and its concern with the affective domain (p. 76).

Content

Introduction. The next item in the English curriculum was content. According to Beckner and Cornett (1977), curriculum was usually divided into two broad categories: understandings and appreciations which referred to speaking and listening (speech), reading (literature), and writing (composition); and enabling skills such as talking, reading, grammar, usage, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

> It is fruitless to debate whether minimum mastery of the enabling skills must precede instruction directed toward the cognitive and affective domains. Pupil progress in both categories of language instruction must proceed simultaneously. Skill instruction is boring and irrelevant to students unless it is done in conjunction with activities in speech, literature, and composition. On the other hand, significant learning in the areas of speech, literature, and composition is impossible in the absence of basic language skills (p. 310).

All of the above should be intertwined with the concepts and skills of critical thinking.

> Perhaps this may be viewed as the all-encompassing goal of language arts instruction. Critical thinking cannot be taught apart from the other aspects of the program, but we should probably adopt the view that the other objectives (skills, understandings, and appreciations) have as their ultimate purpose the development of students and adults who can think and act critically and wisely as they go about their daily tasks (p. 310).

The English content will be discussed using five areas: three main areas (literature, language, and composition), and two sub-areas (communication and media).

Literature. Literature was often the main focus of English classroom content. According to Roberts (1977, p. 3), "Literature, like all art, is one of the essential things that make human beings human. In one way or another, everyone is touched by it." Fowler (1965) defined literature as the following:

> Literature is the record of the attempt of writers to express and communicate their ideas about man's hopes, dreams, ideals, feelings, thoughts, and experiences, and his relationship to society. Literature deals with the life of man in moments of crisis and anguish, with his most intimate relationships, with his innermost thoughts and his deepest loves and hates, with his courage, honor, hope, pride, compassion, pity, and sacrifice (p. 217).

Hipple (as cited in Shuman,1981) suggested the following reasons why literature was taught:

> We believe that literature is fun, enjoyable, a source of pleasure for students in school and for the adult community they will soon join. We believe that literature provides a record of humankind's yearnings, achievements, and failures and that today's students can learn much about themselves by examining in literature the struggles of others. We believe that the study of literature not only typically affords but, indeed, almost universally forces an exploration of values, both those to be discovered in the literature and those to be developed in its readers. We believe that literature can be a moral force, an instrument that has the potential to benefit humankind in important ways. We believe in the utilitarian aspects of literature study, in its power to make us better readers. And finally we believe that literature can often be art, a glorious rendering into language of imaginative and significant visions, a subject that richly regards its careful and continuing study (pp. 20-21).

Fowler (1965, p. 217) stated that ". . . we want the young to become readers, to find delight and value in literature, and to remain readers throughout their lives." In addition, "We hope for continued growth in taste and discrimination. We ask not only that they read, but that they read thoughtfully and critically" (p. 218).

Literature could be viewed in many ways. It provided experience, as adolescents could live many lives by reading. Literature could be seen as individual insight were the heart and soul of man were revealed. Literature was social insight offering man caught up in complex social issues and problems. Literature was an aid to international understanding as readers learn about other cultures. Literature was an aesthetic experience bring pleasure, insight, and ideas. Finally, literature could be seen as a study of the values by which men live (Fowler, 1965).

Students developed skills in literary comprehension to help them understand the basic elements of all writing forms. These skills included understanding plot, setting, characterization, figurative language, irony, satire, and differences in literal and symbolic meaning. Critical reading skills were developed with careful attention paid to style which eventually led to the ability to make judgments about the worth of a work. Finally, the development of appreciative reading was seen as the student became an avid reader for life (Fowler, 1965).

Hillocks (as cited in Alpren, 1967) stated that there were three main reasons for teaching literature. The structure of literature took a tripartite form: the relationship of man to his environment (the physical, the social, and the cultural); levels of meaning (plot, tone, allegory, symbol, archetypal symbol, theme); and form and genre.

Kitzhaber (as cited in Hipple, 1973) expressed some concerns about the teaching of literature. Some instructors thought that literature was the only legitimate subject matter for English content; and, as a result, many English classes were conducted with that premise.

Also, it was questionable whether the central or organizing principles of literature could be accurately identified. Some content was organized by types of literature while others organized around concepts such as subject, form, point of view, etc. Another concern was the reason for teaching literature: to prepare the student for life, to teach cultural heritage, to appreciate and understand the forms of literature. All three reasons were valid, but different formats had to be taken in each approach. A final concern was the amount of student involvement in selection of works.

The sources of literature expanded greatly for several reasons. Adolescent literature, which was increasing greatly in popularity because of its availability, was getting better. These stories provided short and easy reading which dealt with problems of adolescents. Another new source included television and movie literature. Students watched television and went to movies, so many classics, mini-series, and even popular situation comedies and dramas could be used to teach various aspects of English. As this area became more popular, teachers' guides were being provided by sponsors. Even with these new sources of literature, the classics could continue to survive and flourish because they offered rewarding reading experiences for each new generation of readers. While instructors disagreed about which ones to teach, whether to show the television or movie versions, or how many to include in the curriculum, the classics would still be taught (Hipple, as cited in Shuman, 1981).

Other sources of literature included career books, biographies, historical novels, poetry, drama, science fiction, fantasy, and popular materials and magazines. These varied sources needed to be taught

for three reasons:

> First, students need to read literature for pleasure and personal involvement. Second, students read literature to extend their ability to comprehend and manipulate new concepts and thought relationships. Third, students read literature to transcend the 'here and now' (Palmer, as cited in Shuman, 1981, p. 61).

Alpren (1967) suggested that the following principles formed the basis for literature curriculum development; therefore, they were considered when selecting content:

1. Literature deals with a subject and expresses that subject as a theme. The basic subjects and themes of literature are concerned with man and his relationship to his physical, social, and cultural environment.

2. The writer approaches that subject with a specific point of view--both physical and psychological--and from a definite perspective.

3. The writer's attitudes toward a subject is expressed through his voice--real and assumed--which is marked by a distinctive tone.

4. The distinctive voice of the writer speaks through his style, which essentially is a product of language--the choice and combination of words, sentence structures, and the rhythms of larger elements.

5. Satire, irony, and hyperbole are special attitudes and tones in which the author's intent is to criticize obviously (satire), subtly (irony), or through exaggeration (hyperbole).

6. The writer structures the material of experience into artistic forms and patterns.

7. These forms of literature have common characteristics that make it possible for them to be classified into genres or types.

8. Basic to the concept of form is the notion of order and sequence; each order and sequence can be logical, chronological, or psychological.

9. Contrast between and likeness of elements are important aspects of pattern and form in literature.

10. Such contrast and likeness are heightened through repetition, balance, and the internal rhythms of the piece itself.

11. Much of literature deals with storied elements; such storied elements have their genesis in some type of conflict.

12. Plot in stories in literature moves from complication, through conflict, to resolution.

13. Such stories in literature take place in a real or imagined setting--a time and a place.

14. Much literature deals with and focuses on character.

15. Almost all literature goes beyond the plot or literal level to suggest deeper levels of meaning; such deeper levels are suggested through image, metaphor, and symbol (pp. 92-93).

Glatthorn (1980) presented a summary of research findings which provided help in content selection of literature:

1. The reading ability of gifted students varies; instruction to help them overcome specific deficiencies will be beneficial.

2. Extensive reading of literature results in the reading of more books, in the development of more favorable attitudes toward books, and in continued growth of reading skills.

3. The student's 'identity' may be the most important determinant of differences in the fictional experience; readers re-create what the writer has written in terms of their own identity theme. Teachers need to appreciate the complex contribution of the student's past experience fantasies, feelings, and identify needs.

4. Response to literature is complex, influenced by factors such as personality, cognitive abilities, expectations, culture, reading ability, and schooling.

5. The subject matter of a work is interesting if it is related to the personal experience of the reader; people tend to become more involved in that which is related to them and tend to seek the work with which they can identify.

6. Instruction in literature affects taste and style of response (p. 61).

Literature was organized in a variety of ways. One method was the historical or chronological approach, which was used frequently because many college instructors complained that students lacked any historical sense in literature study. However, this method presented two problems: student immaturity and the magnitude of the task. Another method was organization by types, often called the generic approach, which packaged literature into units. A third type dealt with selected classics, often called the "Great Books" format. This view suggested that a core of great pieces of literature should be read by all readers. A final approach was the integrated program, unit teaching, or commonly called the thematic approach (Fowler, 1965). While all four methods were valid, only the genre approach, the selected classics approach, and the thematic approach will be discussed in detail. The historical approach could be integrated into each of these organizational methods by effective use of introductory and related information. History and literature were closely related; therefore, it was assumed that the effective English teacher would present important historical information.

Genre was "A term used in literary criticism to designate the distinct types or categories into which literary works are grouped according to form or technique, or, sometimes, subject matter" (Holman, 1975, p. 239). Literature could be divided into four basic genres: narrative fiction, drama, poetry, and non-fiction prose.

> To a greater or lesser degree, all these forms are designed to interest, entertain, stimulate, broaden, or enable. While a major purpose of non-fiction prose is to inform, the other genres also provide information,

> although this usually takes place unintentionally. All the genres share the characteristic of being art forms, with their own internal requirements of style and structure. In varying degrees, the forms are both dramatic and imaginative (Roberts, 1977, p. 3).

A narrative was ". . . a chronological account of a series of events, usually fictional, although sometimes fictional events may be tied to events that are genuinely historical" (Roberts, 1977, p. 3). Short stories, novels, myths, parables, romances, and epics formed this category. A drama or play consisted of spoken dialogue along with directions for actions and was performed on a stage by actors. The three types of drama were: tragedy, comedy, and farce.

> Poetry is a broad term that includes a great number of separate sub-types, such as sonnet, lyric, pastoral, ballad, song, ode, drama, epic, mock epic, and dramatic monologue. Essentially, poetry is a compressed and often highly emotional form of expression (Roberts, 1977, p. 4).

Non-fiction prose broadly referred to short works such as essays and articles and to longer non-fictional and non-dramatic works (Roberts, 1977).

The genre approach was not without its critics. Fowler (1965) suggested this approach emphasized the form of literature at the exclusion of the experience of man:

> This approach often ignores or overlooks an important concept in literature--the same literary theme may be expressed in poetry, the drama, fiction, or the essay. One of the purposes of . . . literature is to enable [the student] to observe the relationships of great literary themes which are expressed in various types of literature (p. 227).

Alpren (1967) said that if only one type of genre was studied per year (short story in ninth, novel in tenth, etc.), no attention was paid to the way that students really read. His solution was ". . . to develop

a spiral curriculum which will include the major literary types in all secondary grades and provide for increasingly mature analysis" (p. 90).

The second organizational type concerned the core of great pieces, often called the Great Books. These works are defined as

> . . . books of lasting appeal, offering the largest number of possible interpretations, and raising the 'persistent, unanswerable questions about the great themes in European thought' in a style that could excite and discipline the ordinary mind by its form alone (Grant and Riesman, 1978, p. 51).

The Great Books curriculum began when two University of Chicago professors decided that the college curriculum had become cluttered with courses of little relevance. They moved to Annapolis, Maryland, where they developed the Great Books curriculum at St. Johns College. An intense, four-year study of approximately 100 books evolved. The criterion of a great book, according to Hutchins (as cited in Brubaker and Rudy,1976), was a book that was contemporary in every age. Of course, the difficult four-year study of the St. John's curriculum was very different from the study at the high school level, but the goal was the same: to read the great works of the past and to critically analyze and synthesize the humanistic ideas presented.

According to the introduction to the Great Books Program, these books are studied for the following reasons:

> The Great Books Program is based on the idea that people can help one another to learn by reading and then discussing some of the best books that have been written during the past two thousand years. The Great Books offer both a challenge and a reward. They are challenging because they force us to think about difficult and basic questions: What can we know? How should we act? What may we hope to be? These are questions that underlie everything we study, everything we do, and everything we want to make of our lives. The Great Books are rewarding because the better we understand the answers they give, the better we under-

> stand ourselves and the world around us (Readings for Discussion, 1966, p. iv).

A third approach to literature was through the thematic unit. Fowler (1965) suggested that this approach presented advantages both in flexibility and comprehensiveness, since it allowed the teacher to bring in biographical and historical facts where relevant. Furthermore,

> It focuses now on one single piece of literature, now on a group of poems, plays, or short stories, and now on a combination of these expressing a common theme. It allows for a maximum of flexibility in planning, grouping, and handling of individual differences (Fowler, 1965, p. 228).

Alpren (1967) agreed that the thematic unit was a useful approach in the English curriculum. "It has immediate appeal for the young reader, helps him make important connections between the works studied, and lends itself readily to composition and discussion" (p. 90). Clendening and Davies (1980) suggested that the thematic approach provided an arena for youth-adult communication.

As literature was presented with a thematic approach, the moral or ethical dimensions became apparent. "Although it is reductive to conceive literature as sending ethical messages to readers, it is blindness not to see that there is a moral dimension (among many other dimensions) in literature" (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 159). As instructors faced this moral dimension, questions arose concerning how to come to terms with it in the classroom.

> There are two ways to achieve a major failure: first, treat the moral dimension as though it were the sole end of literature, to extract it, to encapsulate it, to divorce it from its material or dramatic embodiment and offer it to students as abstract truth; or, second, to avoid the difficulties and dangers of discussing the moral dimension by ignoring it and concentrating on formal, aesthetic, structural, or other elements. Both of these methods are reductive and lead to empathy and

> imaginative sterility in the English classroom (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 159).

The way to deal with the moral dimension was to have books of a great variety of values in the curriculum, even those which went against the accepted values of our society. The instructor should not be didactic or inculcate beliefs, but should question, discuss, and explore the literature with his students.

> Literature so explored should open to the student a variety of possibilities of values and visions, confront him--like life itself--with a multiplicity of ethical systems or moral perspectives. This expansion and deepening of the student's moral awareness constitutes the education of his moral imagination (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 159).

Literature presented with a humanities approach was a type of thematic approach. Historically, humanities was the study of history, philosophy, and literature; however,

> The study of literature . . . has had to take over the responsibilities that used to be discharged by philosophy and divinity. . . . Most young people now get their only or their chief understanding of man's moral and religious quest through literature (Bush, as cited in Fowler, 1965, p. 311).

According to Workman (1982), the study of humanities offered many important learning experiences:

> The process of discovery involves all the basic skills. There are old and new demands in this vital course. In . . . humanities the students are taught (and then they teach each other) how to look, listen, take notes, read aloud, write reports, lead small-group discussions, arrive at group consensus, make interviews, dance, sign, execute a large course project, and evaluate themselves and the course (p. 2).

Workman also pointed out that the learning was interdisciplinary with emphasis on history, philosophy, architecture, etc., all of which led to the discovery of what it meant to be a human being.

Inherent in the humanities curriculum was appreciation of the arts.

> The learning that takes place when a child experiences drama, music, or visual art is akin to what happens whan a reader interacts with a story or poem. Form and content work togethr to enhance enjoyment as well as understanding. In that context, the arts become a logical part of the language arts curriculum and can be treated effectively as such, particularly when literature is the core of that treatment (Monson, 1982, p. 254).

Also important in the humanities curriculum was the language component. Through written records the universal elements of mankind were seen. "Studies of the humanities lead to sharpened observations, critical judgments, keener appreciation, and survival of that which makes us human" (Roser, 1981, p. 451).

Before leaving the topic of literature, the question of censorship must be addressed. Many special interest groups, religious organizations, concerned parents, etc., questioned the materials used in the schools, and the literature content was often the focus. Fransecky (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that the student himself was of central concern in any censorship discussion; however, the culture of our time was decidedly permissive, and the abundance of questionable material made the censor more aware of what was being taught. The best protection for any teacher who made curriculum choices was to be aware of the book selection procedures and policies in his school district. As far as the abundance of paperbacks was concerned, the teacher could discuss the book with the department chairman, then present the reasons for selection to the administration. In this way, the teacher had not made a final decision himself.

The Committee on the Right to Read of the National Council of Teachers of English made the following statement 20 years ago, but it is still valid today:

> The right of any individual to read is basic to a democratic society. The right is based on the only tenable assumption for democratic living: that the educated free man possesses the power of discrimination and is to be entrusted with the determination of his own actions (Fransecky, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p.8).

According to Massie (1982), between 1978 and early 1982, the American Library Association reported the number of challenges to the instructional materials teachers used tripled. One group suggested that teachers were secular humanists attacking moral values while another group cried for works which did not exclude minorities and/or women. "The upshot is that teachers--subjected to vicious pressure from the right and plaintive appeals from the left--are caught in apolitical pincer" (Massie, 1982, p. 109).

While there were no easy answers concerning censorship, the literature teacher had to be aware of the problems involved. The following statement summed up the importance of the problem:

> Literature as man's illumination of man by artificial light, can do much to add depth, breadth, color, and life to the young reader, but the light of truth can only flame in the open market place. The censored teacher breathes foul air and gets only intellectual claustrophobia in a marketplace that is closed and boarded up by those unwilling to listen to his cries and his curses (Fransecky, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 223).

Language. The second major component of the English curriculum was language. In the past, language and literature were considered separate components. Language was a logical system developed primarily

by man's rational faculty and used for the primary purpose of communicating thought. Literature was merely decoration, a refinement of language, but not a necessary component of communication (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973). Perhaps it was this separation that led to the sometimes confusing role of language in today's English curriculum.

Moffett and Wagner (1976) suggested that language was not a subject like most other subjects taught, because it combined all subjects:

> It is a symbol system. It is the medium into which these other subjects are cast. . . . So a language is not just one more garment hanging among the others on a rack. It is the weaving principle by which garments come into existence. This makes it the warp and woof of the whole academic curriculum (p. 38).

Hipple (1973) suggested that the attention paid to language in the secondary school curriculum was puzzling:

> Traditional grammar has long been a subject of obloquy among research specialists in English. Their findings indicate that it is of very limited effectiveness no matter what the conventional purposes teachers use to justify its inclusion in the classroom (p. 349).

During the 1960's it became popular to teach linguistics and transformational grammar, but these methods did not work any better than the traditional methods. As a result of the confusion, teachers assumed one of three stances: they taught the traditional grammar defiantly and defensively; they ignored it and eliminated it from their curriculum; or they instituted a linguistics-based language study. Since then, the emphasis on grammar shifted; and semantics, dialect study, language history, and usage all emerged as elements of language study (Hipple, 1973).

However, there were valid aims of instruction in teaching language, both of grammar and usage. Fowler (1965, p. 167) suggested this instruction's aim was ". . . helping students understand the nature and structure of their language; establishing desirable habits of usage; and developing the command of language in speaking and writing" (p. 167). Kitzhaber (as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 19) pointed out that in many curriculum projects, language study was justified on humane grounds: "Language, the most important and complex of all human inventions, is deserving of study for its own sake, just as literature, history, and 'pure science' are". These advocates did not deny any relation between the study of language and greater skill development, but they simply stated that such claims could not be substantiated. However, many of them hoped that detailed grammar study would lead to better control over the written language.

Bushman (as cited in Hipple, 1973) listed three general areas of language which needed to be stressed: the evolution of English, the operation of contemporary English, and the operation of the "student's English." This emphasis led to teaching how to use the language, not just teaching about the language. Bushman further divided the three categories into seven subdivisions. The first dealt with the relationship between language and cultures and included language and symbols, relationship of language to speech, and linguistic change. The second category concerned phonology, morphology, and syntax in addition to the English spelling system. The third area was exploring usage from its beginnings through its changes through the centuries to present time with the dictionary as a focus. Area four was language heritage exploration which could easily parallel a literary and/or historical

survey of America or England. Also included could be borrowings from other languages. Exploring geographical and social dialects was the fifth focus. Students could study specific dialect areas, differences in American and British dialect, use of dialects in literature, etc. Exploring semantics to learn of the symbolic function of language was the next area. The use of language in politics and advertising could certainly be studied in this area. Exploring the silent language, the last category, dealt with gestures, voice tone, facial expressions, etc., which communicated non-verbally. As Bushman (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested,

> The seven categories of the language component of the English curriculum offers a vast number of resources for study; but more than that, they offer a way for the students to gain the power of language and, thus, the ability to sustain control over his world in the community in which he lives (p. 352).

Bushman (as cited in Hipple, 1973) was against forcing language study in pure form with the claim that the student would become a better speaker or writer. The process should be emphasized through oral and written composition. When definite areas of trouble became apparent, the instructor would teach grammar directly.

Goodman (as cited in Shuman, 1981) suggested that three major questions about language and its application to learning experiences were considered in curriculum development and selection:

1. What do scholars in the field of language know that is significant in the development of language curriculum? What is the knowledge available that must be understood in order to build approriate language curriculum?

2. From the knowledge base, what is necessary for teachers to know and what should be organized in such a way to teach to students? What do students need to know about language?

3. How can the curriculum be organized so students use language in order to maximize their growth in language use? (pp. 30-31).

The scientific study of language had greatly increased since the turn of the century, and evidence showed that children developed a systematic approach to language learning and written development. Research had also indicated that:

> Learning specifics about language such as grammar, spelling, and phonics may improve scores on tests of grammar, spelling, and phonics; however, such learning in and of itself has little impact on improved speaking, listening, reading, and writing in the everyday use of these language processes (Goodman, as cited in Shuman, 1981, p. 32).

Instead, the more people read, wrote, spoke, or listened, the more proficient they became. These elements had to be kept in mind as language content was planned.

Two areas relating to language should be taught: learning about language and using language, keeping in mind that the exploration, the forms, and materials used should be based on the concerns, interest, and relevance to the students. As students learned about language by listening to friends, adults, or television, they could recognize the diverse elements; and, in turn, they would learn to use language correctly. Teachers could also help students as they discussed writing assignments and focused on individual problems (Goodman, as cited in Shuman, 1981).

The second area of concern was the development of proficient users of language. The English curriculum would be organized so that the greatest amount of time was spent learning to use language and only about 25 percent learning about language. Knowledge about language would come from its use, and not be a prerequisite to its use.

As students read, wrote, spoke, and listened, they would enjoy learning about language; and no dictionary study or vocabulary exercise could develop such knowledge (Goodman, as cited in Shuman, 1981).

Glatthorn (1980) listed several research findings concerning the teaching of grammar and spelling:

1. Teachers should understand the distinctions among three commonly confused terms: linguistics is the scientific study of language; it includes grammar, the principles of word and sentence formation, and usage, the changing fashions of so-called correctness within regional and social dialects.

2. The study of traditional grammar does not help a student write better and, in fact, may hinder development as a writer.

3. Diagramming does not work well enough to justify all the time and bother; it also seems to perpetuate a distorted and incomplete picture of English structure because of its dependence upon a Latinate grammar.

4. Instruction in mechanics is most effective in the rewriting stage, in response to an individual's needs; previous teaching of grammatical technology is unnecessary.

5. Spelling ability and reading ability are highly correlated.

6. There is as yet no field-tested substitute for direct instruction on the basic core of high-frequency words needed by children and adults in their writing.

7. It is more efficient to study words from lists, rather than from context; words are learned more quickly, are more easily remembered, and are more readily transferred to a new context.

8. Only a few rules should be taught--those with few or no exceptions.

9. There is some tentative evidence that writing activities designed to enhance syntactic skills will lead to improved reading comprehension (pp. 66-68).

In conclusion,

The study of language today stands at a new frontier.

> It has wide horizons; it draws on a range of materials of a vitality and richness and flexibility undreamed of in an earlier era. It emphasizes creation rather than dissection. Instead of handing the student a narrow list of prohibitions to memorize, the teacher sends him to language in use--his own and that of others--for the purpose of exploring, discovering, observing, and finally creating an infinite variety of patterns of language possible for the users of English (Fowler, 1965, p. 163).

Composition. The third major component of the English content was composition or writing. As with other areas, there was disagreement about how this should be taught.

> The only agreement seemingly possible about composition is that everybody is in favor of it--and of its importance to the curriculum. About almost everything else--the way it is to be taught, the number of themes that should be written, the type of writing that should be emphasized--there is heated controversy (Alpren, 1967, p. 92).

Fowler (1965) suggested that the writing process was much more than just learning the correct mechanics, but that it dealt with the thoughts, heartaches, and joys of youth:

> Writing during the adolescent years can be for both student and teacher a richly rewarding experience. At its best, it becomes a means of individual growth and a challenging intellectual exercise for the exploration of ideas (p. 129).

Larsen (as cited in Hipple, 1973) felt that composition was unlike most other elements in the English curriculum since

> . . . the work in written composition is intended to help students achieve successful performance, not simply cognitive knowledge (as in the study of language) or sensitivity in the understanding of others' writing (often the goal of the study of literature) (p. 300).

Bacig (as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 300), on the other hand, suggested that ". . . the real rationale for writing is in its humanizing

potential, its capacity to help us order our universe or discover our 'selves.'"

Fowler (1965) presented the following writing goals:

> Organization, accuracy, clarity, and economy are probably the virtues most in demand in writing today. In addition to these, most thoughtful teachers wish to encourage students to write honestly and responsibly, using language with care, integrity, and sensitivity (p. 133).

Hartig (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested seven purposes for writing. The assignment purpose, when the student was required to produce a product merely because it had been assigned, could not, by itself, lead to effective writing. The altruistic purpose, a conscious desire to please the reader, to help him understand, and to respect his feelings and intelligence, required maturity and responsibility. The persuasive purpose required the writer to take his work seriously, think clearly, and mean what he said. The informational purpose showcased the writer's ideas and thoughts supported by factual evidence and logical reasoning. The self-expressive purpose generally included the creative element of writing such as poetry, but all types of writing offered the opportunity to communicate a writer's ideas. The creative purpose, related to self-expression, went beyond and reached for a higher level of achievement in terms of an artistic standard or ideal. The final purpose, problem-solving, clarified and explored the writer's own thoughts and ideas. Students would hopefully respect and value their own writing, read and revise it, and, as a result, learn much about themselves.

According to Holman (1975), there were four types of composition: narrative, descriptive, exposition, and argumentation. The purpose of

narrative writing was to recount an event or series of events. The two forms included simple narrative which merely recited an event or events and was basically chronological and narrative with plot, which was arranged according to a plot. Of course, in either instance, the major purpose was to instruct and entertain. Descriptive writing was basically the picturing of a scene or setting, and while often taught as a separate entity, was often used with other types of writing, especially narrative. Details were carefully selected, images were clear and concrete, and words of color, sound, and motion were employed. Exposition or expository writing explained an idea, a theme, or the nature of an object. Various components included analysis, comparison and contrast, identification, illustration, classification, and definition. While it could be used apart from the other types, it was often blended. Argumentation, as with the other types, was often combined. The purpose was to convince the reader by presenting the truth or falsity of an idea. While it was often combined with exposition, it differed technically, since exposition was content with an explanation while argumentation sought to convince.

Roberts (1977) suggested 18 separate kinds of writing assignments which could be written about literature. The precis, or abstract, was a shortening in one's own words of a work. The summary theme went beyond the precis by requiring a structure containing a central idea, a thesis sentence, and topic sentences. The report was between the summary theme and analysis in that the student ". . . will need to write a summary that is a quick, thumb-nail sketch of a work, while also dealing with the principal object of writing about literature, namely, analysis and evaluation" (Roberts, 1977, p. 43). The character

analysis theme dealt with the inner qualities which determined how a person reacted to situations in life. The point of view theme concerned the method of presentation and analysis concerning why it was chosen. Setting, the environment in which the story occurred, dealt with both physical and temporal objects. The theme expressing ideas explained a concept, thought, opinion, or belief which came from the process of thinking. The theme on close reading grew out of the previous one. It could be either general or very specific, but the underlying assumption was that each part of the work was essential, and a careful analysis revealed the true intent. The theme on a specific problem required persuasiveness to convince the reader the problem had indeed been solved.

The theme of comparison-contrast compared authors, works by the same author, different drafts of a common work, characters, incidents, and ideas in the same or different works. The theme analyzing structure dealt with the organization of a work influenced by the plot or main idea. Imagery and its companion symbolism provided the focus for the next theme as these components were analyzed as to how they evoked responses. The theme of tone discussed the means by which a writer conveyed attitudes. The theme analyzing prosody studied the sound and rhythm in poetry and their relation to the other parts. Another assignment was the theme analyzing prose style. "Style is usually understood to mean the way in which writers employ their words, phrases, and sentences to achieve the desired effects" (Roberts, 1977, p. 200). The theme of evaluation was one of the most important types of literary writing. "Evaluation implies that there are ideal standards of excellence by which decisions about quality can

be made, but it must be remembered that these standards are flexible. . . ." (Roberts, 1977, p. 216). The review was a general essay concerning a work, also referred to as a critique, a critical review, or an essay. While the review was a free form, all aspects of a work were relevant and should be included. The final type, the theme on film, represented a specialized form of drama combining dialogue, monologue, action, spectacle and photography, editing, film development, and sound. A technical awareness was needed in order to analyze a film effectively. The preceding assignments, for the most part, were presented in a sequence of thought and difficulty; and as such, they provided a basis for a broad scope and a valid sequence in a writing program.

Another type of specialized writing was the term paper, an area of controversy. Problems with resources, time, and plagiarism abounded, but because a large percentage of students pursued college careers, it was an important component of the curriculum, especially in the final years. Butler (1982) suggested several reasons why a research paper should be undertaken. High school students seldom produced an extended piece of expository writing; most assignments were brief essays. The students became involved with the subject in a manner that was impossible in a brief paper. This deeper emphasis led to pride in their writing efforts combined with added responsibility. In addition, the practical skills involved were needed in college work. While some opponents suggested that the colleges should teach the research paper because of their superior resources, Butler felt the high school must first provide the foundation. Finally, the entire process covered a large range of skills. "Research, collation,

organization, depth, value judgments, reading abilities, specific writing skills, and pride in the crafting of a major work--all are involved in writing a term paper" (p. 4).

Another type of writing was creative writing as opposed to factual writing. Warriner and Griffeth (1973) presented the following difference in the two types:

> All writing is creative in the sense that any piece of writing is a creation; it is something that never existed before. However, the term 'creative writing' has a special meaning. It usually means a more personal kind of writing than the kind normally required in school courses and in life after you graduate. It includes stories, personal essays, and poems. Creative writing is literary writing as distinguished from practical workaday writing. It is imaginative rather than factual. It attempts to interest the reader, to stir his feelings, to amuse and entertain him, rather than to inform or to explain (p. 632).

Before creative writing was undertaken, some understanding about the creative process was necessary. Torrence (1965, p. 3) stated that creativity ". . . is usually defined in terms of either a process or a product, but may also be defined in terms of a personality or an environmental condition." Clark (1979) felt that creativity nearly defied definition because of its very special condition. However, certain categories of creativity could be identified:

> . . . rational thinking; high levels of emotional development or feeling; talent and high levels of mental and physical development; and higher levels of consciousness, resulting in use of imagery, fantasy, and breakthroughs to the preconscious or unconscious states (p. 245).

In order to develop creative writing, teachers needed to give purpose to it. Creative writing skills were not developed by assigning a theme a week, but they needed nurture with suggestions given, examples studied, and time given to complete an assignment. In addition,

critical evaluation would not be included too frequently (Torrence, 1965).

The content of the creative writing component included the production of poems, short stories, a play or television script, and personal essays with the following skills stressed:

> Fluency - quality thinking of many possibilities;
>
> Flexibility - categories, thinking of different kinds of possibilities;
>
> Originality - new, thinking of novel, unique, or unusual possibilities;
>
> Elaboration - embellishing, thinking of details or possibilities (Kaplan, 1977, p. 86).

Glatthorn (1980) summarized the following research findings concerning composition:

1. The study of grammar is an ineffective way to teach writing and takes time away from reading and writing.

2. Frequency of writing in and of itself is not associated with improvement of writing.

3. There is a positive relationship between good writing and increased reading experiences.

4. Beneficial results accrue from the use of such prewriting procedures as thinking, talking, working in groups, role playing, interviews, debates, and problem-solving.

5. 'Teachers should give greater emphasis to the guiding of careful development of a limited number of papers, with careful attention given to direct methods of instruction and to the solving of communication problems before and during the writing process, rather than on the hurried production of a great number of papers' (Haynes, as cited in Glatthorn, 1980, p. 59).

6. There is some evidence that sentence-combining practice, without instruction in formal grammar, is an aid to syntactic fluency.

7. While there seems to be no evidence to support one revision process over another, there is substantial

evidence that the revision process itself is critical in improving writing.

8. The kind or intensity of teacher evaluation of composition is unrelated to improvement in writing skill.

9. Written language is closely related to oral language. Teaching should emphasize and exploit the close connection between written and oral language.

10. The quality of students' writing is unaffected by positive or negative criticism, but positive comments are more effective than negative ones in promoting positive attitudes toward writing.

11. Peer evaluation and editing are effective in improving writing skills (pp. 59-60).

Communication. Another important component of the curriculum was the communication area which included both speaking and listening. Klein (as cited in Shuman, 1981) pointed out the importance of oral language:

> Oral language continues to be our primary communication mode. Decisions about us--our personalities, our social and professional competence--are made on the basis of our ability to use this language in oral exchange with others (p. 47).

In addition,

> Though global in concern, the responsibility for developing literacy skills will continue to fall upon the shoulders of those who have historically been entrusted with their teaching--the English teacher, and language arts teacher, and/or the speech teacher (p. 47).

However, Kitzhaber (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that speech instruction was usually neglected in the English classroom. Speech had been separated as a separate subject; teachers were not prepared to teach speech, the speech lessons in English texts were not adequate, and it took much time for oral presentations.

Listening, too, had often been neglected in the English classroom. It was ". . . an activity which is always included under the language arts designation and which everyone agrees is important, but which no one appears to know how to teach" (Kitzhaber, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 18).

The following goals for speech work and listening training were suggested: ease and fluency, clarity, responsibility, and critical listening. Since these were not automatic, they had to be taught in an integrated program. Special units or short talks used periodically were not enough; instead,

> . . . speaking becomes a normal part of the everyday work in English as students meet in groups, plan panels, or round-table discussions, give oral reports, make tape recordings to improve their use of language, and read literature aloud. Listening, too, becomes part of the program, with time spent in analyzing listening skills, practicing for improvement in accurate and critical listening, and learning to listen for appreciation of language and literature (Fowler, 1965, p. 77).

Clendening and Davies (1980) suggested that speaking be perceived as a communication tool with the following perceptions:

> Perceive that speech is a vehicle for conveying thought and emotion.
>
> Perceive that effective speaking is a learned process.
>
> Perceive the requirements for a speech of quality and effectiveness.
>
> Perceive the distinguishing characteristics of the speech designed to entertain or amuse.
>
> Perceive the distinguishing characteristics of the speech designed to inform or instruct.
>
> Perceive the distinguishing characteristics of the speech designed to stimulate or actuate through emotion.

> Perceive the distinguishing characteristics of the speech designed to convince or move to action.
>
> Perceive the distinguishing characteristics of debate (p. 519).

Klein (as cited in Shuman, 1981) listed two factors which shaped the direction of oral language instruction. The first was the increased understanding of language as "the house in which we live. It shapes in critical ways our sense of self and, even more fundamentally, our ability to get along in the world" (p. 46). A second factor concerned the heightened sense of community awareness in the areas of purposes and directions of education and the responsibilities of the schools. While language had always been a tool for transmission of information or self-expression, it helped in the processing and monitoring the growing boundaries of the rapidly expanding knowledge base of today's society. And, as to the second factor, public demands for accountability, tightened budgets, and curriculum policy decisions increased the demand for more oral communication skills.

Mass Media. The final area of content in the English curriculum was the mass media. The importance of this area could not be overlooked. As Fowler (1965) suggested,

> It seems clear that if schools are to produce citizens who are intelligent and critical listeners, readers, and viewers of the mass media, they must take some interest in recommending good entertainment, in developing standards of taste and appreciation, and in increasing the intelligent and critical use of the media (p. 333).

Media

> . . . is commonly understood to refer to broadcast or publically disseminated music, words, pictures, and/or speech. In the context of the classroom, media usually refers to the broad range of audiovisual instructional

> materials and the equipment necessary for their use (Cleaver, as cited in Shuman, 1981, p. 93).

Hipple (1973) suggested that for years English teachers had two opinions about the mass media: those who regarded the media as enemies and never used it in the English classroom, and those who used the media as adjuncts to printed materials but not as tools in themselves. However, with the emerging popularity of media, teachers began to see its importance. "In sum, the decade of the 1960's ushered into the schools the instruments and artifacts of the mass media and the movement shows every sign of continuing and increasing during the decades ahead" (Hipple, 1973, p. 227).

Whether good or bad, radios, television, movies, newspapers, and magazines were the chief recreational fare of adult years; and there was little chance of returning to a book-dominated culture. Also, because the mass media supplied information to students, they needed to become critical readers and viewers. In addition, media studies provided resources in teaching speaking, reading, writing, and listening. "They provide a textbook of constantly changing materials for the development of critical thinking and the study of language--the basic part of the English teacher's job" (Fowler, 1965, p. 334). The following goals were suggested for a mass media program: train students to become widely acquainted with sources of information and become more discriminating in their use; train students to evaluate the authority of sources and to judge critically the value of the opinions; and improve skills and appreciation of language and literature through media materials (Fowler, 1965).

Johnson (1981) was concerned about the negative effects of the media:

> Hours upon hours spent in front of the tube mean equivalently fewer hours spent daydreaming, fantasizing, acting out impulses in rituals and games that the child plays alone. It is in those hours that the child reflects upon his or her experiences and begins to forge a separate identity (p. 53).

The schools could be the only hope for offsetting the "homogenizing and trivializing effects" of the media by affirming their commitment to the humanities and liberal arts as well as developing analysis and critical viewing skills (p. 54).

Deer (as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 229) thought English instructors should view the media as new languages: "Briefly, the main idea is this: films, television, radio, magazines, and newspapers all have 'subjects' which they can communicate best, and unique ways of communicating those subjects." Furthermore, the mass media and popular arts provided sources for stylistic and logical problems as well as materials for compositions and literary problems. Teachers worked for improvement in the media since the book culture was being taken over in some areas by the media. "To assume no responsibility is to leave the field to those less prepared to command it" (Deer, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 229).

In summary, Cleaver (as cited in Shuman, 1981, p. 95) suggested the following use for the media: "Media can be used in the classroom to provide vicarious experience, to stimulate ideas, to extend the students' world. They will also be used to provide students with alternatives in content and teaching style."

One final concern of content selection was the choice of instructional materials, especially in the media.

> No local choice has more influence on instruction in English than has the selection of instructional materials. Probably at no other time in the history of education has more ingenuity been exercised in developing instructional materials than is being shown today. Variety in kind is matched by an abundance coming in part from improvements in the mass media--television, transparency projection, and copying machines, to name a few. Both variety and abundance can lead to confusion. Faced with myriad choices for organizing the instructional program in English, those concerned with the teaching of English must continually inform themselves of curriculum innovations. To become informed requires a willingness to study and to try out new ideas, an ability to distinguish between change that produces progress and change merely for its own sake, and a knowledge of old and new procedures for evaluating innovations (Bennett, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 29).

Learning Activities

Various learning activities could be utilized in presenting each of the components of the English curriculum. Suggestions concerning each of the five language arts areas provided varied procedures.

As modern teachers presented literature instruction, they were less concerned with detail questions and more interested in questions which caused students to relate to their own experiences. Approaches focusing on values, responses, and imagination were used with increasing emphasis (Hipple, 1973).

Miller (as cited in Hipple, 1973) used three terms to describe the contemporary literature teacher: informality, flexibility, and improvisation. Two major goals provided concentration:

> He will try to meet each student wherever he is, to honestly engage his understanding, his interest, his imagination, his emotional energies. . . . And after

> he has reached the student, the modern teacher will try every means at his disposal to provide the experience that will grow into the lasting commitment. . . . (p. 160).

Furthermore, three elements were stressed: vitality, drama, and creativity. "It is imperative that the literature offered to students connect somehow, in meaningful and vital ways, with their lives" (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 161). While involving, awakening, and inspiring the student were the beginnings, the student must be permitted to go as far as his abilities allowed, and if he was to transfer the classroom experiences to his future life, he had to develop his critical and analytical faculties through meaningful literary experiences.

Literature contained both an intellectual and affective content, and both had to be realized.

> While an overemphasis of the intellectual response results in a tendency to glibness, abstraction, and sterility, and overemphasis of the emotional response may result in superficiality, muddlement, and gush. As in so many areas of life, a sensible balance needs to be struck (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 162).

Therefore, close, detailed, line-by-line reading of works was likely to appear. "And this kind of experience will tend to merge with later experiences in the analysis and criticism of a variety of kinds of literary texts" (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1972, p. 163). Furthermore, "As in all teaching, the best methods are inductive, and the student is most likely to be moved by a poem or story that he has discovered on his own, perhaps for an exercise in critical analysis" (Miller, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 162).

The goal of the student leaving high school English was a lifetime habit of reading books, but in addition, ". . . it is hoped

further that he has developed the habit of reading with understanding books of real merit. For selection of books to read he needs a critical sense, . . ." (Bennett, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 162). In order to develop this critical awareness, the literature teacher had to turn his classroom into a vehicle for critical controversy as students dealt with questions of passion and value. "In developing a critical sense, the student will come to know that there are many ways of seeing, many ways of entering, and many ways of understanding any piece of literature" (Bennett, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 163).

Atwood (1976) suggested an outline of critical reading skills based on the idea that reading was a form of communication, while deliberate social contact and expression were important components. Once a student realized that each thing read was a unique experience for each person, reading took on a different connotation; there was no right or wrong interpretation. A reader must sift, sort, condense, analyze and evaluate according to his own experience and purpose. . . . He should be alerted to the implications of inaccurate or poorly communicated messages, as well as extremely persuasive messages (Atwood, 1976, p. 5). Furthermore, the student realized that most messages were sent to reach, not confuse their audiences. The following was Atwood's outline of skills:

I. Receiving a basic message.

II. Identifying the components of communications.

III. Determining the various time periods involved in communication.

IV. Understanding the interaction among the various components.

V. Understanding the impact of time on the various components.

VI. Assessing a message sender's impact on communication.

VII. Assessing an audience; (reader's) impact on communication.

VIII. Analyzing a message.

IX. Evaluating a message (pp. 7-9).

One learning activity of the literature component which caused disagreement was the book report. According to Hipple (1973), the book report did not make the student read more, but instead, often caused him to develop a dislike for the report which carried over to the book itself. Clendening and Davies (1980, p. 127) agreed: "Because the book report has probably done more to destroy the love of reading and the joy of books than any other single educational practice, . . . [it is] to be avoided. . . ."

As instructors planned learning activities involving language study, the difference between language, grammar, and usage had to be realized.

> Language includes speech and its related forms. . . . Grammar is the study of the way the language works. . . . Usage refers to the choices speakers make in the forms and meanings of words and the appropriateness of these choices to the situations in which they are used (Fowler, 1965, pp. 164-165).

Hipple (1973) suggested the basic elements of usage problems be reviewed, but weeks of a high school curriculum would not be spent dealing with problems which existed for only a few. When a student had a specific problem, then the instructor could work individually to correct it, "But we surely don't want to spread his disease to the entire class by making them study the problem whether they have it or not" (Hipple, 1973, p. 130).

Grammar activities should focus on teaching methods associated with student writing, not on the traditional memorization of skills. However, certain areas needed to be explored in grammar study:

> The word classes; the basic sentence patterns and syntactical structures; the operations of coordination, subordination, and modification, the intonation patterns, pauses, and stresses which operate as a signal system in English; and the 'mechanics' of transcribing speech into writing: punctuation and spelling (Fowler, 1965, p. 186).

If these areas were stressed during the composition process once the basic elements were learned, they would be reinforced more readily.

Spelling and punctuation offered areas of difficulty for many students.

> Both are imperfect notations of speech, and both are frozen by printers' forms. They consume a great deal of time which might more profitably be given to other aspects of reading and writing. Nevertheless, an adequate command of the conventions of English punctuation and spelling is an important criterion of educational and cultural background. At least minimal competence in the mechanics of English is demanded by industry, the professions, or almost any position requiring more than mechanical skills (Fowler, 1965, p. 199).

Spelling posed a special problem. Sherwin (as cited in Hipple, 1973) found several interesting points concerning spelling in research studies. Modern students did not spell as well as students did around mid-century; however, it could be that the students were a more select group in the earlier time period. Rules offered only limited help in spelling instruction; they were generally more effective with brighter students. Teaching the "hard spot" in spelling words was a waste of time, and dividing words into syllables was of doubtful use. Finally, if spelling was to be taught, the test-study method was better than the study-test.

Hipple (1973) suggested eliminating spelling at the higher grade levels:

> What we do is to provide as easy way to get top grades for those of our students who enter our classes knowing how to spell already and condemn the rest to a kind of weekly punishment similar in psychology and duration to the Chinese water treatment (p. 129).

Learning the correct use of a dictionary was a more reasonable learning technique for the poor speller at the high school level.

Several principles could be used in developing learning activities in writing. Alpren (1967) believed mastery of writing should move sequentially from sentence to paragraph to whole theme, and there were certain structural principles around which the writing curriculum should be based: writing as thinking, writing as seeing, writing as knowing the nature of the subject, writing as communicating, writing as language, and writing as pattern.

Moffett and Wagner (1976) provided the following suggestions concerning how to teach writing:

> Talking to others and talking to oneself teach writing, because they are composing acts. So, above the literacy level writing can be taught, like reading, through activities other than itself that are oral, social, and intellectual. This opens the way for teaching composition by a rich variety of means. What you should do is arrange for those talking and thinking activities that will develop oral composition so that when students do transcribe their inner speech, they write something interesting and effective. Anything that can be said can be written, and if someone cannot say something (at least to himself) he will not be able to write it either (p. 149).

Hartig (as cited in Hipple, 1973) suggested that the literature concerning composition instruction emphasized providing many opportunities to practice writing, based on the theory that the best way to learn to write was to write. Another emphasis was the correct

understandings about language, logic, and semantic and rhetorical principles. However, he suggested that an important aspect of writing had received little attention, namely, the attitude and purpose of the writer. "Effective theme writing depends very much upon the writer's having a clear and complete conception of his exact purposes in writing" (Hartig, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 307). Therefore, the first step in the writing process was having the writer think carefully about his purposes. If there were several purposes, the writer needed to identify all and then decide which ones he wished to stress. Furthermore, the writer needed to look for hidden purposes and be aware of them.

Bacig (as cited in Hipple, 1973) listed two basic principles for teaching composition. First, Bloom's taxonomy was used in order to realize the attitudinal dimensions of composition. Students should be convinced that writing could be used to share, shape experiences, to discover things about themselves, without fear of grades, teacher reprisals, or administrative outrage. Second, the instructor would reintroduce the playful and creative dimensions of writing with the realization that all students had creative potential.

Applebee, Lehr, and Auten (1981) suggested the following steps to improve writing:

> A first step in improving writing of secondary school students calls for more situations in which writing serves as a tool for learning, rather than as a means to display acquired knowledge. . . . As a second step, we need to bring recent work on the nature of the composing process to the attention of many teachers and to provide them with a framework for analyzing the contexts within which they ask students to write. . . . Creating contexts in which writing serves natural purposes is our third suggestion for improving the teaching of writing. . . . In suggesting a shift from

> writing to display information toward writing to fulfill natural communicative functions, we believe natural contexts will foster and support the learning of information and skills (pp. 81-82).

Finally, Fowler (1965) suggested that writing was a difficult task which required hand/brain coordination, attention to spelling, punctuation, neatness, sentence structure, word choice, placement, etc. Furthermore, "Students do not learn to write better by drilling in grammar exercises or learning prescriptive rules about formal grammar" (Fowler, 1965, p. 131). Writing was a two-way process, with the writer needing an audience. Writing was based on experience, and even when writing about literature, the paper should reflect his own experience. Writing improved with practice; and continual writing developed fluency, skill, and control. With these ideas in mind, a sequential program in composition would be arranged from simple to complex, easy to difficult, brief to longer, with a focus chiefly on the student's own world of experience to increasingly challenging topics demanding logical thinking. Each year's work would include the following types of writing:

> . . . some free and spontaneous informal writing, both in and out of class. This subject matter may be the feelings, reactions, opinions, memories, thoughts, fantasies, or insights of the writer. The practice of keeping journals, diaries, or 'thought books' should be encouraged.
>
> . . . some imaginative writing, free as to form and length, possibly unscheduled, and perhaps ungraded, often personal and private. Such writing can provide releases and offer a chance for creative expression and imaginative invention.
>
> . . . much expository writing in various forms to provide for development of the essential skills of using language accurately and honestly, and exercising faculties of logical reasoning and analytic thinking.

> . . . the research paper is discussed here as the library report. The skills of gathering and documenting materials should be taught. . . (p. 158).

This program included the following types of writing: simple exposition, narration, reporting, description, library reports, writing about books, argument and opinion, critical writing and analysis, and exercises in style.

The area of composition provided many fascinating opportunities for computer use. Students could revise an entire paper without having to rewrite the entire thing, which resulted in better writing (McGee and Peck, 1982). As Hennings (1981, p. 42) suggested, "No longer is editing a cumbersome process requiring physical rewriting. Editing becomes a fun process quickly effected by a few pecks at the keyboard that brings changes into view immediately on the monitor."

While many educators were reluctant to become involved in computer assisted instruction (CAI), it was an area of concern in the curriculum. While instructors sometimes felt the computer depersonalized instruction, this idea came from misuse.

> It is no more depersonalizing to type a composition on a computer keyboard and revise it on a screen than it is to handwrite that composition on paper. Actually, the machine-based operation may be more personal because of the greater speed of the process and the elimination of the need to copy and recopy what has been written (Hennings, 1981, p. 43).

While the computer could be used in functions other than composition in the English classroom, it offered great advances in writing. However, by using programs in language, ". . . the traditionally remote function of the English teacher is relegated to a machine that won't balk at the drudgery, freeing the teacher to spend time with the more involved and subtle questions of writing" (Powers, as cited in

Shuman, 1981, p. 112). In addition, the computer helped hone the reasoning and thinking skills which have been taught and used by English teachers for years. Also, problem solving skills were demonstrated.

> A computer-literate individual is in the habit of think-analytially and welcomes the opportunity to solve problems perceived not as problems but as challenges. It is the English teacher, more than any other, who is already well-qualified to provide the necessary skills to build that habit of thought and to give direction to its application (Wilson, 1981, p. 52).

In conclusion, "As teachers, our challenge is to integrate the microcomputer into a curriculum that meets its objectives while retaining its humanity" (McGee and Peck, 1982, p. 23).

The nature of listening and speaking in the English classroom changed from the times when the teacher did all the speaking and the students did all the listening. Now students talk in many ways in English classes, in speech, in small groups, in debates, in plays. In order to plan effective discussions and to foster both speaking and listening skills, the following rules should be followed for conducting discussions:

1. The teacher will allow thinking time when a student is asked a question.

2. If the student is getting off the track, or if the answer seems too involved, the teacher only reserves the option of polite interruption.

3. All students are expected to participate in the discussion.

4. Students may challenge or disagree with one another and with the teacher as long as they are courteous and are able to support their positions.

5. The students may ask for clarification of the question if it is not clear.

6. The teacher may request clarification if the response is unclear.

7. A prearranged signal will be used to indicate inaudibility.

8. Discussion participants may feel free to modify their views if other positions seem more reasonable, more feasible, or better, in the light of further information. The modification is permissible, not mandatory. The teacher will evaluate pupil response on the basis of quality and quantity.

9. If other limitations are to be placed, such as textbook-only answers, time limit, brief answers only, the teacher will indicate this before beginning the discussion (Lindman, as cited in Hipple, 1973, p. 439).

The mass media offered learning activities related to all the areas discussed previously. Literature, language, composition, listening, and speaking could all be taught through the various components of the mass media, and the creative instructor could devise numerous possibilities.

Torrence (1965) suggested that in all components of the curriculum, teachers should provide opportunities for creative behavior, then develop the skills and strategies of inquiry. Creative achievements could be rewarded in the following ways:

> We need to be respectful of the unusual questions children ask.
>
> We must be respectful of the unusual ideas and solutions of children.
>
> We need to show children that their ideas have value.
>
> We need to provide opportunities and give credit for self-initiated learning.
>
> We also need to provide chances for children to learn, think, and discover without threats of immediate evaluation (Torrence, 1965, p. 16).

Evaluation

Evaluation was the final component of the currriculum. Moffett and Wagner (1976) stated that language arts evaluation served five functions:

> It should indicate to the individual student how effectively he is communicating, to the parent how much the student is learning in school, to the teacher the needs of the student for diagnosing and advising, to the administrator how good a job the teacher is doing, and to all parties how effectively the curriculum and materials reach their goals (p. 415).

In order to do justice to all five functions without letting the evaluation task overrun the classroom, two cardinal principles were followed. First, each party would perform his/her own evaluating. Second, evaluation would not distort, dictate, or displace what it measured. In addition, since learning was the function of education, evaluation would be used to further learning.

> If evaluation ends by determining what is taught and how it is taught, by grossly or subtly turning learning from one thing into another not originally intended, or by simply appropriating to itself the time and energy that could be used for more learning, it is bad evaluation (Moffett and Wagner, 1976, p. 416).

In conclusion, a dilemma was faced concerning evaluation: "A lot of evaluation is needed, because a number of different parties and purposes must be served, and yet a lot of evaluation destroys the very learning it is supposed to facilitate" (Moffett and Wagner, 1976, p. 417).

In order to overcome the problems associated with evaluation, Moffett and Wagner (1976, p. 417) suggested that "The secret is to evaluate by means of valid learning activities themselves without making students do additional activities only for the purpose of

evaluation." Since students were expected to spend their time learning, if students were constantly producing and if the teacher was circulating and observing, then evaluation became possible without special evaluation activities. In language arts, listening, reading, and witnessing activities could be followed by productive activities which let the instructor evaluate the learning activities. Other methods of evaluation included performing, discussing, acting out texts, or translating texts into other media.

Moffett and Wagner (1976) suggested that English instructors should work toward eliminating grades:

> Both students and parents must and do evaluate for themselves anyway. Grades maintain a competitive atmosphere that militates against learning. . . . So long as grades must be turned in on students, collaboration tends to be viewed as cheating and discouraged because individual marks become harder to make up. Thus a powerful learning force is stymied. . . . Grades distract students from the actual goals of effective communication. While competing and comparing themselves, they are also aiming to please adults, which is not a school goal. . . . The job of schools is to take each student as far as they can in the time they have responsibility for his education. For this, not grades or value judgments of individuals are necessary. . . . Grades do not really serve the student, the parent, the teacher, or the administrator, each of whom must do his own evaluating. The mission of schools is learning, and that mission is impaired so long as schools continue to act as screening agencies for employers (pp. 422-423).

Mandel (as cited in Ohmann and Coley, 1973) suggested that an instructor could teach without evaluating or judging. His method worked on the premise that grades and measurement prevented education more than encouraged it. Six rules were followed by the instructor:

1. I listen until I hear.

2. I look until I see.

3. I psychologically support and encourage any signs of intellectual and emotional energy.

4. I encourage interaction among students.

5. I advise, but never force or require.

6. I try to be intellectually and emotionally honest and accessible (pp. 224-225).

The following pedagogical devices were never used:

1. Never call on anybody who has not volunteered.

2. Never correct an interpretation.

3. Never berate students for lack of knowledge, understanding, or hard work.

4. Never use lecture as the dominate approach.

5. Never require specific projects at specific times (Mandel, as cited in Ohmann and Coley, 1973, p. 225).

However, in order to satisfy administrators, Mandel (as cited in Ohmann and Coley, 1973) assigned grades on a quantitative basis rather than a qualitative one. Various projects were assigned to a certain grade, then students chose the desired grade and contracted with the instructor. Of course:

> . . . contract grading calls for an act--even a leap--of faith in students. . . . But I believe that in a non-judgmental, unpunitive, encouraging context, students will want to work toward achieving self-styles and often very challenging goals (p. 230).

Roberts (1977) suggested the English instructor had three major concerns in evaluating tests:

> to see the extent of [a student's] command over the subject of the course, to see how well [a student is] able to think about the material, and to see how well [a student] can actually respond to a question or address [himself] to an issue (p. 246).

Factual questions such as multiple choice, identification, and technical and analytical questions and problems were given to test the

student's factual command as well as his quickness in relating a part to a whole. General or comprehensive questions tested the student's total comprehension of the material. Not only was an answer supplied, but a structure for the answer was created. The instructor judged how intelligently the student selected material or quotations, how well the material was organized, how adequate and intelligent the generalizations were, and how relevant were the facts used to illustrate.

Diederich (1974) discussed the various types of tests given in English classes. Since the highest overall reliability that examiners consistently attained in grades on essays was about .70, short sections of objective items should be included in tests since they had higher reliability. While English teachers generally viewed objective tests as dealing with only the most superficial aspects of English, they could be written with unity. Other types of English activities which could be tested objectively included vocabulary tests, listening comprehension, English usage, sentence structure, and punctuation.

Hipple (1973) suggested that instructors eliminate two types of evaluation: pop quizzes and literature tests on details. Pop quizzes had no part in the learning process, since "About the only thing the teacher of English who uses pop quizzes reveals is the unfortunate paucity of his motivational skills; rarely do such insults to students provide much other information" (Hipple, 1973, p. 127). Instead of threatening students with a pop quiz, the teacher needed to make the assignments exciting so that the student would want to read them. As far as literature tests on details were concerned, some instructors made up questions so difficult that not even the author could answer them. "Let's focus our evaluative efforts on broad ideas, and by so

doing, allow students to make differing responses to literature which we selected, after all, because we wanted the literature to affect our students" (Hipple, 1973, p. 129).

The most difficult aspect of evaluation was student writing. Hipple (1973) proposed eliminating the blood-red theme:

> The themes we return look as though we cut our fingers while reading them. . . . The research evidence indicates abundantly that this kind of never-miss-an error marking benefits no one, save possibly the manufacturer of red pencils. Seldom studied has been its devastating effects on the self-concept of the student who was really proud of the paper he turned in, only to have it returned looking like his dog's breakfast (p. 131).

Instead, perhaps only one or two aspects of writing per set of themes could be evaluated which would lead to a more helpful and less demoralizing learning experience.

Neff (1973) gave two purposes for composition evaluation. First was the necessity of assigning a grade to the paper, and second was to help the student learn how to improve his composition skills. "Time spent in evaluating a theme is wasted time unless the student learns from the evaluation how to improve his performance on the next theme" (p. 168). In addition, the instructor evaluated the theme, not just graded it, which meant pointing out both its strengths as well as its weaknesses, then making positive suggestions for improvement. The following procedure was suggested for the deposition of written compositions after they had been evaluated.

> Return evaluated compositions as promptly as possible.
>
> Give students the opportunity to benefit from comments and suggestions.
>
> Collect the papers again after students have made whatever corrections or revisions the teacher may require.

> Keep them on file for teacher/student reference throughout the year.
>
> Destroy them at the end of the year, except for samples the teacher may wish to retain to serve some future purpose (if compositions grow out of an established literature sequence used from year to year) (p. 160).

Stratta (as cited in Hipple, 1973) stated that instructors should first get beyond the surface appearance of writing and look at it as the student wanted it to be read. With this approach of looking first for achievement, the question of standards was raised. However,

> In recognizing a pupil's strengths, the teacher is not automatically endorsing his present limitations; being sympathetic need not mean an acceptance of inferior work from a sentimental attitude to the pupil (p. 332).

Instructors who marked papers for individual needs first must mark selectively, and this could take different forms. For example, spelling and syntax could be the focus, or only the first and last paragraphs could be considered. Teachers could inform the students in advance of the concentrated evaluation area; therefore, the pupil's attention would be focused on a certain aspect of writing. Instructors should realize that writing was not an undifferentiated task, but it involved many different kinds of tasks, and many students would have trouble with some aspects. Another concern of the instructor was his prejudices regarding subject matter as well as pupils. Comments should be helpful and positive; and numerical marks, if necessary, should be given in two parts: one for technical control, the other for imaginative insight, arguments, or the focus of the assignment. Finally, work handed back should be reviewed, first positively, then by exploring its areas for improvement. Group discussions could be

helpful at this point. Students should be given time to study the teacher's comments, then perhaps write some corrections.

Conclusion

English is, undoubtedly, a complicated discipline with its many components. Instructors must continually seek new information concerning content, learning activities, and evaluation measures which will best further their aims, goals, and objectives. In any case, the curriculum should be one of substance, well-planned in all its entities.

Glatthorn (1980) proposed developing an English curriculum of meaning rather than a curriculum of competence. The curriculum of competence supported the utilitarian; it was the curriculum advocated by those who favored competency-based education; it was the curriculum of applied skills. While he did not question the value of competence, Glatthorn criticized the effectiveness of a competency-based curriculum on three grounds: first, the curriculum emphasized discrete skills which were not sufficiently generalizable; second, the curriculum could become trivial with undue emphasis on competency since the assessment might encourage teachers to stress less important matters as mechanics, letter forms, etc.; and third, many of the competencies derived from what an adult needed in order to "survive" rather than from an analysis of what young learners needed in order to grow.

Glatthorn (1980) suggested the specific attributes of a curriculum of meaning:

> It would stress the meaning of literature--and the literature of meaning. . . . In language study the curriculum of meaning would have little to do with word classes and sentence patterns, . . . but would help students understand the structure of English, would

> place appropriate emphasis on the history of language, and would stress the relationship between language and meaning. . . . An English curriculum of meaning would also accentuate a composing process that derives from the need to understand and express meaning. . . . A curriculum of meaning would include mastery units in critical and creative thinking, which would teach students how to use creative problem-solving strategies in identifying problems, devising solutions, and communicating answers. . . . The English curriculum should provide adequate time for integrated thematic units that help students, under the direction of a caring and competent teacher, use these meaning-centered skills in examining issues grounded in the human condition (pp. 106-107).

Language Arts for the Gifted

The gifted student needed differentiated educational experiences in language arts in all levels of the curriculum plan. Guffin (as cited in Shuman, 1981) suggested specific goals for gifted language arts programs:

> As we attempt to replace, supplement, or extend the standard curriculum to meet the needs of the gifted and talented, we will no doubt make stronger efforts (1) to design programs that embody a high level of cognitive and affective concepts beyond those of the regular curriculum; (2) to design and produce instructional materials exclusively for the gifted and talented and suitable to a variety of learning styles; (3) to encourage learning activities that differ from those of the regular classroom; (4) to promote flexible administrative arrangements for instruction and cultural enrichment, both in and out of school; and (5) to accept active parent involvement in the local school and in national, state, and community councils for the gifted (p. 144).

Clendening and Davies (1980, p. 124) suggested that the primary goal of a gifted language arts program was communication, ". . . to help youngsters understand, appreciate, and utilize their language with skill, discrimination, power, and compassion." As this goal was reached, the students became effective speakers and writers who

created freely, had self-confidence, understood others, and realized their own potential. "A program for gifted children should be planned around their ability to learn facts quickly, superior reasoning ability, and high level of creativity" (p. 124). Communication goals for the language arts would enable the gifted child to realize the following:

1. Categorizing and generalizing are means of ordering relationships.
2. Figurative language is a basic way of extending meaning and explaining relationships.
3. Meaning derived through language is unique and is representative of each individual's singular experience (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 124).

Gifted language arts instruction were composed of exposure, analysis, and expression. Exposure dealt with spelling out the expected outcomes and the relevancy of learnings. Analysis concerned the uses of language, while expression was the doing and producing areas of language arts. Furthermore:

> Neither the introduction of content beyond the regular curriculum nor the extension of the curriculum beyond the age-grade curriculum will automatically designate these modifications as appropriate for the gifted. The relevance of curricular experiences for the gifted is contingent upon more than newness, uniqueness, or difficulty (Kaplan, 1979, p. 157).

With the preceding ideas in mind, types of curriculum differentiation must be decided. Dunn (1973) suggested several changes: from single and specific to flexible, multiple, and changing modes of organization; increased emphasis on conceptually advanced learning instead of content advanced a year or two; a trend toward topics of major importance; eliminate grade level content if it proves unnecessary; deemphasize quantity and rote learning while emphasizing

interdisciplinary study; rely less on exercises and workbooks and on artificially contrived curricula; involve students in curriculum design; and move creativity as a separate dimension role to a cognitive style of learning and a function of personality.

Gallagher (1964) contended that language arts programs needed to develop greater creative production:

> This is particularly true for programs for gifted children, where less emphasis need be placed on simple skills or on remedial procedures than may be needed with average or below-average classes (p. 177).

Hillocks, McCabe, and McCampbell (1971) discussed four methods of differentiating instruction. First was administrative grouping. "Some adminstrative grouping is essential, . . . in providing a sound, workable English program because some differences in ability simply cannot be handled in a heterogeneous class" (p. 43). Second, the instructor could use differentiated questions both in written and discussion exercises. These questions, based on the higher cognitive levels, emphasized the varied abilities of the learners. The third method was differentiation through group work. "The use of groups is an essential part of the technique in reaching concepts; as teacher support is withdrawn, students find intellectual support in small peer groups" (pp. 48-49). Finally, true individualization was accomplished on a one-to-one basis as in a tutorial. "Good conference experiences will do very much to help strengthen performance" (p. 50).

Language arts content selection needed special consideration. In choosing content, Clendening and Davies (1980) suggested keeping the following overall guidelines in mind:

> An enriched language arts program should develop effective communication skills beyond basic reading, writing,

> and speaking abilities. Understanding is an essential element of effective communication. Insights gained through interpersonal relationships, as well as instruction, facilitate understanding in communication (p. 134).

In making literature selections, the main concern would be the basis of ideas rather than vocabulary. Chosen works would be discussed as to similarities and differences in order to enable the student to form ideas, see relationships, and develop generalizations; all the basis for critical thinking. In addition, divergent thinking would be encouraged through literature as students were exposed to mythology, fables, folktales, biography, drama, stories, and poetry, which would present a cross section of cultural values. These various offerings presented many opportunities. "The child secures a better understanding of universal ideas, of himself or herself, and of different writing skills and techniques" (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 126).

Four organizational approaches to literature were identified: history and chronology in which students traced a literary tradition as well as studied authors and their periods in a proper historical basis; genre which analyzed the differences and similarities among the various forms; text analysis which offered opportunities to analyze and synthesize various elements; and theme, which offered the opportunity to discuss universal ideas (Clendening and Davies, 1980).

As far as language content was concerned, it was expected that gifted students had learned the basics of grammar and usage; however, "A study of semantics and critical thinking will include inductive and deductive logic, propaganda devices, identification of the levels of diction, areas of dialects, and the tools for improving and correcting composition" (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 127).

In addition, academic experiences should

> . . . progress from learning to thinking, from convergent to divergent production and knowledge. Tasks that produce cognition, memory, and convergent thinking--such as the acquisition and storage of facts, spelling, phonics, sight reading, vocabulary, word skills, the application solutions--are often too limited. The pupils should have at least equal time for divergent and evaluative thinking--those skills requiring creative solutions, critical thinking skills, and decision-making (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 125).

Furthermore, the authors suggested that all forms of communication be explored in gifted language arts including electronic media communication skills.

As differentiated content was planned, learning activities also took on differences. Dunn (1973) suggested several instructional procedures and materials: self-determine learning activities with the teacher providing time, counsel, resources, and evaluative guidance; develop study kits based upon key questions, resources, or topics; establish a course of study with alternative choices for long-range study based on appropriate level topics and questions; administer pre-course testing in comprehensive course content; and assign students to special mentors for individual study if necessary.

Several teaching principles could be derived from the gifted learning characteristics. Learning could move at a faster rate; therefore, the pace of all curriculum elements could be accelerated. Since learning reached more complex levels, important abstract concepts and ideas in skills and disciplines were introduced earlier. Self-directed learning could be expanded earlier so the gifted pupil was not a passive receiver of teacher-presented material (Reynolds and Birch, 1977).

Dunn (1973) suggested gifted students had little need for drill and routine; they were impatient with detail and sometimes disliked writing because ideas outpaced their ability to put them down; they liked broad questions, ideas, and issues. Furthermore:

> The opportunity to relate problems that they encounter in textual materials to relevant parallel problems, and to analyze possible solutions, appeals to them far more than working as recipients and regurgitators of knowledge (Dunn, 1973, p. 218).

Haring (1974) echoed Dunn's (1973) viewpoint while further suggesting that directive teaching was undesirable:

> Directive teaching usually connotes dissemination of information, facts, and some type of drill and evaluation or testing procedures to determine if the student learned what he was supposed to learn. In other words, it is not recommended that the teacher stand in front of the class beside the chalkboard and lecture (p. 199).

Learning activities in gifted language arts would encourage independent thinking, planning, and problem solving with the following areas of emphasis:

1. associating and interrelating concepts;
2. evaluating facts and arguments critically;
3. creating new ideas and originating new lines of thought;
4. reasoning through complex problems;
5. understanding other situations, other times, and other people, as well as his or her own environmental surroundings (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 125).

Finally, the role of the instructor should change as learning activities were presented; the teacher should shift from the authoritarian to the consultative where questions were asked rather than facts given. "The importance of the teacher's work with the gifted

student lies not in what he or she can give the learner but what the learner can accomplish on his or her own" (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 126).

Evaluation techniques for gifted language arts were the same as for gifted education as a whole. However, with the increased emphasis on writing and other creative production, evaluation would be a careful consideration of the curriculum component.

Summary

A review of the literature led to several understandings. The exceptional student was classified into several categories, one of which was the gifted and talented; however, there had been a trend toward noncategorizing in recent years. While all exceptional students needed special educational provisions, gifted students had unique needs, and these needs were often overlooked. After proper identification, the special needs of gifted learners needed to be recognized; differentiated curriculum and learning situations needed to be developed. While there were many definitions of curriculum, most authors agree with Tyler's (1949) four fundamental questions and with Zais' (1976) components of aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evalution. With these elements in mind, curriculum planners needed to develop special provisions for the gifted; the three most commonly used programming modes were enrichment, acceleration, and ability grouping. While each mode had its merits and demerits, most authors agreed that ability grouping was an effective method for the gifted student.

The development of a gifted curriculum in language arts involved the three main areas of language, literature, and composition and the two sub-areas of communication (speaking and listening) and mass media. Innovative methods and techniques needed to be stressed instead of competency-based education. Several learning techniques were effective in language arts for the gifted, including complex learning levels, stress on creativity, and emphasis on problem-solving abilities.

In summary, while the gifted student was indeed an exceptional learner, the curriculum methods and learning styles suggested for the other categories of exceptional learners did not best serve the needs of the gifted student. A differentiated curriculum in language arts based on ability grouping would appear to best serve the special needs of the gifted and/or talented learner. Therefore, schools should develop and implement special programs that effectively respond to the needs of these students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study presented a thorough review of the literature related to six areas: the exceptional learner, the gifted learner, curriculum, curriculum for the gifted, language arts of English, and language arts for the gifted. In addition, a research instrument was sent to selected school systems in 50 states. The actual schools receiving the instrument were selected by each state's educational agency supervisor, coordinator, or director of gifted and talented programs. Based on results of the literature review and analysis of the data, a curriculum design including aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques was developed for a gifted language arts program at the high school level, grades nine through twelve. The curriculum design was sufficiently broad to allow many instructors, both in college and in secondary schools, to use the basic curriculum policies outlined. For this reason, specific instructional materials were not identified.

Population and Sample

A research instrument was sent to each of the 50 state's educational agency supervisor, coordinator, or director of gifted and talented programs asking that two copies of the questionnaire be sent

to at least two high schools in that state that had functioning gifted programs, preferably ones with programs in gifted language arts at the secondary level. The supervisor, coordinator, or director of gifted and talented programs for each state was also asked to complete a questionnaire.

Description of the Instrument

The research instrument posed questions relating to the following areas of gifted education: identification methods, curriculum modes, instructional methods, teacher selection, evaluation techniques, and langauge arts gifted programs. Each question listed the most common components suggested by the research literature. An opportunity to list other alternatives was incorporated in the format; otherwise, responses were indicated by a check by the appropriate entry.

Data Collection

The research instruments were mailed on three occasions: March 15, 1982; May 7, 1982; and September 15, 1982. The first mailing was sent to each of the 50 state directors; the following two mailings were sent to states which had not responded to the previous appeal. Responses to the questionnaires were received from 41 states (82%). This was considered an adequate response for data interpretation. A total of 80 questionnaires (53%) were returned. Responses for the study were reported in percentages; the number of responses to any one item was changed to a percentage. Responses of 5% or more in the "Other" category were reported. Thirty-one states (62%) responded to the section on gifted language arts; therefore, the responses in this

section were converted to percentages based on the total number of responses received within that category (36 completed questionnaires for 45%). It was noted that many states did not have specific academic aptitude programs for language arts; instead, many had general intellectual ability gifted programs. As a result, many of the respondents could not complete the gifted language arts section of the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The following research questions were considered in analyzing both the review of the literature and the results of the research instrument:

1. What are the characteristics of the gifted learners in language arts according to research literature?

2. What curriculum designs are currently being used to teach gifted learners, especially in language arts?

3. What curriculum designs are recommended in the research literature for teaching gifted learners in language arts?

4. What content, instructional methods or learning activities, and evaluation techniques would be recommended by instructors of the gifted, especially in language arts, at selected institutions?

5. What content, learning activities or instructional methods, and evaluation techniques could best be adapted to the gifted learner in language arts, according to the research literature?

6. What are the aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques of the model curriculum design to use in teaching gifted language arts students?

When the research instruments were returned, the data were gathered and analyzed. In addition, the information assembled in the literature review was synthesized and analyzed. In order to evaluate the information, the following criteria were used, derived from Saylor and Alexander's (as cited in Frierson, 1967) seven components of a good curriculum and the National Education Association's list of procedures and practices for the gifted student:

I. A good curriculum is systematically planned and evaluated.

II. A good curriculum reflects adequately the aims of the school.

III. A good curriculum maintains balance among all aims of the school.

IV. A good curriculum promotes continuity of experience.

V. A good curriculum arranges learning opportunities flexibly for adaptation to particular situations and individuals.

VI. A good curriculum utilizes the most effective learning experiences and resources available.

VII. A good curriculum makes maximum provision for the development of each learner (pp. 254-256).

1. [A good curriculum fosters] the integration of knowledge regardless of the special interests of either the student or the teacher.

2. [A good curriculum develops] the student's own broad cultural background.

3. [A good curriculum recognizes] the earmarks of intelligence and understands their implications for learning and teaching.

4. [A good curriculum realizes] that the intellectual qualities of giftedness render superfluous much of the traditional pattern of classroom instruction and thus imply special methods such as problem-centered teaching and pupil-teacher planning.

5. [A good curriculum recognizes] the basic uniquenesses of the talented, understanding those who have been identified as talented.

6. [A good curriculum realizes] particularly the guidance needs of the talented.

7. [A good curriculum gains] skill in providing a wide variety of learning activities, especially those which will bring about higher, broader, and deeper levels of experience.

8. [A good instructor teaches] with the enthusiasm which transmits a love for learning.

9. [A good instructor learns] when to guide, when to direct, when to 'get out of the way.'

10. [A good curriculum helps] students reach a self-satisfying degree of achievement commensurate with their ability.

11. [A good curriculum provides] for young minds a new freedom of ideas and explorations.

12. [A good curriculum develops] intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivations (p. 27).

It should be noted that selections 8 and 9 of the NEA list were difficult to address since they dealt with the individual personality traits of an instructor. It was assumed by the researcher that a teacher who had adequately differentiated the curriculum for the gifted student would possess these two characteristics.

Summary

A thorough review of the literature in six areas, the exceptional learner, the gifted learner, curriculum, curriculum for the gifted, language arts or English, and language arts for the gifted, along with an analysis of questionnaires received from 50 states, led to the answers to the six research questions. The instrument was divided into six sections: identification methods, curriculum modes,

instructional methods, teacher selection, evaluation techniques, and language arts gifted programs. When the research literature and survey results were synthesized, they were then analyzed using two sets of criteria: Saylor and Alexander's (as cited in Frierson, 1967) components of a good curriculum and the National Education Association's list of procedures and practices for the gifted student. The culmination of the research activities led to the development of a curriculum model in gifted language arts, grades nine through twelve. The aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques were formulated for each grade in the areas of literature, language, composition, communication (listening and speaking), and mass media. This model should provide guidance, not only for gifted language arts instructors, but could also serve as a guide for college instructors of curriculum for the development of similar models in other disciplines.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a curriculum design for gifted language arts students in grades nine through twelve. The two major components of the study, a thorough review of the literature in six areas (the exceptional learner, the gifted learner, curriculum, curriculum for the gifted, language arts or English, and language arts for the gifted), and the submission of a survey instrument to selected schools in 50 states, formed the basis for the research design.

The following research questions were asked:

1. What are the characteristics of gifted learners in language arts, according to the research literature?

2. What curriculum designs are currently being used to teach gifted learners, especially in language arts programs?

3. What curriculum designs are being recommended in the research literature for teaching gifted learners in language arts?

4. What content, instructional methods or learning activities, and evaluation techniques would be recommended by instructors of the gifted, especially in language arts, at selected institutions?

5. What content, learning activities, or instructional methods and evaluation techniques could best be adapted to the gifted learner in language arts according to the research literature?

6. What are the aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques of the model curriculum design to use in teaching gifted language arts students?

Questions 1, 3, and 5 focused on findings and on understandings derived from the research literature, while the answers to questions 2 and 4 derived from national responses to the research instrument. The answer to question 6 resulted from a careful analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of the information received via both methods of analysis.

Analysis of Data

Research Question One

What are the characteristics of gifted learners in language arts, according to the research literature?

According to the research literature, gifted learners in language arts had the ability to become effective readers, speakers, and writers if given the most advantageous curriculum. While gifted learners in high school language arts were often, but not always, creative individuals, they possessed the ability to make great strides in the English curriculum. As Clendening and Davies (1980) suggested, gifted language arts students at the high school level usually had gained command of the basics; therefore, they needed both an accelerated and enriched curriculum which challenged them while encouraging them to work independently without the threat of failure or non-acceptance if their ideas were unique. However, since most gifted students would continue their education beyond secondary school, they needed to have a solid background for future educational experiences. Because the

needs and characteristics varied greatly, individualization of the curriculum should be developed whenever appropriate, and, as Dunn (1973) suggested, students should help determine some of their activities. Several authors (Clendening and Davies, 1980; Guffin, 1981; Dunn, 1973; Reynolds and Birch, 1977) stated that the gifted language arts student was capable of working at higher cognitive levels. They should not be given repetitive, routine, or detailed work which was not considered necessary. Instead, broad questions, ideas, problems, and issues should be presented. Furthermore, these students should be exposed to non-directive teaching in which the instructor assumed the role of a facilitator (Haring, 1974; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Greater creativity should be stressed in addition to the emphasis on reasoning abilities because of the creative potential of these students (Guffin, 1981).

Research Question Two

What curriculum designs are currently being used to teach gifted learners, especially in language arts programs?

Because the elements of the entire gifted program were of interest in this study, and because many schools did not have gifted language arts programs, the research instrument dealt with the gifted program as a whole, as well as the gifted language arts program. Enrichment, the adaptation of the classroom experience without separating the gifted from their peers, was the most often used format (91%). Acceleration, moving the gifted through the traditional curriculum at a faster rate, and grouping techniques, separating the gifted into special classes or ability tracks, were used equally (64%).

Overall, 59% had resource rooms as the organizational pattern, with 50% having part-time classes and 38% having full-time classes. In the schools with gifted language arts programs, large percentages had them at each grade: 89% at ninth; 83% at tenth; 81% at eleventh, and 83% at twelfth (Table I). Other organizational programs included itinerant programs, those with instructors who traveled from school to school (39%), and regular programs with supportive services (38%).

TABLE I

PROGRAMMING MODE, ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN, GRADES OF GIFTED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

Which type of programming mode do you have in your school?

91%	enrichment
64%	acceleration
64%	grouping
____	other methods (please specify)
	14% IEPs

What is the organizational pattern for the gifted/talented in your school?

38%	full-time classes
50%	part-time classes
59%	resource rooms
39%	itinerant programs
38%	regular programs with supportive services

In which grades do you have gifted language arts?

89%	9
83%	10
81%	11
83%	12

Research Question Three

What curriculum designs are being recommended in the research literature for teaching gifted learners in language arts?

Curriculum designs for gifted language arts, as well as curriculum designs for all educational programs, were built on a firm philosophical base with written aims, goals, objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques carefully considered (Zais, 1976; Tyler, 1949; Taba, 1962; Posner and Rudnitsky, 1978). The content for the gifted language arts student was selected with the special needs of the student as the foremost consideration, the learning activities were related to the special abilities of the gifted, and the evaluation techniques would not stifle the creative potential of the gifted (Gold, 1980; Clark, 1979; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Kirk and Gallagher, 1979; Johnson, 1981; Ward, 1962; Reynolds and Birch, 1977; Kaplan, 1977; Smith and Neisworth, 1975). In addition, individualized learning experiences were stressed according to McKeachie (1978) and Sellin and Birch (1980). The curriculum design was a curriculum of meaning rather than one of competence once the basic skills were mastered (Glatthorn, 1980). According to Clendening and Davies (1980), the basic elements of curriculum design for the gifted were the same as for any good educational program; it was the actual execution of these elements based on the needs of the gifted which differentiated the curriculum. These differences will be addressed specifically in research question 6 as the model curriculum plan is presented.

According to the research literature, ability grouping was an effective organizational format for the gifted student, in language arts as well as other areas (Hillocks, McCabe, and McCampbell, 1971; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Miller and Miller, 1980; Gallagher, 1964; Dunn, 1973; Kulik and Kulik, 1982). Of course, incorporated within these specially grouped classes would be elements of enrichment and acceleration.

Research Question Four

What content, instructional methods or learning activities, and evaluation techniques would be recommended by instructors of gifted education, especially in language arts, at selected institutions?

The gifted English programs included advanced placement (83%), honors (78%), creative writing (64%), Great Books (56%), and humanities (53%) (Table II).

TABLE II

SPECIAL CLASSES CLASSIFICATION

How are these special classes classified?

78%	honors
83%	advanced placement (please specify grade level)
	14% 11
	25% 12
53%	humanities
56%	Great Books
64%	creative writing
____	other (please specify)
	8% gifted/talented

Instructional methods showed curriculum differentiation for the gifted in the following areas: higher cognitive processing (94%), creative problem setting and solving (86%), development of abstract thinking (79%), and sharpening of reasoning abilities (79%). Individualized instruction was used in all schools (100%), while 78% utilized mentors. The standardized curriculum was pretested in 54% of the schools. In the schools with gifted language arts programs, all stressed literature (100%) and composition (100%), while 47% stressed language. Learning activities stressed in gifted language arts were creativity (100%), higher cognitive processes (100%), problem-solving (72%), and skill development (69%) (Table III).

Evaluation techniques ranged from criterion-referenced (46%) to norm-referenced (40%) to minimum-essentials (30%). Sixty percent were graded on the same point system as all other students, while 16% had a weighted point system. The following formative evaluation tests were used: self-assessment items (59%), post-tests (56%), pre-tests (51%), and diagnostic measures (50%). The following types of summative tests were used: combination (45%), essay (43%), short answer (34%), multiple choice (31%), true/false (26%). No tests were given in 28% of the programs. The folloiwng types of assignments were given: independent study grades (46%), unit test grades (44%), daily grades (39%), semester test grades (38%), quarter test grades (26%), extra credit grades (26%), six-weeks test grades (19%), and trimester test grades (10%) (Table IV).

Research Question Five

What content, learning activities or instructional methods, and

TABLE III

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

How does the curriculum for the gifted/talented differ from the regular curriculum?

79%	development of abstract thinking
79%	sharpening of reasoning abilities
86%	practice in creative problem setting and solving
94%	higher cognitive processing, i.e., analysis, synthesis, and evaluation

Which of the following techniques, if any, are employed in your program?

100%	individualized instruction
54%	pre-testing of standardized curriculum
78%	use of mentors
36%	special guidance services
____	other (please specify)
	6% independent study
	5% small group

Which of the following is stressed in the gifted language art classes?

47%	language (grammar)
100%	literature
100%	composition
____	other (please specify)
	8% creative

Which of the following are emphasized in the gifted language arts classes?

69%	skill development
100%	creativity
72%	problem-solving
100%	higher cognitive processes
____	other (please specify)
	5% research skills

TABLE IV

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

How are the gifted/talented students' grade point averages calculated?

60% same point system as all students
16% weighted point system
____ other (please specify)
6% no grade

What is the grade point system for your program?

46% four point system
16% five point system

What types of formative evaluation tests are used?

51% pretests
59% self-assessment items
50% diagnostic measures
56% post-tests

What types of summative evaluation tests are given?

43% essay
31% multiple choice
26% true/false
34% short answer
45% combination
28% no tests given

Are criterion-referenced measures, norm-referenced measures, or minimum-essentials measures used?

46% criterion-referenced measures: measures that evaluate achievement in terms of a predetermined standard of performance without reference to the level of performance of other class members

40% norm-referenced measures: measures that evaluate achievement in terms of an individual's position relative to other members of the class

30% minimum-essentials measures: measures used to assess mastery or competence in specifically defined areas

TABLE IV (Continued)

What types of assignments are included in the grading process?	
39%	daily grades
44%	unit test grades
26%	quarter test grades
19%	six-weeks test grades
10%	trimester test grades
38%	semester test grades
46%	independent study grades
26%	extra credit grades

evaluation techniques could best be adapted to the gifted learner in language arts, according to the research literature?

The content of the gifted language arts program included literature, language, composition, communication, and mass media (Sellin and Birch, 1980; Alpren, 1967; Fowler, 1965; Kitzhaber, 1973; Bennett, 1973). In addition, the content was selected according to the aims, goals, and objectives of the curriculum, according to Smith (1977) and Miller (1973). The content was useful to the learner as well as challenging according to Sellin and Birch (1980), Gill (1973), and Glatthorn (1980). A scope and sequence which presented the content in a logical order was desirable, according to Zais (1976). In addition, student selection of content was an integral component (Dunn, 1973). Finally, the freedom of responsible content selection should be preserved (Massie, 1982; Fransecky, 1973).

Learning activities were planned according to a predetermined manner which most effectively presented the content in a manner

meeting the special needs of the students. In addition, these activities were based on the aims, goals, and objectives of the curriculum, according to Zais (1976). Varied methods of activities were used with a focus on student planning and involvement. Discussion techniques and questioning strategies were in-depth and based on higher levels of cognitive thinking (Kaplan, 1977; Hoover, 1980). In order to stimulate creative production, learning activities were flexible to provide for unplanned learning experiences (Hoover, 1980; Callahan, 1978). As with content selection, McKeachie (1978) suggested that the student should become involved in the learning activity selection process. The final important consideration involved a sound knowledge of learning theories in order to make the best activity selection (Zais, 1976; Hass, 1980; Hilgard and Bower, 1966).

Evaluation techniques involved a combination of methods rather than just a few, with emphasis on total evaluation rather than just measurement (Zais, 1976; Hoover, 1980; Herman, 1977). Tests were written with the higher cognitive levels dominating, while both subjective and objective tests were planned (Diederich, 1974; Roberts, 1977, McKeachie, 1978). Grades would not become a major focus of the program but instead be considered a part of the learning process (Moffett and Wagner, 1976). While Clark (1979) suggested eliminating grades as part of the evaluation as a preferable alternative, Mandel (1973) pointed out the necessity of giving grades in order to satisfy administrators, parents, and often the students themselves. Also, it must be remembered that many gifted students will be the focus of scholarships and academic honors, so the program should consider the reality of the situation.

Research Question Six

Introduction

What are the aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evalution techniques of the ideal curriculum design to use in teaching gifted language arts?

As stated previously, the aims, goals, and objectives of an ideal curriculum are based on a philosophical basis. This curriculum is a man-centered one, according to Zais' (1976) definition, and as such, it accepts and incorporates various aspects of all philosophical viewpoints. Because reality is influenced so strongly by culture and society, it is belief in another world for some, belief in the natural world for others, and belief in human experience for still others. A curriculum encompassing all three viewpoints offers insights into greatly differing aspects of reality; therefore, the curriculum helps, not tells, the learner how to make his own decisions. The truth concerns whether knowledge is received, discovered through the senses, or discovered by reason. All three are valid, and in this age of rapidly expanding technology, knowledge is also constructed out of experience. As to the question concerning the "good" in life, both ethics and aesthetics are involved. "Good" things are not easily defined, but the opportunity to sample many types and varieties of knowledge could certainly be a component. This sampling should be within the limits of culture, society, and the individual conscience. As far as aesthetics, the answer is ultimately up to the individual, but educational experiences should present a varied array of acceptable art forms, then allow the learner the opportunity and freedom to

make these judgments himself. Obviously, this philosophical statement is broad, leaving many answers for the learner to decide. However, since education, according to Herman (1977), is an expression of society, the broadness represents the many and varied ideas and values of today's people. Perhaps the pluralism of this philosophy is the essence of the man-centered philosophy. Hopefully, a curriculum based on this philosophy offers freedom to experience the joy of learning, the liberating feeling of accepting others' points of view, and the excitement of making individual decisions based on a personal philosophy.

The preceding philosophical statement, as well as Saylor and Alexander's (1966) components of a good curriculum, the NEA list (as cited in Frierson, 1967) an analysis and synthesis of the research literature, and the research instrument results formed the rationale for the following curriculum components:

Aims

As Zais (1976) stated, the aims of a curriculum were the expected life outcomes. A synthesis of the research literature and research survey results led to the formation of the curriculum aims for gifted language arts during grades nine through twelve. The selected aims specifically reflected the philosophical statement of Kaplan (1977) concerning the gifted program, the aims of an English curriculum as expressed by Miller (1973), as well as the definition of the educated person suggested by Zais (1976). The aims of this curriculum were as follows: knowing the cultural and value pattern of democracy and freedom which entailed the right to make personal decisions; and

considering the diversity of social organizations, social roles, and preferred lifestyles available to American citizens; and realizing the special needs and abilities of gifted individuals, the aim of this curriculum was to produce a well-read, literate person who was able to express himself/herself in both oral and written modes, who possessed the self-reliance and creativity to make life choices which led to a personal and productive lifestyle, and whose educational experiences opened doors to knowledge and personal growth which were limited only by each person's individual experiences and goals. As Moffett and Wagner (1976) suggested, these aims provided the focus for the goals and objectives of the curriculum.

Goals

Based on the review of the literature and the survey results, the following list of goals or school outcomes for gifted language arts students in grades nine through twelve were divided into categories which were a synthesis of several classifications (Caffyn, 1970; Moffett and Wagner, 1976; Alpren, 1967): personal goals, literature goals, language goals, composition goals, communication (listening and speaking goals), and mass media goals. These goals encompassed the entire four-year program, since they were long-range and cumulative. As Zais (1976) suggested, the goals included facts, skills, and attitudes. They also reflected development of the intellect, values, creative thinking, aesthetic awareness, self-appraisal, and social relationships as Gold (1980) suggested. Furthermore, the goals were rather simple, as Beckner and Cornett (1972) proposed, but still they provided the basis for experimental and innovative programs. The

goals, as well as the objectives, are stated in general terms rather than behavioral terms (Moffett and Wagner, 1976). The final consideration of goal formulation was the advancement of communication, as suggested by Clendening and Davies (1980).

Personal Goals. (1) Students will identify their unique talents and abilities and set personal goals which make use of these gifts fully as they seek new knowledge; (2) students will list and discuss the fundamental human values which lead to productive social responsibility; (3) students will grow, both intellectually and creatively as expressed in speaking, reading, and writing; (4) students will demonstrate the power and responsibility of intellectual freedom and discover; (5) students will demonstrate appreciation of people of all abilities and learn to accept all people with respect; and (6) students will value beauty and sensitivity as represented by all the arts.

Literature. (1) Students will read a wide variety of literature; (2) students will identify and evaluate the universal ideas expressed throughout the ages in various genres of literature; (3) students will identify and evaluate the issues, beliefs, and new knowledge presented in literature; and (4) students will analyze the various aspects of all genres of literature.

Language. (1) Students will be proficient in the use of the mechanics of language; (2) students will continually respond to words, expanding their vocabulary and seeking the meanings of words; (3) students will assess the use and abuses of language and become critical

observers and readers; and (4) students will read and evaluate examples of American regional, ethnic, and dialectical writing.

Composition. (1) Students will write clearly, thoughtfully, and correctly; (2) students will discover the vast resources of the library and use it effectively in both personal and school research; (3) students will compose creative writing efforts without critical evaluation; (4) students will become proficient in organization of information and note-taking techniques; (5) students will learn to write thoughtful research papers which are a synthesis of other authors' thoughts, ideas, and concepts, on a variety of subjects; and (6) students will learn to use computer-assisted instruction if available in the composition program.

Communication. (1) Students will listen with respect to all viewpoints, while at the same time becoming both critical and appreciative listeners; (2) students will participate in various verbal activities: discussion, panels, debates, etc.; and (3) students will converse with others in small groups and explain ideas and concepts with patience and clarity.

Mass Media. (1) Students will read, watch, and use the various types of mass media--movies, television, radio, and newspapers; (2) students will recognize the importance of critical evaluation of the mass media; and (3) students will demonstrate the myriad uses of the computer, if available, not only in conjunction with the language arts, but in relation with all aspects of the educational process.

Objectives

Keeping in mind the problems associated with writing objectives for the language arts curriculum (Hembree, 1973; Maxwell, 1973; Moffett and Wagner, 1976), but also realizing the necessity of planning all parts of the curriculum (McKeatchie, 1978; Mager, 1962; Hass, 1980), the following general objectives based on the review of the literature and the research instrument were compiled for this particular curriculum design. For the first time, the curriculum was divided into four parts, since the objectives represented short-range goals which were attainable within a year's instructional sequence. It was realized that objectives from each year were automatically incorporated into the following year's curriculum; this is, of course, curriculum sequencing as suggested by Zais (1976). The objectives for each year were divided into five areas: literature, language, composition, communication (listening and speaking), and mass media, the generally accepted components of English (Beckner and Cornett, 1977; Fowler, 1965; Kitzhaber, 1973). According to the research survey, literature and composition provided the main focus of the language arts curriculum. Because specific texts and materials are not listed in this curriculum, the objectives are very broad and general; it is understood that the instructor using this curriculum model would write more specific objectives dealing with specific curricular materials, perhaps with a behavioral focus. The objectives were taken from or based on Learning Objectives for Individualized Instruction: Language Arts (1975).

Grade Nine - Literature. (1) Show understanding of genre by classifying and reading various literary selections; (2) discuss the main and supporting ideas, setting, theme, plot, point of view, characterization, and mood of various works; (3) express an understanding of literary devices both by writing and identifying them; and (4) realize the reader's experiences and needs affect his understanding of a literary work.

Grade Nine - Language. (1) Recognize basic grammatical terms and functions, and use them in writing; (2) write sentences which meet generally accepted standards of sentence structure; (3) write sentences which have a varied structure; (4) use a variety of techniques to infer meanings of unfamiliar words, including structural analysis techniques relating to prefixes, suffixes, and roots; (5) use capitalization, punctuation, and spelling appropriately in writing; and (6) explore American regional, ethnic, and dialectical differences in both reading and writing.

Grade Nine - Composition. (1) Write descriptive, narrative, argumentative, and expository compositions; (2) write compositions which show unity of idea, effective organization, and a combination of concepts, principles, and generalizations; (3) prepare various types of outlines; and (4) produce a research report from notes and an outline.

Grade Nine - Communication. (1) Understand and apply the skills necessary to build listening comprehension which is necessary to take accurate notes; (2) prepare, present, and evaluate an oral presentation;

(3) develop criteria for evaluating content and speech techniques; (4) participate in a discussion group, apply techniques for leading a discussion, and evalute the results; and (5) produce a form of nonverbal communication (painting, sculpture, collage, photograph, movie) to express an emotion or an idea.

Grade Nine - Mass Media. (1) Describe forms of mass media and analyze their importance to individuals and to groups.

Grade Ten - Literature. (1) As you read, recognize the relatedness of art forms of the humanities by discussing common themes; (2) explain how the same theme can be presented in the various genres by reading thematic units; (3) differentiate between fact, opinion, and theory by discussing methods of analyzing literary selections; and (4) given a character from a literary work, decide whether a decision made is ethically right or ethically wrong, and describe the consequences.

Grade Ten - Language. (1) Review the history of the English language; and (2) analyze the relationship of both emotional and psychological impact of words to semantics.

Grade Ten - Composition. (1) Using the techniques of creative writing, create original compositions in each of the genres; (2) using logic, develop a written presentation, either for or against a specific view; and (3) using a universal theme, research how various authors deal with this theme and then present the findings in a research paper.

Grade Ten - Communication. (1) Prepare an oral presentation in order to persuade the audience to accept your point of view; (2) evaluate

other speaker's persuasive arguments; and (3) create non-verbal communication expressing the various themes studied.

Grade Ten - Mass Media. (1) Analyze media reviews of various works of art; (2) prepare mass media techniques to persuade an audience; and (3) describe and analyze the techniques of advertising.

Grade Eleven - Literature. (1) Identify, evaluate, compare, and value the universal ideas of the authors of the Great Books; (2) describe the relationship of characters to motivation and action, and judge the author's effectiveness in presenting these relationships; (3) identify and analyze the similarities and differences in the works of the Great Books series; (3) using techniques of literary criticism, evaluate the effectiveness of a given literary work; and (4) describe and analyze the relationship that causes conflicts between characters and/or ideas.

Grade Eleven - Language. (1) Identify and use various types of analogies to aid in vocabulary development; and (2) examine the problems of translation of literary works.

Grade Eleven - Composition. (1) Demonstrate ability to write the following types of compositions: precis, summary theme, report, character analysis, point of view, setting, ideas, close reading, specific problem, comparison-contrast, structure, imagery or symbolism, tone, prosody, prose style, evalution, review, and film analysis; (2) write a scene using the following techniques of effective drama: soliloquy, aside, and dialogue; and (3) research in-depth an author

or synthesize ideas concerning a universal subject and present the information in a research paper.

Grade Eleven - Communication. (1) Demonstrate logic and rhetoric in preparing oral arguments or debates.

Grade Eleven - Mass Media. (1) View as many varied presentations of the Great Books literature as possible and analyze the effectiveness of each; and (2) produce various media presentations: radio programs, television tapes, filmstrips, slides, stage productions, etc.

Grade Twelve. Major objectives of this year could not be determined, since the focus was on independent study of the student's choice. However, the objectives of the previous three years of the curriculum provided the basis for the independent study objectives. Objectives could be developed in any of the five language arts areas for an effective and relevant independent study project.

Content

Before discussing in detail the content for the four-year curriculum, the selection process must be outlined. The review of the literature presented many types of content as well as methods of presentation. No one method could be determined as the correct one. The special abilities of the gifted, i.e., their ability to learn quickly, their superior reasoning abilities, and their reception to creative activities provided the foundations for synthesis of the literature (Clark, 1977; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Kirk and

Gallagher, 1979; Guffin, 1981). Next, two sequence principles were followed as Zais (1976) suggested: simple to complex and prerequisite learnings. Chronology, to a lesser extent, was a component. The spiral curriculum was a factor since each year's curriculum built on the materials learned during the previous year(s). The curriculum provided both a skill focus and a humanistic focus (Bennett, 1973; Gallagher, 1964; Reynolds and Birch, 1977). The learner's interests were considered along with opportunity for content choices and independent study each year during the first three years, culminating in a full year of independent study the senior year. The content blended three types of curriculum movements in the language arts: the knowledge curriculum, the skill-oriented focus, and the individual fulfillment model (Gill, 1973). Because material could be both enriched and accelerated as suggested by both the literature review (Reynolds and Birch, 1977; Payne, 1974; Kough, 1960) and the research instrument, it was possible to focus on all three aspects, not to the neglect of any part, but to the betterment of all. A complete scope and sequence of the content can be found in Appendix A.

Grade Nine. - The literature organization was by literary genre with a knowledge-oriented focus. As Reynolds and Birch (1977) suggested, the teacher had to first make sure the skills of the regular curriculum were acquired. The focus of all elements of the freshman year, not only literature, provided this background. This focus was similar to the honors class which 78% of the surveyed schools had as the programming for gifted language arts. In addition, skill development was an emphasis of 69% of the surveyed schools. The study of genre

provided a basis for the remainder of the literature program since the focus was on the basics of literature (Fowler, 1965; Clendening and Davies, 1980). A large variety of each of the four genres (narrative fiction, drama, poetry, and non-fiction prose) were to be studied. The genre approach was a familiar one since many literature anthologies presented their material in this manner; however, even if the textbook used was not arranged by genre, it was simple to arrange the selections. The following elements, based on Roberts' (1977) classification, were studied: main and supporting ideas, setting, plot, point of view, theme, mood, tone, characterization, conflict, style, literary devices (simile, metaphor, alliteration, imagery, personification, onomatopoeia, allegory, hyperbole, apostrophe, irony, etc.), and satire in relation to narrative fiction; main and supporting ideas, setting, plot, dramatic structure, theme, mood, tone, chracterization, conflict, style, literary devices, rhyme and rhythm (for some), satire in relation to drama; literary devices, rhyme and rhythm, elements of poetry (ode, sonnet, lyric, ballad, dramatic monologue, free verse, etc.), in relation to poetry; and main and supporting ideas, setting, point of view, theme, mood, tone, characterization, style, literary devices, and satire in relation to non-fiction prose.

The student would hopefully realize the interrelatedness of the elements of the genres and utilize these in future studies. Of course, the instructor would not lose sight of the common ideas of literature, and an effort would be made to show the common themes (Fowler, 1965). Students could aid in content selection by suggesting choices to add to each area. In addition, students needed to develop critical reading skills by realizing the difference between communication problems

in the sender, audience, message, and technical implementation. It should be stressed as the literary selections were read that a reader's experiences and needs affected his understandings of the author's message (Atwood, 1976).

The language content was skill-based, since the students were expected to know elements of traditional grammar for college entrance examinations; and, in addition, many college professors expected students to be familiar with the terminology. In addition, these terms were employed in the basic composition process as areas of needed improvement were noted. While some research studies indicated that study of grammar did not help students to write better and that mechanics of writing and usage could best be taught in the rewriting process (Glatthorn, 1980), it was deemed necessary in this curriculum to ensure that the basics of grammar, usage, and mechanics were learned in order to provide a solid foundation for the remainder of the program (Fowler, 1965; Kitzhaber, 1973; Goodman, 1981). Of course, all elements would be pretested with opportunity for independent study for those who tested out. This was the only year that language was studied in this manner, but the elements were employed and reviewed as necessary as a spiral curriculum evolved. Hopefully, the gifted English student would learn these language skills quickly and easily without undue emphasis placed upon them.

The grammar content included the following: grammar (parts of speech, the sentence, the phrase, the clause); usage (subject and verb agreement, pronoun and antecedent agreement, correct pronoun usage in nominative and objective cases, correct verb usage in principle parts, tense, and voice, and correct use of modifiers); and mechanics

(capitalization, end marks, commas, semicolons, colons, underlining, quotation marks, apostrophes, hyphens, dashes, parentheses). In addition, emphasis on sentence variety and structure were stressed (Warriner and Griffeth, 1973).

Also important in the language curriculum were word skills and vocabulary development, since many standardized college entrance examinations stressed vocabulary and because much of the literature contained difficult vocabulary. Emphasized were a variety of techniques to infer the meaning of unfamiliar words: learning new words from their contexts; learning common prefixes; suffixes, and roots; and using a dictionary. Hopefully, this structured vocabulary study would lead to spelling, pronunciation, and reading comprehension improvement (Bushman, 1973; Goodman, 1981). Spelling was not taught in this curriculum design, but independent study units for students with spelling problems would be developed (Hipple, 1973).

The composition element continued building a strong foundation as the types of composition were stressed: narration, description, expository, and argumentation (Holman, 1972). There were several ways to teach these forms: in conjunction with specific genres such as narrative writing with narrative fiction, descriptive writing with poetry, etc.; introducing all four types early in the school year to use throughout the year; or dealing with one type each school quarter. Flexibility was the key as the individual instructor became the final judge. As the year progressed, student selection of both type and topics should be integrated. If available, computer-assisted instruction should be utilized (McGee, 1982; Hennings, 1981; Powers, 1981).

Each year a research report or paper with a different focus was written. This year's project was a report focused on the literary genre with emphasis on research skills and format. Possible topics included biographical information of a major author of a genre, a detailed analysis of a particular work, or an analysis of several works of the same genre. Correct procedures in note-taking, outlining, revision, and mechanical procedures were stressed (Butler, 1982).

If a student wished to pursue creative writing, the instructor would always be willing to give assistance and comment on the work. Special emphasis on this type of writing was presented during the sophomore year.

The communication (speaking and listening) emphasis was in the following areas: presenting and preparing oral reports; listening to and evaluating oral reports; and preparing, participating in, and evaluating group discussions (Fowler, 1965; Kitzhaber, 1973; Klein, 1981). Most language textbooks contained sections on these areas, and the innovative instructor could use these as developmental cornerstones. However, modifications would be made to insure that these provided relevant information and higher cognitive levels of thinking as well as critical thinking and problem-solving activities.

Continuing with the idea of a foundation curriculum, the mass media study dealt with the various forms and their importance. Areas of study included radio, television, movies, newspapers, and magazines (Fowler, 1965; Cleaver, 1981). Emphasis on the four types of writing and how they were used in the media, as well as similarities and differences in presentation of the written word, were presented. The instructor integrated with the literature available films, television

programs, songs, critical reviews, etc. More than any other area of the curriculum, this area relied on the creative content choices of the instructor; and, in addition, students were encouraged to contribute meaningful examples.

Grade Ten. The focus of the sophomore year moved from a skills to a humanistic focus. However, the prerequisite skills learned were reintroduced and reviewed as necessary. The simpler aspects of the curriculum became more complex as the curriculum broadened in scope. While the knowledge-based curriculum was still a major factor, increasing emphasis on student selection of content and creative writing provided a move toward an individual fulfillment model (Gill, 1973). Independent study projects were available throughout the year as students further pursued a theme.

The literature was organized around the thematic approach and, in a broader sense, a slant towards the humanities (Fowler, 1965; Alpren, 1967; Miller, 1973; Bush, 1965; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Of the schools surveyed, 53% had language arts humanities classes. The genre types were assimilated in thematic units dealing with universal concepts. Many literature anthologies were arranged in thematic selections, and these could be used as a starting point. However, the students, with the guidance of the instructor, could develop the units using the materials available as the individual fulfillment model was pursued (Gill, 1973). Once a particular theme was selected, the search for all types of genre choices dealing with the theme led to a wide variety of material being chosen and read. Also included were various media selections and other art forms such as paintings, ballet,

movies, and music. If possible, trips to museums, theaters, and other cultural activities could be included. The intent was to present the chosen theme in as many ways as possible. The various elements of literature learned in the genre study provided the foundation for literature discussion, while the thematic content was the major focus. As certain controversial themes were presented, students came to differentiate between fact, opinion, and theory as they assessed the writer's impact on the message (Workman, 1982; Monson, 1982).

The language component of the curriculum shifted from emphasis on the basics to skills improvement in the writing process (Bushman, 1973; Goodman, 1981; Glatthorn, 1980; Hartig, 1973). If a certain problem was common to the majority of the class, that particular component was reviewed, while independent study units were prepared for individual problems (Hipple, 1973; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Gagne and Briggs, 1974). In addition, if the students were preparing to take any standardized examination, a brief review of the skills learned in the previous year would be helpful. By no means, however, should great amounts of time be spent on grammar, usage, or mechanics.

Increased emphasis was placed on vocabulary development, with a study of the development of the English language emphasized. Students became familiar with the Indo-European background, as well as old English, middle English, and modern English. Also, analysis of the emotional and psychological impact of words in relation to the thematic units were undertaken (Bushman, 1973).

Creative writing provided the composition focus. Sixty-four percent of the schools surveyed had creative writing courses, while all schools emphasized creativity. While it could be argued that all

writing is creative (Warriner and Griffeth, 1973; Torrence, 1965), only a few students had the innate ability to produce poems, stories, plays, scripts, etc. However, there were methods available to teach these forms, but learning to produce creative writing was a time-consuming process. By presenting the basics to the entire class at one time, all students would have the opportunity to learn the structure. The creative writing projects would be based on the thematic units with products produced relating to the readings. Of course, any type of creative effort would be accepted at any time, and those especially talented students would be encouraged to produce as much as possible, while, in addition, they would work with a mentor, if available (Klopf and Harrison, 1982).

In addition to creative writing, the four composition types stressed the previous year were incorporated in the assignments. The research project was expanded to a paper, not just a report, dealing with a student-selected universal theme and an analysis of how various authors approached it, continuing the humanities emphasis.

Continued emphasis on communication skills such as oral reports and group discussions continued (Kitzhaber, 1973). However, with the emphasis on other art forms, the listening and speaking activities included activities with guest speakers, tour guides, and media and/or artistic presentations. Oral presentations on controversial themes were presented with persuasive techniques highlighted. Students discussed the various ways of convincing others to accept their viewpoint, while also producing nonverbal communication such as various art forms to express the themes studied. Group discussions evolved

into group activities stressing working to produce a product (Clendening and Davies, 1980).

Because of the humanities approach, the mass media was especially important. Stressed were how various media presented art forms as well as how the media viewed a work of art. Students read critical reviews and discovered media presentations of the themes studied. Similarities and differences were noted. The role of the media in shaping views or ideas provided discussion, since the thematic approach dealt with a variety of opinions. No longer did the forms of the media provide the focus, but the ideas and method of presentation were stressed (Deer, 1973; Cleaver, 1981).

Grade Eleven. The major focus of the junior year was a literary one, as the Great Books provided the literature selections. Of the schools surveyed, 56% had Great Books classes. The skill focus and the humanistic focus of previous years provided the foundation for an intensive study of the masters of the past (Grant and Reisman, 1978). While the other components of the curriculum were still important, they all were based upon the reading program to a great extent.

It was suggested that the adult Great Books series be used as material. There were five sets divided into six areas: philosophy, theology, history and social science, science and method, drama, and other literature. Because of the vast amount of material, some choices would be made. Each of the five sets contained selections from each of the six areas, so the instructor could choose to teach only the works in a particular set or sets. If all five sets were available, selections could be made from each. Of course, the ideal

method would be to let the students themselves decide which selections to read, either in small or large groups. Selections not chosen by a group could be read for independent study. The selections could be studied by genre, thematically, or chronologically.

The language component continued with improvement through writing assignments as the focus. As during the previous year, a quick review before standardized tests could be helpful. Also, independent study units could be prepared for those students with areas of weakness. Exercises in analogies increased vocabulary skills as well as developed logical thinking skills. The problems of translations could be studied since most of the Great Books were translated. Various translations of the same work could be analyzed with differences in meaning stressed. The writing styles found in works from different countries, time periods, and genres could be compared and contrasted (Bushman, 1973; Goodman, 1981). Student interest and involvement provided the focus of these studies (Fowler, 1965).

The composition program followed Roberts' (1977) 18 suggested writing assignments: the precis, the summary theme, the report, the theme of character analysis, the theme about point of view, the theme about setting, the theme discussing ideas, the theme of a close reading, the theme on a specific problem, the theme of comparison-contrast; the theme analyzing structure, the theme on imagery or symbolism, the theme analyzing tone, the theme analyzing prosody, the theme analyzing prose style, the theme of evaluation, the review, and the theme on film. As Roberts stated:

> This approach has worked; it has the virtue of making the theoretical discussion of a technique of literary criticism immediately vital to students. If they can

> see a literary problem in the light of their necessity to write about it, they are more likely to learn their lesson well (p. xv).

The instructor decided which assignment went with which Great Books reading assignment; this detailed writing and literary criticism background provided a strong foundation for the independent study pursued the senior year.

The research paper could either be an in-depth examination of a single author's philosophy or a synthesis of ideas concerning a universal subject as expressed by several authors. Of course, creative writing projects would be incoporated as desired.

Listening and speaking skills were especially important, since the Great Books series offered a myriad of discussion topics. While the English classroom was not meant to be a speech class, the use of formalized debates provided a challenging focus to the communications area (Lindman, 1973; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Because so many critical reading and thinking skills were developed by discussing the Great Books, it was logical that these ideas be further expounded by debates. Of course, it was possible that several class members were debate team members; they could provide the necessary expertise. Otherwise, the instructor or student leaders could present the necessary background. While preparation for debates was a time-consuming process, the learning experiences would be enormous. Not only would research skills be honed, but listening and speaking skills would be improved. Student-chosen topics would provide the content, continuing with the individual fulfillment focus (Gill, 1973). Students not involved in a particular debate would be expected to provide both oral and written evaluation of the debate; and every student would

participate in at least one debate (Clendening and Davies, 1980; Kitzhaber, 1973).

Because many of the Great Books were available on film, video, filmstrips, and tapes, the instructor would obtain as many as possible to view in connection with the reading assignments. In addition, the students produced their own media presentations such as radio tapes, video productions, filmstrips, slide presentations, stage productions, etc. Of course, the equipment available determined the extent of the activities. A thorough understanding of the intricacy of the mass media, as well as the organizational problems, would evolve (Clendening and Davies, 1980; Deer, 1973; Cleaver, 1981).

Grade Twelve. The content of the senior year provided the opportunity to synthesize the knowledge and skills gained through the previous years. The focus was on independent study which could be in conjunction with an Advanced Placement English Program if offered by the school or as replacement of the regular curricular offering. Advanced placement classes were offered by 83% of the schools surveyed. According to Clendening and Davies (1980), and AP course was a one-year college-level learning experience which took the form of an honors class, a tutorial, or an independent study:

> It is usually challenging and thought-provoking and--compared to other high school study courses--it often takes more time, requires more work, gives greater opportunity for individual progress and accomplishment, goes into greater depth, and is more stimulating (p. 482).

Two AP examinations were offered in English: English Language and Composition, and English Composition and Literature. The former ". . . should reflect an awareness of the most useful theories of

language and composition. . ." (Clendening and Davies, 1980, p. 358). Included were both reading and analysis of discursive prose as well as study of the writing process. The students dealt specifically with the following:

> kinds and levels of diction, from the casual to the formal
> varieties of sentence structure
> logical and functional relationships of sentences within paragraphs and of paragraphs within essays
> modes of discourse (narration, description, analysis)
> aims of discourse (information, persuasion, and expression)
> various rhetorical strategies (the logical, emotional, and ethical appeals)
> appropriate relationships among author, audience, and and the subject (p. 359).

The second course stressed both the study and practice of writing, as well as literature study. Students learned to use the characteristic modes of discourse and various rhetorical strategies; and through speaking, listening, reading, and writing, they became aware of the connotation, metaphor, irony, syntax, tone, and other resources of language. Writing focused on the critical analysis of literature as well as creative production. Students studied intensively a few challenging and worthwhile works from several genres and periods. While some translations were used, most of the assignments were originally written in English, since the language and style would be stressed. This study provided valuable lessons:

> Through such study, students sharpen their awareness of language and composition and their understanding of the writer's craft. They develop critical standards for the independent appreciation of any literary work, and they increase their sensitivity to literature as shared experience. To achieve these goals, students study the individual work, its language, characters, action, and themes. They consider its structure, meaning, and value,

> and its relationship to contemporary experience as well as to the times in which it was written (Clendening and Davies, 1980, pp. 359-360).

If the AP courses were not offered, the independent study offerings could follow a similar format. However, other approaches such as creative writing with a mentor, an in-depth study of an author, genre, time period, etc., or a detailed media study could be undertaken (Villapando and Kolbe, 1979; Gagne and Briggs, 1974). In any case, the year of independent study utilized the concepts presented in the previous years' studies; in addition, it offered the gifted student the opportunity to become an autonomous learner with only his own drive for knowledge setting the limits for meaningful learning experiences (Sellin and Birch, 1980; Clendending and Davies, 1980; Pomerantz, 1975).

Learning Activities

Learning activities were directly related to the aims, goals, and objectives as well as the content. Essentially, the learning activities would be planned to educate the gifted language arts student in a manner befitting his specific needs, talents, and abilities while endeavoring to instill in the student self-reliance as well as a selected body of personal knowledge which would lead to life-long learning. Therefore, the learning activities were differentiated; there would be no busy work, no wasted time, no activity that was not relevant to the stated aims, goals, and objectives (Kaplan, 1971).

The first step in planning learning activities was an assessment of the learners' abilities, culture, and interests. While ability levels in a gifted program were similar, the other areas varied.

Activities reflected concern for all three components (Zais, 1976; Clendening and Davies, 1980).

As Hoover (1980) suggested, learning activities progressed from learning basic concepts, principles, and theories, to helping students derive meaning and significance from the basic knowledge, to individualied performance activities. The research survey found that development of abstract thinking, sharpening of reasoning abilities, practice in creative problem setting and solving, and higher cognitive processing were to be main focuses. The basic principles of continuity, sequence, and integration were followed in this curriculum as students built on each year's knowledge (Zais, 1976). In all five areas of English curriculum, the work progressed from the basic skills to more complex skills and extended to other areas of the educational process. The content was selected with these principles in mind, and the progression of content called for learning activities designed to complement the process.

All four learning theories were considered as a basis for learning activities, keeping in mind the learners' needs, the different kinds of learning, and the different kinds of knowledge. Basic language foundations, vocabulary development, components of literature, and basic composition skills were categorized as S-R learning. As literature study moved to the humanities and the writing focus to creative writing, the field learning theories prevailed. The entire curriculum employed the Freudian concept of self-knowledge as the student moved towards a year of independent study. Finally, the instructor would continually be aware of the social learning theory as the students learned through areas outside the classroom (Zais, 1976;

Hass, 1980). In addition, Hilgard and Bower's (as cited in Zais, 1976) principles of learning provided a basis for learning activities.

Both large-group and small-group activities were utilized. The lecture, both large-group and lecturette, was used sparingly, but it should not be totally eliminated, since it developed note-taking and listening skills. Students could become involved by presenting material usually presented by the instructor in a lecture (Hoover, 1980).

Small-group techniques such as buzz groups, clustering, tutorials, and brainstorming were employed in all areas of the curriculum. These aided in thinking skills, listening, and speaking development (Hoover, 1980).

The seminar method, used for literature discussion in all grades, became the major focus during the Great Books discussions. Elements of brainstorming, panel discussions, symposiums, dialogues, colloquies, and debates were employed as the instructor deemed appropriate (Hoover, 1980; McKeachie, 1978).

Discussion questions developed from centering or focusing questions designed to converge student thinking to expansion questions which extended thinking to higher cognitive levels. As questions were planned, emphasis was sequenced from recall to comprehension to analysis to evaluation to problem questions. Discussion problems extended from fact to values to advocacy to policy. While simpler discussion techniques could be utilized to some extent, the emphasis on more difficult levels increased steadily as the curriculum progressed (McKeachie, 1978; Hoover, 1980; Kaplan, 1977).

Students were exposed to role-playing, sociodramas, and simulation games each year of the curriculum since these activities fostered

listening and speaking skills in addition to providing creative elements (Herman, 1975; Hoover, 1980).

The keys to learning activities selection for the gifted language arts curriculum were informality, flexibility, and improvisation (Miller, 1973). Both cognitive and affective outcomes needed to be considered (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl et al., 1964). The inquiry process or discovery approach provided a basis for many of the activities. Focus proceeded from convergent thinking to divergent thinking activities, with the ultimate goal of creative and independent thinking. The learning activities were meaningful, but they were not assigned with the idea that gifted students could do more of the same thing. A few well-selected appropriate activities were far superior to a great number of poorly-selected ones (Kaplan, 1977; Reynolds and Birch, 1977; Dunn, 1973; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Finally, creativity in all learning activities would always be a consideration when selecting learning activities (Callahan, 1974; Hoover, 1980; Torrence, 1965).

Evaluation

As evaluation was considered for this curriculum design, the difference between measurement and total evaluation was considered, as was suggested by the research literature. However, most school systems required a letter grade be produced as the research instrument indicated; therefore, the methods used to obtain the grade must be carefully considered (Herman, 1977; Smith and Neisworth, 1975). In addition, evaluation grew out of the aims, goals, and objectives; and

as such, these criteria provided the basis for evaluation (Zais, 1976; Hoover, 1980).

Tests provided a portion of the evaluation process with lessening degrees of emphasis each year. According to both the research survey and the research literature, in most instances, tests items would be completion or fill-in, multiple-choice, and/or essay. While the objective tests usually provided testing for factual command of the material, the essay tests provided total comprehension information and were used to a greater extent as the curriculum progressed. Furthermore, test questions were composed with Bloom's cognitive levels in mind (McKeachie, 1978; Herman, 1977; Hoover, 1980; Roberts, 1977; Diederich, 1974). While some product evalution was on the relative standard scale, most tests were criterion-referenced rather than norm-referenced. Both formative and summative tests were given; and the language areas of grammar, usage, and mechanics were pre-tested with an option of independent study available (Herman, 1977).

Rating scales and checklists provided an alternate method of evaluation and were effectively applied in various listening and speaking activities. Both instructor and students used these evaluations (Hoover, 1980).

Creative and risk-taking learning activities would be supported without the threat of grades (Johnson, 1981; Gowan, 1981). One way to deal with these activities was to contract for a grade at the beginning of the project. A post-contract evaluation could be conducted by the instructor, the student, the mentor (if used), and possibly parents, counselors, other instructors, etc. Of course, the contract

could be used in other areas of the curriculum in areas of independent study as well as regular classroom activities (Mandel, 1973).

Effective use was made of self and peer evaluations without the use of actual grades. Students felt a greater involvement if they had input into the evaluation process (Clark, 1979; Moffett and Wagner, 1976).

Instructors would work toward a non-graded program if possible, or at the least, an evaluation program which did not penalize the student for being in a gifted program. However, standards would not be lowered just to make sure that all students received and A (Clark, 1979). If the students were placed correctly; if the aims, goals, and objectives were valid; if the content choices were meaningful; if the learning activities were relevant; and if the evaluation process was an assessment of all aspects of the curriculum, grades hopefully will not be a problem.

Summary

Through a thorough review of the literature and the results of a research survey, the research questions related to gifted language arts programs in grades nine through twelve were answered. The research investigation resulted in a synthesis and analysis of the materials which developed into a suggested curriculum model for gifted language arts. Areas of curriculum developed included literature, language, composition, communication (speaking and listening), and mass media for each of the four years. Aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques were developed through a synthesis of the research information.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This study was concerned with the formulation of a curriculum model for gifted language arts in grades nine through twelve. It was based on an extensive review of the literature in six areas: the exceptional child, the gifted and talented learner, curriculum, curriculum for the gifted, language arts or English, and language arts for the gifted. In addition, a research instrument concerning existing gifted and talented programs was sent to schools in 50 states. Based on information from these two elements, a gifted language arts curriculum model for grades nine through twelve was developed. Areas of the curriculum development plan included aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation. Areas of the language arts program included literature, language, composition, communication (speaking and listening), and the mass media.

Findings

Relative to the Review of Literature

The six areas of literature reviewed included the exceptional child, the gifted and talented learner, curriculum, curriculum for the

gifted, language arts or English, and language arts for the gifted. General conclusions were reached in each area.

Exceptional Child

The gifted/talented student was just one of the classifications of the exceptional learner (Gardner, 1977; Dunn, 1973; Kirk and Gallagher, 1979). All categories included those students who needed special educational consideration (Gearheart, 1972; Dunn, 1973; Reynolds and Birch, 1977). Classification systems, commonly called labeling, could pose problems (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979; Gardner, 1977; Teleford and Sawrey, 1977), or they could be helpful to the exceptional student (Smith and Neisworth, 1975; Kirk and Gallagher, 1979). The negative effects led to mainstreaming, which took the exceptional children from special classes and placed them in regular classrooms (Teleford and Sawrey, 1977; Dunn, 1973). While the mainstreaming experience for some exceptional children classifications provided better learning experiences, it was not without problems; therefore, some special classes were necessary (Dunn, 1973; Teleford and Sawrey, 1977).

The Gifted and Talented Learner

Gifted and talented students provided the educational system with an abundance of potential educational opportunities (Lyon, 1981; Martinson, 1973). However, because of concern about an elitist and/or undemocratic environment, the needs of these students were often overlooked (Bettelheim, 1959; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Reynolds and Birch, 1971). The Marland Report findings and various research studies showed the need for differentiated educational provisions for

the gifted student (Clendening and Davies, 1980; Reynolds and Birch, 1971). Also, adequate identification procedures needed to be used (Reynolds and Birch, 1977; Dunn, 1973; Ward, 1962). While gifted learners had some traits in common, generally they were individuals needing special educational provisions (Terman, 1925; Teleford and Sawrey, 1977). Five areas of gifted learners had special needs beyond differentiated educational provisions: underachieving gifted, disadvantaged gifted, culturally different gifted, handicapped gifted, and female gifted (Clark, 1979).

Curriculum

While curriculum had many different meanings, it generally was considered the aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques developed for a school program. In addition, a review of the literature showed that many curriculum authors used the four fundamental questions posed by Tyler (1950) as the basis for curriculum design (Zais, 1976; Tanner and Tanner, 1981; Hass, 1980; Taba, 1962). The philosophical basis of the curriculum (ontology, epistemology, and axiology) provided the foundation for the aims, goals, and objectives (Zais, 1976; Herman, 1977). While each component of the curriculum had many considerations, the content, learning activities, and evaluation techniques were planned according to the stated aims, goals, and objectives; therefore, special consideration should be taken when formulating these components (Posner and Rudnitsky, 1978; Zais, 1976; Mager, 1963; Hass, 1980). Aims did not relate to school outcomes and were not obtainable until the completion of the school years; goals were school outcomes but long range in

nature; objectives were specific course outcomes (Zais, 1976). While the question concerning stating objectives in behavioral or in general terms was arguable, nevertheless, written objectives were considered a necessity (Gagne and Briggs, 1979; Hass, 1980; Moffett and Wagner, 1976; Maxwell, 1973). Both cognitive and affective learning domains were considered in writing objectives (Bloom, 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 1964). Content encompassed knowledge, skills, and values (Hyman, 1973), and should be arranged in an effective scope and sequence (Zais, 1976; Kaplan, 1977). Learning activities were closely related to content and were classified as three types of experience: ability, culture, and interest (Zais, 1976). Organized either vertically or horizontally, learning activities were more difficult to formulate for the higher cognitive levels (Hoover, 1980). Various types to be considered included small and large group techniques, discussion methods, lecture methods, simulation techniques, role-playing, and creative products (Hoover, 1980; McKeachie, 1978; Callahan, 1978). Learning theories needed to be considered as learning activities were developed (Zais, 1976; Hass, 1980). Understanding the difference between measurement and evaluation was necessary for effective evaluation to take place (Zais, 1976; Hoover, 1980). Various types of tests included pre-tests, formative tests, diagnostic tests, and summative tests (Hoover, 1980; Herman, 1977). Various test items included short-answer, essay, true-false, multiple choice, fill-in or completion, and matching (McKeachie, 1978; Hoover, 1980; Herman, 1977).

Curriculum for the Gifted

As with all curriculum, curriculum for the gifted was based on aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities, and evaluation. However, because of the special needs of the gifted student, the curriculum was differentiated (Haring, 1974; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Johnson, 1981). Three programming modes were generally used: enrichment, acceleration, and ability grouping (Clark, 1979; Payne, 1974). While each programming mode had both positive and negative aspects, each provided a realistic and helpful approach to gifted education (Kough, 1960; Clark, 1979). While there was some concern about elitism in gifted education (Bettelheim, 1959), the needs of the gifted child should be the foremost consideration (Clendening and Davies, 1980; Miller and Miller, 1980). Grouping of gifted students provided benefit for the advanced learner in some situations (Kulik and Kulik, 1982). Because of their special needs, all aspects of the curriculum needed to be focused on the higher cognitive levels, creative potential, and problem solving abilities found in the gifted learner (Kirk and Gallagher, 1979; Kaplan, 1977; Johnson, 1981). Evaluation posed a special concern because of the pressure and/or lack of self-confidence of many gifted students; therefore, special attention was required for developing self-confidence and student involvement in the curriculum development process with a focus on individualized learning (Sellin and Birch, 1980; Clendening and Davies, 1980; Pomerantz, 1975). Mentors provided special help for the gifted in special areas (Klopf and Harrison, 1982). Finally, gifted students needed help in guidance problems (Alvino, 1981).

Language Arts or English

While there were many conceptions of language arts or English, most agreed that the three main components were literature, language, and composition (Fowler, 1965; Gill, 1973; Sellin and Birch, 1980; Beckner and Cornett, 1972). In addition, the two areas of communication (listening and speaking) and mass media were often included (Alpren, 1967; Fowler, 1965; Moffett and Wagner, 1976). English curriculum movements could be classified as knowledge-centered, the functional curriculum, and the individual fulfillment model (Gill, 1973). In each area of the curriculum, specific objectives needed to be written based on aims and goals (Alpren, 1967; Beckner and Cornett, 1972). Several authors suggested using general rather than behavioral objectives (Moffett and Wagner, 1976; Maxwell, 1973; Hembree, 1973). Literature could be presented in several formats such as genre study, chronological order, thematic units, or Great Books (Fowler, 1965; Holman, 1975; Grant and Reisman, 1978; Alpren, 1967; Miller, 1973). Advanced placement was also a suggested program (Clendening and Davies, 1980). Censorship of literature content posed a special concern (Fransecky, 1973; Massie, 1982). Language could be divided into grammar, usage, and mechanics (Fowler, 1965; Bushman, 1973; Goodman, 1981). Composition dealt with either expository or creative writing and ranged from the sentence to an extended research paper (Larsen, 1973; Roberts, 1977; Fowler, 1965; Hartig, 1973; Holman, 1975; Warriner and Griffeth, 1973). While these elements provided the curriculum for English content, the methods and emphasis provided by individual instructors led to the type of program planned (Hipple,

1973). Elements stressed in learning activities were informality, flexibility, improvisation, vitality, drama, and creativity (Miller, 1973). Evaluation posed a special problem because of the nature of English content; therefore, it was suggested by some authors that English instructors should work toward eliminating grades, if possible (Moffett and Wagner, 1976; Mandel, 1973). While it was considered simpler to teach English as a curriculum of competence, that was not necessarily the best method. Instructors should move toward a curriculum of meaning so that result was a student who could read, write, listen, and think critically (Glatthorn, 1980; Sellin and Birch, 1980).

Language Arts for the Gifted

Language arts for the gifted must provide differentiated elements in each area of the curriculum (aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation), and in each area of the English components (literature, language, composition, communication, and mass media). Questions, ideas, and issues were emphasized with little need for drill or routine (Clendening and Davies, 1980), while exposure, analysis, and expression were major elements of the learning activities (Kaplan, 1979). Enrichment and acceleration should be used with students determining many aspects of the curriculum (Kaplan, 1979; Dunn, 1973; Guffin, 1981). The instructor was a facilitator rather than a director of learning (Reynolds and Birch, 1971; Haring, 1974; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Creative expression was fostered, while at the same time, a solid base of skills was built (Gallagher, 1964; Clendening and Davies, 1980). Higher cognitive levels, varied

learning activities including self-determination, and reduced threat of grades should be employed (Clendening and Davies, 1980).

Relative to the Survey

While not all parts of the research questionnaire were used in the development of the curriculum model, nevertheless, they were of interest in understanding the general gifted program area. Conclusions regarding each section of the instrument will be identified.

Identification Methods of the Gifted/Talented

Based on the results of the survey, school systems used a variety of identification methods. Research indicated that teacher nomination was a poor identification technique, yet 90% of the schools used it. Standardized achievement scores were used in 91% of the schools, while 71% used individual intelligence test scores, probably the best single method. Other methods used included previous school achievement (65%), group intelligence test scores (65%), and creativity test scores (43%). A majority of the schools (73%) used a committee to identify the gifted students. The classroom teacher identified the gifted student in 53% of the cases. Other methods of identification included the teacher of the gifted/talented (46%), the school psychologist (41%), and school administrators (35%) (Table V). Multiple criteria was required in many states, and this use of several measures identified more gifted students.

Curriculum Modes for the Gifted/Talented

Special programs included general intellectual ability (88%),

specific academic aptitude (63%), creative or productive thinking (46%), visual and/or performing arts (41%), and leadership ability (38%). The gifted curriculum was developed by the gifted/talented coordinator (64%), instructors (41%), curriculum committee (38%), and the curriculum coordinator (16%). Eighteen percent reported no specific curriculum used (Table VI).

TABLE V

IDENTIFICATION METHODS

Please check the method(s) which you currently use in your program to identify the gifted/talented learner:

71%	individual intelligence test scores
65%	previous school achievement
90%	teacher nomination
91%	standardized achievement test scores
43%	creativity test scores
65%	group intelligence test scores
____	other methods (please specify)
21%	parent
15%	peer
15%	self
6%	Renzulli-Hartman Scales
6%	product/performance evaluation

Please check the person(s) who identifies the gifted/talented in your program:

53%	classroom teacher
46%	teacher of gifted/talented
41%	school psychologist
35%	school administrators
73%	a committee
____	other (please specify)
10%	parents
6%	counselors

TABLE VI

CURRICULUM MODES

Please check the areas in which you have special programs for the gifted/talented:

88% general intellectual ability
63% specific academic aptitude (please specify areas)
(based on the 50 responses listing specifics)
- 44% math
- 30% science
- 26% English or language arts
- 28% social studies
- 6% reading

46% creative or productive thinking
38% leadership ability
41% visual and/or performing arts (please specify areas)
(based on the 33 responses listing specifics)
- 30% visual arts
- 18% drama
- 15% instrumental music
- 18% choral music
- 12% dance

Who developed the curriculum for the gifted/talented in your school?

38% curriculum committee
16% curriculum coordinator
64% gifted/talented coordinator
41% instructors
18% no specific curriculum used

As mentioned earlier (see Table I), resource rooms and part-time classes were the most frequently used organizational pattern, with only 38% having full-time classes for the gifted. Enrichment was the most-used programming mode (91%), while acceleration and grouping were used equally (64%); all were valid methods. Other patterns included itinerant programs and regular programs with supportive services.

Instructional Methods

The schools responding to the surveys showed an understanding of the differentiated instructional methods needed. Development of abstract thinking (79%), sharpening of reasoning abilities (79%), practice in creative problem solving and setting (86%), and higher cognitive processing (94%) were stressed. Individualized instruction (100%) was used in every program, while mentors (78%) and pre-testing (54%) were components. Thirty-six percent had special guidance programs (see Table III).

Teacher Selection

Instructors of the gifted were administratively selected 71% of the time, while the coordinator made the selection in 60% of the cases. Inservice provided training for 60% of the instructors, workshops for 49%, and college credit in gifted/talented instruction for 44% (Table VII).

Evaluation Techniques

Evaluation results were presented in Table IV. A variety of formative and summative evaluations were used: pre-tests (51%), self-assessment items (59%), diagnostic measures (50%), and post-tests (56%). Forty percent used criterion-referenced measures, 40% used norm-referenced measures, and 30% used minimum-essentials measures. In addition, a varied number of assignments were included in the grading process: daily grades (39%), unit test grades (44%), quarter test grades (26%), six-weeks test grades (19%), trimester test grades

(10%), semester test grades (38%), independent study grades (46%), and extra credit grades (26%). Several different types of tests were given: essay (43%), multiple choice (31%), true/false (26%), short answer (34%), combination (45%), and 28% gave no tests. Sixty percent of the students were graded on the same point system as the other students while 16% were graded on a weighted point system.

TABLE VII

TEACHER SELECTION

Who selects the instructors for the gifted/talented classes?

9%	volunteers
71%	administratively selected
60%	gifted/talented coordinator
16%	department head

What special training, if any, is required for the instructors in the gifted/talented class?

44%	college credit in gifted/talented
60%	in-service
49%	workshops
____	other (please specify)
11%	none

Language Arts Gifted Program

Of the schools that had gifted language arts, over 80% had programs at each of the four grades. These special classes included

advanced placement (83%), honors (78%), creative writing (64%), Great Books (56%), and humanities (53%) (see Table II). Literature (100%) and composition (100%) were stressed in all programs while language was stressed in less than half (47%). Creativity (100%) and higher cognitive processes (100%) were emphasized in all programs, with problem-solving (72%) and skill development (69%) being emphasized to a lesser degree (see Table III). The fact that only 45% of the schools responding to the questionnaire had gifted language arts programs points to the need for greater development of specific academic aptitude programs.

Conclusions

It seems appropriate to conclude from the findings of the present study that:

1. School systems are concerned with the exceptional child, but often the needs of the gifted student are misunderstood.

2. The gifted and talented learner should be offered differentiated educational opportunities in an ability grouped classroom with components of enrichment and acceleration.

3. Special care should be taken to identify all gifted and talented students, especially the underachieving gifted, disadvantaged gifted, culturally differerent gifted, handicapped gifted, and female gifted.

4. The components of a good curriculum include carefully formulated aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques, all of which should be based on a sound educational philosophy.

5. Because of their special needs, attention must be given to developing self-confidence and student involvement in gifted curriculum programs.

6. The language arts or English curriculum should be composed of the following components: literature, language, composition, communication (speaking and listening), and mass media.

7. Language arts for the gifted should provide differentiated aims, goals, and objectives; content; learning activities; and evaluation techniques.

8. Gifted programs include general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, visual and/or performing arts, and leadership ability; however, some of these areas are being neglected.

9. Some schools do not provide a specific curriculum for the gifted, and based on the research literature, the needs of the students might not be met.

10. The lack of full-time programs for the gifted in many instances suggest that many gifted students are not having their needs met.

11. More schools need to provide gifted classes in the special academic areas, especially at the secondary level.

12. Instructors of the gifted should be facilitators of learning, not directive teachers; however, many instructors are not prepared in an educationally sound manner to instruct the gifted.

Recommendations

After considering the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. It is recommended that school systems provide differentiated education for gifted students in language arts at the high school level (grades nine through twelve). These students are capable of educational experiences that go far beyond the normal high school curriculum.

2. It is recommended that gifted students be grouped homogeneously in areas of special academic ability at the high school level. Research indicates that students so grouped make more significant gains than students who are heterogeneously grouped.

3. It is recommended that instructors of the gifted receive special training in gifted education, preferably college courses in identification, characteristics of the gifted child, and curriculum for the gifted. Without this special training, misconceptions about instruction of the gifted may affect the educational process.

4. It is recommended that instructors of the gifted be prepared to deal with the types of gifted students with special needs, i.e., underachieving gifted, disadvantaged gifted, culturally different gifted, handicapped gifted, and female gifted. These groups present special educational problems in addition to their needs as gifted students.

5. It is recommended that, if appropriate and available, the gifted student has the opportunity to work with a mentor in special areas of giftedness. The classroom instructor cannot offer the maximum educational experiences in all areas of giftedness.

6. It is recommended that school systems have sound identification procedures for the gifted based on multiple criteria. Without valid identification procedures, many gifted students are overlooked.

7. It is recommended that the administrators, instructors, parents, students, and community be instructed in the special needs of the gifted so that an understanding of the differentiated curriculum will be developed. An understanding of the special needs of the gifted will help eliminate a fear of an elitist education.

8. It is recommended that all areas of gifted/talented students identified by the Marland Committee (general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, and visual and performing arts) be served. All areas of gifted/talented students need special programs.

9. It is recommended that future research studies pursue the development of differentiated curriculum models in specific academic aptitude areas. Without these special models, the gifted students in the various specific academic aptitude areas will not be offered the maximum educational experience.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Administration, Procedures and School Practices for the Academically Talented Student in the Secondary Schools (National Education Association, 1960), in E. C. Frierson, "Education of Gifted Youth in Secondary Schools and Colleges." Education, 88 Sept.-Oct., 1967, pp. 25-29.

Alpren, M., Ed. The Subject Curriculum: Grades K-12. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.

Alvino, J. "Guidance for the Gifted." Instructor, XCI(415), November/December, 1981, pp. 64-66.

Applebee, A. N., Lehr, F., and Auten, A. "Learning to Write in the Secondary School: How and Where." English Journal, 70(5), Sept., 1981, pp. 78-82.

Atwood, B. S. Developing Skills in Critical Reading. Palo Alto, California: Learning Handbooks, 1976.

Bacig, T. "A Humane Rationale for Composition," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 199-206.

Beckner, W. and Cornett, J. D. The Secondary School Curriculum: Content and Structure. Scranton, Pennsylvania: Intext Educational Publishers, 1972.

Bennett, R. A. "The English Curriculum: Out of the Past, Into the Future," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 22-29.

Berger, G. The Gifted and Talented. New York: Franklin Watts, 1980.

Bettelheim, B. "Segregation: New Style." School Review, 66, 1959, pp. 251-272.

Bloom, B. S., Ed. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Bush, D. "The Humanities," in M. E. Fowler, Teaching Language, Composition, and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965, p. 311.

Bushman, J. A. "The Power of Language: Can the Student Survive Without It?" in T. W. Hipple, Reading for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 351-356.

Butler, G. R. "High School Term Papers Should Be Required." The Clearing House, 56(1), Sept., 1982, p. 4.

Caffyn, L. "Behavioral Objectives: English Style," in J. Maxwell and A. Tovatt, Eds., On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English. Champaign, Illinois: Commission on the English Curriculum, National Council of Teachers of English, 1970, pp. 71-74.

Callahan, C. M. Developing Creativity in the Gifted and Talented. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Clark, B. Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979.

Cleaver, B. P. "The Media and the English Curriculum," in R. B. Shuman, Ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 93-99.

Clendening, C. P. and Davies, R. A. Creating Programs for the Gifted: A Guide for Teachers, Librarians, and Students. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1980.

Dale, E. Building a Learning Environment in C. P. Clendening and R. A. Davies, Eds. Creating Programs for the Gifted: A Guide for Teachers, Librarians, and Students. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1980, p. 104.

Deer, I. "Mass Media and the English Teacher," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 227-233.

Dewey, J. Democracy and Education in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, 1976, p. 186.

Diedrich, P. B. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Dunn, L. M., Ed. Exceptional Children in the Schools: Special Education in Transition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Dunlap, J. M. "Gifted Children in an Enriched Program." Exceptional Children, 21, 1955, pp. 135-137.

Education of the Gifted. Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Forshay, A. W. "A Modest Proposal," in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, 1976, p. 331.

Fowler, M. E. Teaching Language, Composition, and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Fransecky, R. B. "The Right to Read: Adults Only," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 215-224.

Frierson, E. C. "Education of Gifted Youth in Secondary Schools and Colleges." Education, 88, Sept.-Oct., 1967, pp. 25-29.

Frost, J. L. and Rowland, G. T. Curricula for the Seventies: Early Childhood Through Early Adolescence. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

Gagne, R. M. The Conditions of Learning in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, 1976, p. 246.

Gagne, R. M. and Briggs, L. J. Principles of Instructional Design, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Gallagher, J. J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Boston: Allyn Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Gallagher, J. and Kinney, L., Eds. "The Adjustment of Gifted Children in the Regular Classroom," in B. Clark, Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979, p. 305.

Gardner, W. I. Learning and Behavior Characteristics of Exceptional Children and Youth: A Humanistic Behavioral Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Gearheart, B. R., Ed. Education of Exceptional Children. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook, 1972.

Getzels, J. W. and Dillon, J. T. "The Nature of Giftedness and the Education of the Gifted," in R. M. W. Travers, Ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973, pp. 689-731.

Gill, K. "Wither an English Curriculum for the Seventies," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 30-38.

Glatthorn, A. A. A Guide for Developing an English Curriculum for the Eighties. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1980.

Gold, M. J. "Secondary Level Programs for the Gifted and Talented," in L. Silverman, "Secondary Programs for Gifted Students," Journal for the Education of the Gifted, IV(1), Fall, 1980, pp. 30-42.

Goodman, Y. M. "Language and the English Curriculum," in R. B. Shuman, Ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 30-35.

Gowan, J. "Educating the Ablest," in C. Johnson, "Smart Kids Have Problems Too," Today's Education, 70(1), Feb.-Mar., 1981, pp. 26GE-29GE.

Grant, G. and Riesman, D. The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Guffin, J. A. "English for the Gifted and Talented," in R. B. Shuman, Ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 141-146.

Guttentag, M. "Undoing Sex Stereotypes," in B. Clark, Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979, p. 315.

Haring, N. G. Behavior of Exceptional Children: An Introduction to Special Education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1974.

Haynes, E. "Using Research in Preparing to Teach Writing," in A. A. Glatthorn, A Guide for Developing an English Curriculum for the Eighties. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1980, p. 59.

Hartig, H. "Student Attitudes and Purposes in Writing," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 107-111.

Hass, G., Ed. Curriculum Planning: A New Approach, 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Hembree, C. W. "Accountability in Secondary English," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 80-85.

Hennings, D. G. "Using Computer Technology to Teach English Composition." The Education Digest, XLVI(8), April, 1981, pp. 41-43.

Herman, T. M. Creating Learning Environments: The Behavioral Approach to Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Heyman, M. Simulation Games for the Classroom in K. H. Hoover, College Teaching Today: A Handbook for Postsecondary Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980, p. 225.

Hildreth, G. H. Educating Gifted Children at Hunter College Elementary School. New York: Harper, 1952.

Hilgard, E. R. and Bower, G. H. Theories of Learning in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundation. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976, pp. 291-292.

Hilgard, E. R., Marquis, D., and Kimble, G. Conditioning and Learning in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundation. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976, p. 246.

Hillocks, G. "Approaches to Meaning: A Basis for the Literature Curriculum," in M. Alpren, Ed., The Subject Curriculum: Grades K-12. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1967, p. 91.

Hillocks, G., McCabe, B., and McCampbell, J. The Dynamics of English Instruction. New York: Random House, 1971.

Hipple, T. W. "Eliminating the Negative in English Teaching," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 126-131.

Hipple, T. W. "Literature Studies in the 80's: A Look at the Possibilities," in R. B. Shuman, Ed., Education in the Eighties: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 20-29.

Hoetker, J. "Limitations and Advantages of Behavioral Objectives in the Humanities," in J. Maxwell and A. Tovatt, Eds., On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970, pp. 49-60.

Holman, C. H. A Handbook to Literature. Indianapolis: The Odyssey Press, 1975.

Horner, M. "Fail: Bright Women," in B. Clark, Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979, pp.

Hoover, K. H. College Teaching Today: A Handbook for Postsecondary Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Hutchins, R. M. The Higher Learning in America in J. S. Brubacher and W. Rudy, Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1976, p. 275.

Hyman, R. T. Approaches in Curriculum in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1976, p. 324.

Johnson, C. "Smart Kids Have Problems, Too." Today's Education, 70(1), Feb.-Mar., 1981, pp. 26GE-29GE.

Johnson, C. "The Standardized Childhood." Today's Education, Nov.-Dec., 1981, pp. 51-54.

Kaplin, S. N. "Language Arts and Social Studies Curriculum in the Elementary School," in D. R. Sellin and J. W. Birch, Educating Gifted and Talented Learners. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corp., 1980, p. 157.

Kaplin, S. N. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Karnes, M. B. et al. "The Efficacy of Two Organizational Plans for Underachieving Intellectually Gifted Children." Exceptional Children, 29, 1963, pp. 438-446.

Kelleher, J. "Individualized English: New Roles for Teachers and Students." English Journal, 64(8), Nov., 1975, pp. 29-31.

Kelly, A. V. The Curriculum: Theory and Practice. London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1977.

Kirk, S. A. Educating Exceptional Children, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.

Kirk, S. A. and Gallagher, J. J. Educating Exceptional Children, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1979.

Kitzhaber, A. R. "What is English?" in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 4-21.

Klein, M. "Oral English and the Literacy Imperative," in R. B. Shuman, ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 46-53.

Klopf, G. J. and Harrison, J. "The Case for Mentors." The Education Digest, XLVII(5), Jan., 1982, pp. 34-35.

Kough, J. Practical Programs for the Gifted. Chicago: Science Research Associated, Inc., 1960.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. J., and Masia, B. B. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II, Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964.

Kulik, C. and Kulik, J. A. "Research Synthesis on Ability Grouping." Educational Leadership, 39(8), May, 1982, pp. 619-621.

Larsen, R. L. "Toward a Non-Graded Program in English Composition," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 190-198.

Learning Objectives for Individualized Instruction: Language Arts. Sunnyvale, California: Westinghouse Learning Corp., 1975.

Leonard, J. P. "Some Reflections on the Meaning of Sequence," in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976, p. 340.

Lindman, M. R. "Improving Oral Response," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 437-440.

Logan, L. M. and Logan, V. G. A Dynamic Approach to Language Arts. Toronto: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967.

Lyon, H. C., Jr. "Our Most Neglected Natural Resource." Today's Education, 70(1), Feb.-Mar., 1981, pp. 15GE-20GE.

Macmillan, C. J. B. "Curriculum Choices: Why Study Macbeth?" The Educational Forum, XLVI(3), Spring, 1982, pp. 369-378.

Mager, R. F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Mallis, J. A. "Seminar for Superior Students." The Clearing House, November, 1956, pp. 175-178.

Mandel, B. J. "Teaching Without Judging," in R. Ohmann and W. B. Coley, Eds., Ideas for English 101: Teaching Writing in College. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975, pp. 224-331.

Martinson, R. A. Children With Superior Cognitive Abilities in N. G. Haring, Behavior of Exceptional Children: An Introduction to Special Education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1974, p. 193.

Massie, D. C. "Of Mice and Men, and Huckleberry and Harrassment." Today's Education, 71(3), 1982, pp. 108-113.

Maxwell, J. "Behavioral Objectives for English: Some Pro's and Con's," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 72-79.

Maxwell, J. and Tovatt, A., Eds. On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970.

McGee, J. and Peck, A. D. "Must Every Students Become 'Computer Literate?'" NEA Today, 1(1), p. 23.

McKeachie, W. J. Teaching Tips: A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1978.

McNeil, J. D. Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1977.

Miller, B. and Miller, B. "Recognizing the Gifted: Is Differentiation Undemocratic?" The College Board Review 115, Spring, 1980, pp. 3-7.

Miller, J. E. "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 154-164/

Moffett, J. "Misbehaviorist English: A Position Paper," in J. Maxwell and A. Tofatt, Eds., On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970, pp. 110-116.

Moffett, J. and Wagner, B. J. Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading, K-13: A Handbook for Teachers, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1976.

Monson, D. "The Literature Program and the Arts." Language Arts, 59(3), March, 1982, pp. 254-258.

Neff, C. and Neff, N. Aids to Curriculum Planning: English Language Arts, K-12. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1973.

Ohmann, R. and Coley, W. B., Eds. Ideas for English 101: Teaching Writing in College. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975.

Palmer, W. S. "Reading and the Teaching of English," in R. B. Shuman, ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 54-63.

Payne, J. "The Gifted," in N. G. Haring, Behavior of Exceptional Children: An Introduction to Special Education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishers, 1974, pp. 29-30.

Phenix, P. Realms of Meaning in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row Publshers, 1976, p. 330.

Piaget, J. The Psychology of Intelligence in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976, p. 341.

Pomerantz, N. "Individualized Instruction: Theory and Practice." English Journal, 64(8), Nov., 1975, pp. 47-48.

Posner, G. J. and Rudnitsky, A. N. Course Design: A Guide to Curriculum Development for Teachers. New York: Longman, 1978.

Powers, R. S. "Computer-Assisted English Instruction," in R. B. Shuman, Ed., Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981, pp. 108-113.

Readings for Discussion. Chicago: Great Books Foundation, 1966.

Reynolds, M. C. and Birch, J. W. Teaching Exceptional Children in All America's Schools. Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977.

Rinkel, M. E. "Multiplying the Image: or a Kaleidoscopic View of Individualiation." English Journal, 64(8), Nov., 1975, pp. 32-39.

Roberts, E. V. Writing Themes About Literature, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Roser, N. "The Humanities in American Life: A Response." Language Arts, 58(5), May, 1981, pp. 540-544.

Saylor, J. G. and Alexander, W. M. Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Scheffler, I. The Language of Education. Springfield, Illinois: Peacock Publishing, Inc., 1960.

Sellin, D. R. and Birch, J. W. Educating Gifted and Talented Learners. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corp., 1980.

Sherwin, J. S. "Research and the Teaching of English," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 132-140.

Shuman, R. B., Ed. Education in the 80's: English. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1981.

Silverman, L. "Secondary Programs for Gifted Students." Journal for the Education of the Gifted, IV(1), Fall, 1980., pp. 30-42.

Smith, J. A. Classroom Organization for the Language Arts. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Smith, R. M. and Neisworth, J. T. The Exceptional Child: A Functional Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Smith, B., Stanley, W., and Shores, J. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development in R. S. Zais, Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976, p. 340.

Stratta, L. "Some Considerations When Marking," in T. W. Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973, pp. 326-339.

Taba, H. Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt, 1962.

Tanner, D. and Tanner, L. N. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1980.

Telford, C. W. and Sawrey, J. M. The Exceptional Individual. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Terman, L. M., Baldwin, B. T., and Bronson, E. "Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children." Genetic Studies of Genius, 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1925.

Torrence, E. P. What Research Says to the Teacher: Creativity. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1965.

Travers, R. M. W., Ed. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1973.

Tyler, R. W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1950.

Unruh, G. G. Responsive Curriculum Development: Theory and Action. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975.

Villapando, E. and Kolbe, K. Independent Projects. Phoenix: Think Ink Publications, 1979.

Ward, V. S., Ed. The Gifted Student: A Manual for Program Improvement. Charlottesville, Virginia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1962.

Warriner, J. E. and Griffeth, F. English Grammar and Composition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.

Wilson, K. G. "English Teachers: Keys to Computer Literacy." English Journal, 70(5), Sept., 1981, pp. 50-52.

Workman, B. "How Do You Vitalize a Curriculum?" NAASP Bulletin, 66(454), May, 1982, pp. 1-4.

Zais, R. S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1976.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

TABLE SHOWING SCOPE AND SEQUENCE OF THE GIFTED LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM, GRADES 9-12

TABLE VIII

SCOPE AND SEQUENCE OF THE GIFTED LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM, GRADES 9-12

Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
	Literature		
Genre Study: narrative fiction poetry drama non-fiction prose	Thematic units with a humanities slant centered around universal ideas	Great Books (philosophy, theology, history, and social science; science and method, drama, and other literature)	Independent Study
	Language		
Grammar: parts of speech the sentence the phrase the clause Usage: subject/verb agreement pronoun usage verb usage modifier usage Mechanics: capitalization end marks commas semicolons colons underlining	Review as necessary Vocabulary: study of old English, middle English, and modern English Emotional and psychological impact of words	Review as necessary Analogies Translations	Independent Study

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Grade 9	10	11	12
		Language (cont.)	
Mechanics (cont.): quotation marks apostrophes hyphens dashes parentheses Vocabulary: context prefixes suffixes roots dictionary use			
		Composition	
Narrative Descriptive Expository Argumentative Researcher report focused on genre Creative writing	Creative writing (poems, stories, plays, etc.) Continued narrative, descriptive, expository, argumentative Research paper focused on universal theme	Precis, summary theme, report, character analysis, point of view, setting, ideas, close reading, specific problem, comparison-contrast, structure, imagery or symbolism, tone, prosody, prose style, evaluation, review, film	Independent Study

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Grades			
9	10	11	12
	Communication		
Presenting, preparing, and evaluating an oral report Preparing, participating in, evaluation of, group discussions	Oral reports focusing on persuasive speaking Discussions focusing on group process Group activities focused on producing a product	Oral reports Discussions Debates	Independent Study
	Mass Media		
Forms of media: radio, television, movies, newspapers, magazines	Media presentations of art forms Media's view of art Critical reviews Role of media in propaganda	Media presentations of Great Books Production of original media: radio programs, video, filmstrips, slides, stage productions	Independent Study

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

March 15, 1982

Dear Gifted/Talented Coordinator:

I am a graduate student currently working on my Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University. Part of my requirements is writing a dissertation titled Development of a Curriculum Design in Language Arts for Gifted and Talented Students at the High School Level. A portion of the dissertation will deal with the results of the enclosed questionnaire which I would like for you to complete.

Also, since I cannot become familiar with the gifted/talented programs in each state and since I am concerned with quality programs, I would appreciate it if you would forward the other two enclosed questionnaires to two of the best gifted/talented programs in your state, preferably ones which have gifted programs in language arts at the high school level.

It would be most helpful if all the completed questionnaires were returned to me by May 1. Your help in this matter is most appreciated. Also, if you have any information which you feel would be of interest to me, especially information concerning curriculum and/or instruction in the gifted/talented programs, I would welcome it.

Sincerely,

Brenda R. Lyons

Brenda R. Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma
73034

March 15, 1982

Dear Instructor of the Gifted/Talented:

I am a graduate student currently working on my Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University. Part of my requirements is writing a dissertation titled Development of a Curriculum Design in Language Arts for Gifted and Talented Students at the High School Level. A portion of the dissertation will deal with the results of the enclosed questionnaire which I would like for you to complete. Since your name has been suggested by your state's director or coordinator of the gifted/talented, I feel that the information provided will be of great help in my research project.

It would be helpful if I receive the completed questionnaire by May 1. Your help in this matter is most appreciated. Also, if you have any information which you feel would be of interest to me, especially information concerning curriculum and/or instruction in the gifted/ talented programs, I would welcome it.

Sincerely,

Brenda R. Lyons

Brenda R. Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma
73034

May 7, 1982

Dear Gifted/Talented Coordinator:

Last March I sent each state coodinator of gifted education a research questionnaire and two additional letters to be mailed to systems within the state. I have received answers from only twenty-five states; I have received no response from your state. As I am sure you are aware, for research surveys to be valid, a larger return than 50% is necessary; therefore, I am resubmitting the entire package with the hope that you will help me in my research project.

As I stated in my earlier request, it is impossible to become familiar with the gifted/talented programs in each state. As a result, I would appreciate it if you would forward the two enclosed questionnaires to two of the best gifted/talented programs in your state, preferably ones which have gifted programs in language arts at the high school level. While I realize the questionnaire is aimed at the instructional teacher, would you complete the one enclosed in your packet with the items marked which you feel would be the best answer.

It would be most helpful in all the completed questionnaires were returned to me by June 1. Your help in this matter is most appreciated. Any other information concerning your program, especially in the areas of curriculum and instruction, would be welcome.

Sincerely,

Brenda R. Lyons

Brenda R. Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

May 7, 1982

Dear Instructor of the Gifted/Talented:

I am a graduate student currently working on my Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University. Part of my requirements is writing a dissertation titled Development of a Curriculum Design in Language Arts for Gifted and Talented Students at the High School Level. A portion of the dissertation will deal with the results of the enclosed questionnaire which I would like for you to complete. Since your name has been suggested by your state's director or coordinator of the gifted/talented, I feel that the information provided will be of great help in my research project.

It would be helpful if I receive the completed questionnaire by June 1. Your help in this matter is most appreciated. Also, if you have any information which you feel would be of interest to me, especially information concerning curriculum and/or instruction in the gifted/ talented programs, I would welcome it.

Sincerely,

Brenda R. Lyons

Brenda R. Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma
73034

September 15, 1982

Dear Gifted/Talented Coordinator:

In order to write the research section of my dissertation concerning the design of a curriculum for gifted secondary English, I am surveying each of the fifty states concerning their gifted/talented programs. As of now, I have received information from thirty-eight states, but I have not received information from your state.

Would it be possible for you to forward either two or three of the enclosed questionnaires to schools in your state which have gifted/talented programs? If you wish, you could complete one of the three questionnaires, or you could forward all three. While I am especially interested in quality programs with language arts or English gifted programs, any school which has an existing program could complete the survey.

If it is not possible to forward the surveys, is there any information concerning your state's program for the gifted which you could provide? Any information would be most useful.

As a secondary classroom instructor, I appreciate the demands placed upon you and the classroom teachers, so I will especially appreciate any help you can give me. Hopefully, the survey results will lead to better programs for the gifted. I would be glad to forward the results to you if you wish.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

September 15, 1982

Dear Instructor of the Gifted/Talented:

I am a graduate student currently working on my Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University. A portion of my dissertation will deal with the results of the enclosed questionnaire which I would like for you to complete. Since your name has been suggested by your state's director or coordinator of the gifted/talented, I feel that the information provided will be of great help in my research project.

It would be helpful if I receive the completed questionnaire by October 15 or as soon as possible. Your help in this matter is most appreciated. Also, if you have any information which you feel would be of interest to me, especially information concerning curriculum and/or instruction in the gifted/talented program, I would welcome it.

Sincerely,

Brenda R. Lyons

Brenda R. Lyons
4106 Karen Drive
Edmond, Oklahoma
73034

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Please complete each section of the following questionnaire.

Part I: Identification Methods of the Gifted/Talented

Please check the method(s) which you currently use in your program to identify the gifted/talented learner.

____ individual intelligence test scores

____ previous school achievement

____ teacher nomination

____ standardized achievement test scores

____ creativity test scores

____ group intelligence test scores

____ other methods (please specify)_____

_____

Please check the person(s) who identifies the gifted/talented in your program.

____ classroom teacher

____ teacher of gifted/talented

____ school psychologist

____ school administrators

____ a committee

____ other (please specify)

_____

Part II: Curriculum Modes for the Gifted/Talented

Please check the areas in which you have special programs for the gifted/talented.

____ general intellectual ability

____ specific academic aptitude (please specify areas)

_____

_____

____ creative or productive thinking

____ leadership ability

____ visual and/or performing arts (please specify areas)

_____

_____

Which type of programming mode do you have in your school?

____ enrichment

____ acceleration

____ grouping

____ other (please specify)

_____

Who developed the curriculum for the gifted/talented in your school?

____ curriculum committee

____ curriculum coordinator

____ gifted/talented coordinator

____ instructors

____ no specific curriculum used

____ other (please specify)

_____

What is the organizational pattern for the gifted/talented in your school?

____ full-time classes

____ part-time classes

____ resource rooms

____ itinerant programs

____ regular programs with supportive services

____ other (please specify)

_____

Part III: Instructional Methods

How does the curriculum for the gifted/talented differ from the regular curriculum?

____ development of abstract thinking

____ sharpening of reasoning abilities

____ practice in creative problem setting and solving

____ higher cognitive processing, i.e. analysis, synthesis, and evaluation

____ other (please specify)

_____

Which of the following techniques, if any, are employed in your program?

____ individualized instruction

____ pre-testing of standardized curriculum

____ use of mentors

____ special guidance services

____ other (please specify)

_____

Part IV: Teacher Selection

Who selects the instructors for the gifted/talented classes?

____ volunteers

____ administratively selected

____ gifted/talented coordinator

____ department head

____ other (please specify)

_____

What special training, if any, is required for the instructors in the gifted/talented classes?

____ college credit in gifted/talented

____ inservice

____ workshops

____ other (please specify)

_____

Part V: Evaluation Techniques

How are the gifted/talented students' grade point averages calculated?

____ same point system as all students

____ weighted point system

____ other (please specify)

_____

What is the grade point system for your program?

____ four point system

____ five point system

____ other (please specify)

_____

What types of formative evaluation tests are used?

____ pretests

____ self-assessment items

____ diagnostic measures

____ posttests

____ other (please specify)

_____

What types of summative evaluation tests are given?

____ essay

____ multiple choice

____ true/false

____ short answer

____ combination

____ no tests given

____ other (please specify)

_____

Are criterion-referenced measures, norm-references measures, or minimum-essentials measures used?

____ criterion-references measures: measures that evaluate achievement in terms of a predetermined standard of performance without reference to the level of performance of other class members

____ norm-referenced measures: measures that evaluate achievement in terms of an individual's position relative to other members of the class.

____ minimum-essentials measures: measures used to assess mastery or competence in specifically defined areas

What types of assignments are included in the grading process?

____ daily grades

____ unit test grades

____ quarter test grades

____ six-weeks test grades

____ trimester test grades

____ semester test grades

____ independent study grades

____ extra-credit grades

____ other (please specify)

_____

If you have a program for language arts gifted students, please complete the remainder of the questionnaire.

Part VI: Language Arts Gifted Program

In which grades do you have gifted language arts?

____ 9

____ 10

____ 11

____ 12

How are these special classes classified?

____ honors

____ advanced placement (please specify grade level)_____

____ humanities

____ Great Books

____ creative writing

____ other (please specify)

_____

Which of the following is stressed in the gifted language art classes?

____ language (grammar)

____ literature

____ composition

____ other (please specify)

_____

Which of the following are emphasized in the gifted language arts classes?

____ skill development

____ creativity

____ problem-solving

____ higher cognitive processes

____ other (please specify

_____

Is there any other information which you think would be of interest?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Name_____

Position_____

Address_____

_____

_____

_____

VITA

Brenda Rogers Lyons

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: DEVELOPMENT OF A CURRICULUM DESIGN IN LANGUAGE ARTS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS IN GRADES NINE THROUGH TWELVE

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tulsa, Oklahoma, June 20, 1945, the daughter of Dewey B. and Anita Fay Rogers.

Education: Attended elementary school in Ft. Worth, Texas, and Turley, Oklahoma; junior high school in Turley, Oklahoma; high school diploma received in 1963 from McLain High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma; received Bachelor of Science degree in 1967 from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a major in language arts education; received the Master of Arts degree in 1978 from Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma, with a major in English; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May, 1983.

Professional Experience: Taught eighth and ninth grade English at Carey Junior High School in Cheyenne, Wyoming, 1967-71; substitute taught secondary subjects in Ft. Collins, Colorado, 1972; taught ninth and tenth grade English at Edmond Mid High School in Edmond, Oklahoma, 1976-82; currently serving as department head and tenth grade English instructor at Edmond Mid High School.

Professional Organizations: Edmond Association of Classroom Teachers; Oklahoma Education Association; National Education Association; Kappa Delta Pi.