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ABSTRACT

A NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF GIFTED EDUCATION
FOR FRENCH IMMERSION STUDENTS IN
CANADIAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

Vivienne Collinson

This study investigates a select population of Canadian elementary school children, namely, gifted students in French immersion programs. Survey data were gathered from the Canadian Ministries of Education, school boards with "full" French immersion, and publishers of immersion resources. The study concentrates on eight areas: provincial/territorial supports for French immersion and gifted immersion programs; the influence of location and time on the implementation of gifted immersion; identification methods and measures; comparison of distribution between gifted immersion and gifted mainstream classes; staffing; methods of program delivery; target grades for gifted programs; curriculum needs and resources.

Implications and recommendations, based on the results, are outlined and elaborated.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

French Immersion

Canadian elementary schools have been implementing French immersion (FI) programs since 1965 (Bruck and Swain, 1976). FI is continuing to grow and it has now been established in every province and territory. With an enrollment of 221,314 elementary children in 1987-88 (Statistics Canada, 1988) compared to 45,482 a decade earlier (The CPF Immersion Registry, 1988), FI has been recognized as a uniquely Canadian approach to bilingualism. It has generated research and a substantial amount of literature (Swain and Lapkin, 1981; Mollica, 1987), but as is often the case in educational innovations, immersion has not been without its share of problems and criticisms (Volkart, 1983; Burns, 1986; Tyler, 1988). Nevertheless, it is now entrenched as an expanding reality of Canadian education.

Gifted Education

Gifted education has also appeared on the Canadian educational scene, although in a far less political or publicized way than FI. School boards have seemed wary of implementing programs, perhaps because in an egalitarian-oriented society, special education for the gifted may be perceived as a costly privilege instead of a need; or perhaps because gifted programs
might encourage the same cries of elitism that immersion first engendered. While the decade of the eighties produced an ever-expanding volume of research and literature in gifted education in the United States (Renzulli et al., 1981; Clark, 1983; Gardner, 1983; Stein, 1986), the Canadian attitude has remained cautious.

An educational minority, FI students represent only 8.7% of the elementary school population (Statistics Canada, 1988). With gifted students an even smaller minority, the unique group of students who are both gifted and in French immersion is truly a minority within a minority.

**Review of Literature**

A preliminary search of available literature using the Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC), the Bibliographic Retrieval Service (BRS), and the Ontario Education Resources Information System (ONTERIS) indicated a lack of evidence of any published research in the area of giftedness in FI programs.

**Purpose**

The literature review supports the need for research into gifted immersion programs in Canada.

The specific goal of this study is to investigate and present an overview of:

1. current provincial/territorial immersion and gifted immersion programs with specific reference to support
grants and guidelines;
2. identification procedures, staffing qualifications and needs, and methods of program delivery;
3. curriculum needs and resources.

It is hoped that the research:
1. may give clues as to how seriously Canadians are committed to special education needs on the far right side of the standard distribution curve;
2. will highlight issues and recommendations that are useful in future planning and development by school boards;
3. will indicate trends and needs of school boards already offering gifted programs to FI students;
4. will generate further questions for future research.

Focus of the Study

The study concentrates on eight research questions in order to determine:

1. to what degree the implementation of immersion and gifted immersion is linked to Ministry of Education grants and guidelines;
2. whether school boards near francophone communities or school boards offering FI for the longest period of time are most likely to initiate gifted immersion;
3. which methods and measures are used to identify gifted immersion students;
4. whether the proportion of gifted students is higher in immersion programs than in mainstream English programs;
5. which provinces are experiencing staffing shortages for their gifted immersion programs;
6. how gifted immersion programs are being delivered;
7. at which levels (Primary K-3, Junior 4-6, Intermediate 7-8) gifted immersion is being offered;
8. needs and sources for curriculum support resources.

Limitations
1. Only school boards offering “full” French immersion are considered in the study. Full French immersion is defined in this study as a program of early, middle, or late immersion in which French is the language of instruction for all subjects (except English Language Arts) for at least the first two years.
   It should be noted that this study does not include the many Canadian school boards that offer partial immersion.
2. Private schools, schools for Canadian Forces Bases, and special schools for rehabilitation, handicapped, etc. are excluded.
3. The study includes only elementary students (Kindergarten through grade 8). No data were gathered for secondary school students.
4. Since the province of Quebec does not officially recognize FI for anglophones, Quebec is not included in this study. Even though Statistics Canada cites the English school system in Quebec as having "the highest proportion of students enrolled in French immersion programs in Canada (about 18%)" (1988, p. 255), a Ministry official politely declined to fill out the survey. In a telephone conversation, the same official skirted the issue by not admitting the existence of FI in Quebec.¹

¹Nothing prohibits English schools from teaching any subject in French, but French is the compulsory language of instruction for immigrants whose first language is neither French nor English.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Population

This study investigates a select population of Canadian elementary school children, namely gifted students in French immersion.

In order to gather data related to the education of the target population, three groups were surveyed:

1. the Ministries or Departments of Education for ten provinces and two territories;
2. the 206 school boards or districts in Canada that offer full immersion. These school boards were identified by the Ministries of Education, then double-checked in *The CPF Immersion Registry* (1988), the annual Canadian Parents for French listing of immersion programs in Canada;
3. the 88 Canadian publishers or distributors of French or FI materials appropriate for elementary students. The companies were identified through Ontario's *Circular 14* (1988), publishers' displays at national conferences, and my personal experience of ordering books for immersion school libraries.

Instruments

A different survey was designed for each of the groups
(Appendix A, p. 84). Participants were sent a copy of the survey and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study. The surveys were all original authored and were designed to elicit information related to the purpose of the study and to the corresponding research questions. The surveys will be discussed in the sequence of the three groups described above.

Table 1
Groups Surveyed and Percentage of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministries of education</td>
<td>100% (N = 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School boards</td>
<td>84.9% (N = 206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers/distributors</td>
<td>53.4% (N = 88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey 1. This is a three-part survey that deals with ministry grants for both immersion students and gifted students, ministry guidelines for the same two groups, and a request for a list of provincial or territorial school boards that offer full immersion.

Survey 2. Section A requests background information to
divide the school boards into three categories determining which further sections they would complete:

1. school boards not offering gifted immersion (GI) to students;
2. school boards offering GI in English only;
3. school boards offering GI in French.

Section B addresses identification procedures; Section C, program delivery and staffing; and Section D, curriculum needs and resources. Section E indicates which school boards, currently not offering a gifted program, intend to offer one within five years. Section F offers a synopsis of the study to all respondents, an offer made in each of the surveys.

Survey 3. This survey seeks information about publishers' current and projected materials for GI, detailing subject areas and grade levels in particular.

Limitations of surveys

1. Surveys 1 and 2 were discussed with two researchers, one an expert in FI. The responses did not indicate any major deficiencies in the surveys.
2. Table 1 indicates the disappointing return of Survey 3 by publishers. The original list of 88 companies is recognized as not being a definitive list of all Canadian sources of French books or FI resources. However, most of the large and well-known school suppliers are among those that responded.
Procedure

Survey 1 was sent first since the lists of school boards furnished by the ministries would determine how many copies of Survey 2 were required. Surveys 2 and 3 were then sent simultaneously. A second copy of Surveys 2 and 3 with a different cover letter was sent to the school boards and publishers who had not returned the original survey within one month. No further contact was made.

Being familiar with the wide diversity of delivery of English gifted programs in Ontario, I had anticipated difficulty creating a special section in Survey 2 to accommodate the variety of possible responses. I therefore decided on a phone interview instead. Each school board offering its immersion students a gifted program in English was contacted by phone to discuss:

1. the method of program delivery;
2. the relationship between GI and mainstream English gifted content;
3. grades at which the GI option is offered;
4. the degree of satisfaction with the program.

An opportunity was given for discussing open-ended explanations or areas of interest. The only exceptions to this were the eight respondents who had already volunteered such information when completing the survey.

I also contacted 49 other respondents and/or agencies for
information or for clarification of comments written on the surveys. For example, specific background information was sought from such agencies as the Association for Bright Children (ABC) and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. In another instance, I was curious why only one school board in Canada had listed IPAT (Appendix B, p. 100) as an identification measure. The respondent explained that the board had located the measure during a search for a culture-fair intelligence test for its population.

Finally, as indicated in the surveys, a synopsis of the study was sent to any respondent who had requested one.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Provincial/Territorial Support for French Immersion and Gifted Immersion Programs

The purpose of the first research question was to determine to what degree the implementation of FI and GI is linked to Ministry of Education grants and guidelines. The data collected suggest that there is evidence that while ministry support mechanisms may help school boards, they do not have to be in place for program implementation to occur. In some cases, other pressures must have influenced implementation since programs are in place with little or no ministry support.

Evidence in Table 2 supports the fact that full immersion not only is well established in Canada, but also is continuing to expand. Yet, considering the length of time that programs have been in place, two surprising facts emerged from the data:

1. Despite substantial involvement in FI, school boards in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the Northwest Territories do not receive any special grants for immersion students.

2. Ontario, with the largest number of full immersion boards in Canada, does not have immersion guidelines in place. Even though Ontario has had immersion for
almost two decades and even though various dates have been suggested for the release of immersion guidelines, a ministry official would not commit to any firm date of publication (File).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents (Boards) with Full Immersion</th>
<th>Average Number of Years</th>
<th>Range (in Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>31 ($N = 35$)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>80 ($N = 5$)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>37 ($N = 22$)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>30 ($N = 37$)</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>27 ($N = 158$)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>34 ($N = 59$)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>18 ($N = 120$)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>21 ($N = 141$)</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>35 ($N = 75$)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>67 ($N = 3$)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>100 ($N = 1$)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. The Yukon has no school boards. The entire territory is The Yukon Territory School System, administered by the Yukon Department of Education.
Nova Scotia is the only other province without provincial guidelines, but they are expected to be in place by late 1989 (Statistics Canada, 1988).

Immersion programs have continued to grow and expand with or without ministry grants or guidelines. Telephone comments indicated that parental interest and pressure were powerful influences on boards. Parents seem to have been the first group to have looked beyond the government's unification ideal and seen the link between bilingualism and the job market. They realized that immersion could provide an opening for economic and job opportunities (Olson and Burns, 1981; McGrath, 1984; Vancouver Sun, 1984).

Parental interest can also be seen in the 1977 founding of the organization called Canadian Parents for French. It grew from 3,210 memberships\(^2\) in 1981 to 17,887 members by June 30, 1988 (CPF, phone interview). While this group does not limit itself to immersion issues, it does serve as an example of strong parental involvement in education and a political factor that could well influence school boards.

Support in the form of grants or guidelines is considerably less for gifted programs than for immersion programs. Evidence from the study seems to indicate that the

---

\(^{2}\)In 1985, CPF changed its system of counting from memberships to members. Prior to 1985, for example, a husband and wife would have been listed as one membership. After the change, they would have been counted as two members.
Table 3
Availability of Ministry Grants for Gifted and Immersion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both Programs</th>
<th>Immersion Only</th>
<th>Neither Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Provinces/Territories Offering Gifted Immersion Programs With or Without Ministry Gifted Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With</th>
<th>Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presence or absence of ministry support mechanisms does not necessarily influence implementation of programs:

1. Nova Scotia does not offer GI in any board. If ministry supports were considered influential, this situation would be expected since Nova Scotia has neither grants nor guidelines for either immersion or gifted education. Yet, Nova Scotia has immersion programs.

2. The Yukon has not implemented GI despite grants and guidelines in place for both immersion and gifted programs. One official told me that student numbers are too low for the Yukon to consider implementing GI (File).

3. The Northwest Territories now have GI in one board despite the absence of gifted grants or guidelines.

4. Ontario and the western provinces indicate a higher degree of correlation between ministry supports and board practices.

Table 5 shows that Ontario and the western provinces have the largest number of GI programs in Canada. It would seem as though ministry support may well have been a factor influencing GI implementation in these two regions; all of these provinces have gifted guidelines in place and all except Saskatchewan have grants for GI.
One western respondent commented that although both immersion and gifted grants are available, they are not fully utilized because of organizational and staffing problems (File). It should be noted, too, that in Ontario, one might expect even higher numbers of boards offering GI since Ontario has legislated special education and services for exceptional children, including gifted children (Education Act).

Table 5
Percentage of Immersion Boards Offering Gifted Immersion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic provinces</td>
<td>12.5 (N = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>74.4 (N = 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western provinces</td>
<td>59.8 (N = 58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories</td>
<td>33.3 (N = 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, taking parental influence into account, Ontario has strong representation in the Association for Bright Children (ABC). Ontario's involvement has caused a growth spurt from
one chapter in 1973 to over 35 chapters in 1989.\textsuperscript{3}

The data collected to determine the degree of influence of ministry support mechanisms on program implementation suggest that grants and guidelines must be combined with factors such as political climate, parental influence, student population, and staffing in order to determine the implementation of programs. Results from the survey suggest that ministry action can lag behind widespread innovations at the board level.

\textbf{Influence of Location and Time on Implementation of Gifted Immersion Programs}

In addition to determining a possible relationship between ministry supports and GI implementation, the study also explored two other factors: board proximity to a francophone community as well as the length of time that FI has been in place. The purpose of the second research question, therefore, was to determine:

1. whether full immersion boards near francophone communities were more likely to implement GI than comparable boards not near francophone communities;

2. whether boards that have had FI longer than the

\textsuperscript{3}The Ontario president of ABC estimates 37 to 40 chapters in Ontario as of June 30, 1989. The exact number of chapters and members will not be known until late 1989 when all memberships will be handled centrally from Toronto for the first time (phone interview).
Table 6
Analysis of Boards With/Without Gifted Immersion and Their Proximity to a Francophone Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Province(s)</th>
<th>With GI</th>
<th>Without GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>O 3</td>
<td>E 7.10</td>
<td>O 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 5.90</td>
<td>P .018*</td>
<td>P .997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Francophone Community</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>O 13</td>
<td>O 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 9.83</td>
<td>P .969</td>
<td>P .089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O 22</td>
<td>E 18.02</td>
<td>O 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 14.98</td>
<td>P .960</td>
<td>P .087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>O 1</td>
<td>O 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 10.37</td>
<td>P .000</td>
<td>P .999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O 19</td>
<td>E 13.65</td>
<td>O 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 11.35</td>
<td>P .995</td>
<td>P .016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>O 36</td>
<td>O 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 34.40</td>
<td>P .747</td>
<td>P .363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** O = Observed  
E = Expected  
P = Probability of K ≤ O  
* p < .05 one-tailed  
* p > .95 indicates a meaningful association
average number of years were more likely to implement GI than boards with FI for less than the average number years.

The survey data were organized into frequency tables and then analyzed separately for location and time (refer to Appendix D, p. 103). Analysis for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories was not included for geographical reasons. Since the entire Yukon Territory is one school board, it is meaningless to say whether or not the board is near a francophone community. Similarly, the huge area of the Northwest Territory is divided into only three boards.

Table 6 indicates that in the Atlantic provinces, there is no meaningful association between proximity to a francophone community and the implementation of GI \((p < .05)\). The implementation of GI by Atlantic boards near francophone communities is lower than expected; in the region, only four boards offer GI—a far lower ratio than anywhere else in Canada (refer to Table 17, p. 57). It is interesting to note that if one considers ministry support as another possible factor influencing implementation, the Atlantic region does not have nearly the support enjoyed by Ontario and the western provinces (refer to Table 3 and Table 4, p. 14). Also, as pointed out earlier, Nova Scotia does not offer any GI at all.

The data indicate that in Ontario and the western provinces, there is a meaningful association between proximity to a francophone community and the implementation of GI
Table 7  
Number of Years of Immersion as a Possible Influence on the Implementation of Gifted Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Province(s)</th>
<th>Higher than M</th>
<th>Lower than M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O 1</td>
<td>O 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 6.21</td>
<td>E 5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>P .001&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>P .057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Francophone Community</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>O 9</td>
<td>O 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 5.32</td>
<td>E 4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P .992</td>
<td>P .559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td>O 11</td>
<td>O 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 9.46</td>
<td>E 7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P .856</td>
<td>P .984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td>O 1</td>
<td>O 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 3.66</td>
<td>E 2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P .050</td>
<td>P .058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Near Francophone Community</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>O 7</td>
<td>O 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 8.41</td>
<td>E 5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P .330</td>
<td>P .999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
<td>O 26</td>
<td>O 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>E 21.73</td>
<td>E 13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P .984</td>
<td>P .068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. O = Observed  
E = Expected  
P = Probability of K ≤ O  
<sup>a</sup> p < .05, one-tailed
(p > .95). However, in Ontario, the number of boards with GI that are not near a francophone community is also higher than expected. It is possible that because Ontario legislated gifted education, boards implemented GI regardless of location. However, despite legislation, one full immersion board does not offer gifted education to mainstream English students and 11 do not offer GI (refer to Table 17, p. 57). One has to conclude that proximity to a francophone community may well have been a factor in the implementation of GI in Canada, but that it should be considered along with several other factors.

Table 7 indicates that again, the territories were not included: the Yukon does not offer GI; the two boards offering GI in the Northwest Territories have offered FI for eight years and nine years respectively. The small number of boards and the similarity between the number of years make analysis of the territories impractical.

The data show that the number of years a board has had FI has not influenced the implementation of GI. Even regions with FI for less than the average number of years are offering more GI programs than expected. (The results were similar even when the Canadian means were used instead of the regional means—\( M = 10.3 \) near a francophone community and \( M = 8.3 \) not near a francophone community.)

The conclusion is that boards that have had FI longer than the average number of years will not be more likely to
implement GI than boards with FI for less than the average number of years, although isolated boards may appear to be exceptions. Two such cases are Sudbury and Carleton. Statistics Canada (1988) notes that:

About 6% of Ontario students are currently enrolled in French immersion. In two bilingual regions of Ontario, the numbers are quite extraordinary. In the Carleton School Board in the Ottawa area, about 55% of students entering kindergarten in September 1988 enrolled in immersion programs, and in Sudbury almost one-third of public school board students take French immersion at the elementary level (p. 256).

This study found that of the Ontario respondents, Carleton has had FI the longest time (19 years) with Sudbury not far behind (14 years). A third exception, the Timmins Board of Education, also in a bilingual area, ranks second in Ontario with 18 years of FI. All three boards have GI programs that are well-established and recognized by educators in the province.

Some boards that have recently implemented FI told me that gifted education was being implemented board-wide just prior to or at the same time as FI, and GI was implemented from the outset of the immersion programs (FIE).

It would seem that while ministry grants and guidelines, as well as proximity to a francophone community, can influence
the implementation of GI, their significance should be investigated in conjunction with other possible factors. Parental demand and educational trends seem to be worth consideration.

Identification Methods and Measures

The purpose of the third research question was to determine which methods and measures are used to identify GI students.

As surveys were returned, it became apparent that there is dissatisfaction and difficulty with a definition of giftedness and with identification procedures and measures. Telephone conversations reinforced respondents' discontent in these two areas (File).

The Question of Definition

The amount of literature on defining giftedness and on identifying gifted students suggests that this is no easy task. As research continues, the definitions become more complex.

Numerous U.S. states base their definition of giftedness on what is widely known as the Marland definition (Marland, 1972). This identifies six areas of ability: intellectual, academic, creative thinking, visual and performing arts, and leadership. The U.S. Office of Education in its definition of gifted and talented students now recognizes high performance in the areas of intellectual, creative, artistic, and leadership ability (U.S. Office of Education, 1988). Renzulli added to the definitions
with his three-ring concept (above-average ability, creativity, and task commitment) as did Gardner with his work on multiple intelligence (1983). Dabrowski theorized that the realms of giftedness can include the intellectual, emotional, imaginative, sensual, and psychomotor (Piechowski, 1979).

It is interesting to note that the definition of giftedness adopted by Ontario's Ministry of Education recognizes only intellectual ability and that aesthetic, kinesthetic, and psychosocial talents do not qualify for exceptionality groupings (Ministry of Education, 1984 and 1985). Only one province is attempting to meet the needs of its talented students; this program is limited to one school board in Atlantic Canada and it is still in its early stages of development [File].

The Question of Identification

Even though the trend seems to be toward a multidimensional or multifaceted definition of giftedness, Renzulli believes that "many people 'talk a good game' about the six categories [of the Marland definition] but continue to use a relatively high intelligence or aptitude score as a minimum requirement for entrance into a special program [and that] perhaps the time has come for persons in all areas of endeavor to develop more careful procedures for evaluating the products of candidates for special programs" (Renzulli, 1978). Gallagher notes that "intelligence testing that asks children to respond to questions requiring memory, association, and logical thinking
remains the prime tool for identification of intellectually superior children" (1985, p. 28). A Canadian survey found that one third of its respondents relied on a minimum IQ score ranging from 115 to 145 (Borthwick et al., 1980). While educators may be aware of pitfalls in tests and in test results, the question of identification has not been resolved. The U.S. Department of Education, in seeking proposals for a $6.2 million grants program to support gifted and talented education, will give absolute priority to applications "that propose to identify gifted and talented students who may not be identified through traditional assessment methods" and invitational priority to projects "that use multiple criteria for selecting highly able students for admission into a gifted and talented program, rather than a single measure such as a standardized test" (Federal Register, 1989).

In Canada, similar concerns were also raised in this study. Although seven provinces indicated the use of standardized tests, some school board respondents specifically commented on the difficulty of not being able to test for certain dimensions of giftedness such as creativity, abstract or global thinking, and divergent thinking.

The situation of testing FL children introduces another dimension to an already complex arena and will be discussed as a separate issue later.
Identification of Gifted Students

The conditions for eligibility to GI programs include a variety of identification procedures. The results of the data support the aforementioned finding that formal testing remains one of the prime tools of identifying gifted children. By formal, I mean the inclusion of standardized or norm-referenced tests; informal being defined as checklists, inventories, etc. that are not standardized and are usually based on observation (refer to Appendix B, p. 100). Of the provinces that do include formal

Table 8

Use of Formal and Informal Identification Measures by Provinces/Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal and Informal</th>
<th>Informal Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** Nova Scotia and The Yukon Territory do not have a gifted immersion program in place.
testing as a part of their identification procedures, boards in all seven provinces regularly include the Canadian Test for Basic Skills (CTBS), boards in six provinces use the Canadian Cognitive Abilities Test (CCAT), and in five provinces the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-R) is used.

Within each province, the array of identification measures used varies from school board to school board. A complete inventory of measures listed by the boards is in Appendix B (p. 100).

The recent trend in identifying giftedness seems to be moving toward the adoption of multiple sources of assessment (Fox, 1981; Gallagher, 1985; Tuttle et al., 1988). From the data collected, there is strong evidence to support the use of multiple sources by Canadian school boards offering FI.

Many school boards indicated that they use a combination of the assessment methods listed in Table 9 or that the measures might vary depending on the age of the child. Clearly, the immersion teacher plays a key role in identifying gifted children. Concerns about the teacher’s role will be discussed later.

The results in Table 9 are similar to the results of the Canadian Education Survey (Borthwick et al., 1980). The major difference is that in this study, parental identification ranks higher than in the 1980 study. However, as elaborated earlier, parental involvement in educationally-based associations has
Table 9
The Order of Priority of Identification Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental identification or inventory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence tests</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interest</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer identification</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity tests</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometric tests</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** The order of priority is ranked from 1-8 with 1 being the most important.

also increased in the intervening years.

The inventory of identification measures used by immersion school boards (Appendix B, p. 100) indicates only four instruments in French, although several boards have adapted or devised their own measures appropriate for immersion students. However, evidence from the data collected supports the perception of school boards (ratio 5:1) that there is a lack of French measures suitable for identifying GI students.
Some of the comments include (File):

- "We don't know if there are any" [suitable measures in French].
- "Math should be tested in the language of instruction."
- "Many tests lack a Canadian cultural base."
- "The available [French] tests are for Francophones, not for French as a Second Language students."
- "We do not have personnel trained to administer tests in French."

Since only four French measures were listed, it is reasonable to conclude that most testing of immersion students is conducted in English. Respondents were asked what their language preference would be if oral and written identification

Table 10
Language Preferences for Identification Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Oral(^a)</th>
<th>Written(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination of French and English</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French only</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(N = 39\) \(^b\) \(N = 38\)
measures were available in both English and French.

The results in Table 10 indicate that the current practice of testing entirely or almost entirely in English is not meeting the needs of immersion school boards. How diligently these boards have searched for French measures or whether the existing French measures are culture-fair or too difficult for immersion students is unknown. Concerns about testing immersion children in English will be elaborated later.

A Comparison of Distribution:
Gifted Immersion and Gifted Mainstream

As a result of my own experience teaching immersion students, I suspected that the number of GI students might be proportionately higher than the number of gifted children in mainstream English programs. Edmonton had already noticed by 1984 that the average ability of their immersion students was higher than the average for the district (Jones, 1984). However by 1987, Wiss had observed that “the majority of these children no longer are the high achievers who once typified FI classes” (1987), an observation supported in this study by a large Ontario board (File).

Without standardized test results included in the identification procedure, the answer to the question of distribution remains subjective and speculative. Yet, as mentioned earlier, not all boards or provinces include formal
testing. Also, while IQ or other test results allow us to make objective comparisons, there is a further complication in school boards where potentially gifted children are not given formal tests until after they have been recommended by a teacher. Evidently, the number of children missed is unknown.

One school board indicated that its ratio of GI students to gifted English students was 3:2, another board 14:11, and a third 2:1. A western board wrote that “9.7% of our French immersion students are in the Academic Challenge Program versus 1.5% of regular English program students.” Comments from other school boards included (File):

- “Our ratio was much higher when we started our immersion program, but is now about par.”

Table 11
Responses as to Whether There Are More Gifted Students in French Immersion Programs Than in Mainstream English Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 (N = 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (N = 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to my knowledge</td>
<td>37 (N = 16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• "French immersion is considered by some to be a program for the gifted or élite in itself."

• "More highly able and motivated students are drawn to immersion."

• "Generally parents appear to place their children who are more academically gifted in this program."

Ontario appears to have some particular problems vis-à-vis GI:

1. Gifted education is widely available to immersion children; 76.2% of Ontario’s full immersion school boards offer a gifted program. Of interest is the result indicating that of all the Canadian immersion school boards who offer their GI students a gifted component in English only, 52% are in Ontario. This is three times higher than the second ranked province. The study also discovered that Ontario is the only province where there are school boards that do not make a gifted component available to GI students as long as they are in FI. That is, if the GI students want to continue in FI, they must forego gifted education. If they want a gifted program, they must withdraw from FI.

2. The data reveal that of 18 Canadian boards indicating parents withdrawing students from immersion programs to put them into English gifted programs, 13
are in Ontario. A 1987 survey of a school board near Toronto found that 9% of the immersion population transferred to the gifted program (Tyler, 1988).

The replies in Table 11 (p. 31) indicate that there is not a higher frequency of gifted children in immersion programs. It is not known, however, whether the respondents (except for the four cited earlier) had access to accurate statistical data. Nor is it known how many students are missed by teacher recommendation or informal testing. There is also the possibility that full immersion children may be disadvantaged by being tested in English, particularly if the test includes reading or writing and if the test is given before much formal English is introduced. Finally, results are biased when gifted children are withdrawn from FI in order to participate in a gifted program.

Staffing

The question of which provinces are currently experiencing staffing shortages for GI inevitably leads to the question of which provinces project a staffing shortage in the near future.

With continuing growth of FI across Canada, it was unavoidable that the question of staffing—and, by extension, teacher training—would eventually have to be addressed. One of the largest boards in Canada hired outside of the province for the 1989-1990 school year in order to meet its current, growing need for French teachers (File). The Commissioner of Official
Languages has already recommended that “planning at the national level be undertaken to overcome current and projected shortages of teachers of French as a second language” (Statistics Canada, 1988, p. 250). The introduction of gifted education into immersion programs by 95 of Canada’s 175 full immersion school boards added another dimension to the issue of staffing.

From the data collected, it was determined that the provinces currently experiencing difficulty in finding qualified teachers for GI are British Columbia, Ontario, and New Brunswick (with British Columbia citing the largest number of boards experiencing shortages). A consultant near the Ontario-Manitoba border said the size and remoteness of the board means that it cannot compete with larger, more urban boards in attracting and holding highly qualified GI teachers (File). Yet one board official near Toronto told me that their current Intermediate GI class would have to be discontinued unless a teacher could be found by September, 1989. He blamed the general shortage of French teachers in Ontario as well as the high cost of housing in the Toronto area (File).

Alberta’s GI boards reported few hiring difficulties up until now, but Alberta and Manitoba as well as British Columbia, Ontario, and New Brunswick predict staffing shortages for their gifted programs in the near future. One respondent said his board would like to integrate the gifted component with the
Table 12

School Boards Experiencing Gifted Immersion Teacher Shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortages</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36 (N = 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64 (N = 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

immersion program but that staffing is difficult (File). A western official wrote that "[gifted] immersion programs are not as well defined or well supported as English programs because of a lack of gifted/enrichment teachers who are also competent in French" (File). This double role or dual competency may be one of the reasons some immersion boards offer their gifted component in English only. It should be noted here that this study does not attempt to determine whether there is a shortage of English gifted teachers even though almost half of the GI programs are taught in English (refer to Figure 2, p. 40).

In addition to the question of dual competency if the gifted program is offered in French, another possible hurdle may be the qualification requirements which, in some cases, demand considerable time and effort to attain. The following is a summary of requirements for a GI teacher depending on the
province or territory (File):

- no requirements beyond a teaching certificate;
- high teaching performance;
- personal interest in gifted education;
- a knowledge of the gifted program and materials;
- Special Education Part I desirable;
- Special Education and French as a Second Language Part I;
- specialist certification in Special Education;
- specialist certification in both French as a Second Language and Special Education with a gifted option.

One western board sent me a two-page job description for a GI candidate. Some of the qualities expected in addition to the required paper qualifications are outstanding interpersonal skills, mastery of the spoken and written language (French), thorough familiarity with the immersion curriculum, and evidence of skill in developing curriculum (File). The development of these attributes requires time and experience.

Given the evidence of staffing shortages, what is being done to improve the situation? An Atlantic school board has solved the problem by designing an in-board training course. A western school board pays to send its teachers to be trained in Connecticut (File). Other boards offer training and professional support by means of (File):

- inter-school visitation training;
• financial aid for attending regional and national conferences;
• local monthly in-service meetings;
• placement of a resource teacher in each school;
• access to an area resource teacher or consultant.

Clearly a dilemma is in the making. The three provinces with the largest number of GI programs are all beginning to experience or are predicting staffing shortages. Eighteen immersion boards across Canada are planning to implement GI within five years. While these predictions may be encouraging for French-speaking graduates of Faculties of Education, school boards may find themselves looking seriously at lowering their standards of qualification requirements, training their own teachers well ahead of time, or going outside the province to find teachers. Staffing shortages are no longer a long-range consideration; they are a present reality.

Methods of Program Delivery

In determining how GI is being delivered in Canada, data from the surveys support the assumption that immersion boards can be classified according to three categories:

1. boards that do not offer a gifted program to their immersion students;
2. boards that offer GI using English as the language of instruction;
3. boards that offer GI using French or partial French (a combination of French and English) as the language of instruction.

The distribution of these three categories is illustrated in Figure 1.

Only 54% of the immersion school boards currently offer GI to their students. Another 18 boards (10.3%) indicated that they will be implementing a gifted component within the next

Figure 1
Availability of Gifted Programs for Immersion Students

\[ N = 175 \]

- NO PROGRAM OFFERED
- PROGRAM AVAILABLE IN FRENCH OR PARTIAL FRENCH
- PROGRAM AVAILABLE IN ENGLISH
five years.

As seen in Figure 2, there is a nearly even division between boards offering their program in French or a combination of French/English and boards offering their program in English only. Three of the latter indicated that they will be switching to French instruction within five years. As mentioned earlier, 24 (52%) of the boards using English are in Ontario. Three of those boards require parents to choose either immersion or gifted at some stage of their child's development.

**Gifted Immersion Programs in English**

One way of coping with GI students has been to offer them the same program as English gifted students receive (42 boards or 91%). Two western boards offer a gifted component in English but especially designed for their immersion students; two other western boards are currently offering an English-language gifted component only as staffing and resources permit. All except these latter two boards withdraw the immersion students from class to join their English counterparts. Five boards said they try to integrate the gifted material with topics the students are studying in their immersion class. However, several pointed out that time constraints of teachers may cause communication breakdowns in program planning.

The amount of time the students are withdrawn from the immersion classroom varies from board to board. Withdrawal ranges from "flexible" in one board to "a few times a year" in
another. Still another board has a regular withdrawal timetable of one week in four at a residential gifted centre for which the board pays the cost of transportation and lodging except for meals. On a continuum, there are many other variations and combinations specific to individual boards.

Figure 2
Language(s) of Instruction of Gifted Immersion Programs

\[N = 95\]

- 48% English
- 19% French
- 33% French/English

The grades at which gifted program withdrawal is available in English also vary widely. However, all of the boards except two make the program available at the Junior level (grades 4-6).
These two exceptions offer only late immersion which is available when students enter grade 7.

Given the definition of full immersion, it is somewhat surprising that nine boards (20%) offer GI in English at the Kindergarten or grade 1 level. Either it is assumed the immersion child can read English or no reading is included in the gifted program. However, it is possible to argue that children beginning immersion in Kindergarten or grade 1 may not have learned enough French to express themselves adequately, therefore making English the logical language of communication.

Some of the comments about GI programs delivered in English include (File):

- "In such a small board, this is the best we can offer."
- "Withdrawal is not the answer."
- "Our board policy is that Special Services must be delivered in English."
- "Our program is delivered in English because of the lack of French resources."
- "There is a problem [delivering the program in English] if the immersion pupil is a Francophone."

**Gifted Immersion Programs in French or French/English**

When respondents answered the question whether second language limitation are affecting their gifted program, the replies were split evenly between yes and no. The comments indicate
that the greatest problem is a lack of vocabulary in the early years of the program (File):

- "Lack of vocabulary makes brainstorming difficult."
- "We use English in K-1 where there is insufficient French vocabulary to cope."
- "It's a question of whether you're enriching French language or thinking skills or both."
- "They [students] lack vocabulary to express themselves in the affective and cognitive domains."
- "Students cannot do exercises with higher level thinking skills or use abstract concepts in the French language compared to their gifted peers in the regular gifted program."

Despite the variety of program delivery methods, evidence from Table 13 indicates clearly that the immersion classroom teacher plays an important role. This evidence may explain why some boards have high qualification requirements for their GI classroom or resource teachers, particularly if the teacher helps design as well as deliver the program. Nevertheless, the influential role of the classroom teacher also raises some serious concerns which will be discussed later.

Telephone and written comments indicated that some boards are pleased with the direction of their gifted program while others are looking for ways to improve delivery. It is encouraging that a number of boards are open to new
suggestions and willing to conduct a program evaluation although along with willingness, support from administrators, time, and funding need to be ensured in order for a thorough evaluation to be conducted and acted on if changes are necessary.

Table 13
Methods of Delivery of Gifted Immersion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of boards$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment in regular classroom</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal from classroom</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special groupings</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compacted program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. Because many boards offer more than one method of program delivery, a total of these responses is not meaningful.

$^a$ N = 49
Target Grades for Gifted Programs

The results from the question to determine at which grade levels GI is being offered are not unqualified. There is a notable difference depending on the language of instruction used to deliver the gifted program, particularly at the Primary level.

Gifted children do not “become” gifted at a certain age or for part of a day, week, or month. Nor do their abilities neatly fall into the Primary (Kindergarten-grade 3), Junior (grades 4-6), or Intermediate (grades 7-8) levels we have created in elementary schools. The ideal course of action would be to offer an on-going gifted program at all three levels; but boards need to consider the number of children involved, staffing, resources, and costs. In Ontario, even with provincial legislation in place for special education for gifted students, there seems to be no guarantee that special education will be available. For example, survey results show that 11 of 43 full immersion boards in Ontario offer no gifted program at all to their immersion students.

Nor does it appear that a gifted program is necessarily on-going. In one western board, immersion students may access a gifted program component only while they are in grades 4 and 5—not before, not after (File). Prior to this study, I had informally observed that gifted programs for mainstream English students seemed to be in place at Junior and Intermediate levels, but that not nearly as many were available
to Primary children. Hence the interest in finding out whether this was indeed the case and whether the practice would hold for GI.

Figure 3

*Availability of Gifted Programs for Mainstream English Students*

![Bar Chart](image)

\[N = 175\]

**NOTE.** Some boards offer gifted programs at both the 4-6 and the 7-8 levels. There are many organizational patterns; but as an example, if a board offered a program from grades 2-8, it would be represented in "all three levels."
A Comparison of the Availability of Gifted Programs for Three
Distinct Groups

The evidence of Figure 3 and Figure 4 supports the observation that most gifted programs offered only in English are, in fact, available at the Junior and Intermediate levels. The number of boards with continuous programs spanning some variation of all three levels (for example grades 2-8) is 44.6% and 33.3% respectively. The evidence also confirms the assumption that very little is being done for Primary gifted children, particularly in immersion. Comments during telephone interviews suggested a reluctance on the part of some educators to use intelligence tests with young children. Another possibility is that full immersion children may not have any formal English reading or writing until late Primary or early Junior, thus leading to test bias if the testing is done in English.

The results for programs offered in French or a combination of French/English are very different (Figure 5). A possible explanation for the low number of gifted programs at the Intermediate level may be that some boards began their immersion programs quite recently and that their first GI students have not yet reached the Intermediate grades. Conversely, the emphasis on Primary gifted programs may be because boards introduced gifted education at approximately the same time as immersion and the gifted program was continued
annually as the lead class advanced. This is speculation, however, and further research is needed to determine why the results of the immersion groups are so different.

Figure 4

Availability of Gifted Programs Offered in English to Immersion Students

NOTE. Some boards offer gifted programs at both the 4-6 and the 7-8 levels.
Figure 5
Levels at Which French or French/English Gifted Immersion Programs Were Implemented

N = 42

NOTE. School's discretion means that the program is offered if teachers are available.

Curriculum Needs and Resources

The purpose of the final research question was to determine the needs and sources for curriculum resources or support materials. Results from the data of Surveys 2 and 3 indicate a need for French resources at all grade levels, but show only a small number of sources producing French gifted
materials.

As indicated previously, there is a nearly even split among immersion boards offering gifted programs, a division determined by the language of instruction for the gifted component. Programs offered in English can draw on a rich background of children's literature and a wealth of reference books and gifted materials produced in Canada or in the United States. Programs offered in French or partial French make up only a small fraction of all Canadian gifted programs and of the publishing market for schools. This study concentrates on the curriculum needs for French GI materials and publishers' present and future responses to those needs.

Curriculum Needs

While one respondent reasoned that "strategies and methods are more important than materials" (File), 69% of the respondents indicated that they lack curriculum resources suitable for GI students. The situation is exacerbated by the lack of provincial—not to mention national—standardization of immersion programs. For example, a school board first introducing immersion in grade 7 (late immersion) and delivering its gifted component in French would need far different materials than would a board whose grade 7 students had begun immersion in Kindergarten.

One could argue that there may already exist gifted resources and a wealth of French children's literature in
Table 14
Levels at which Gifted Immersion Resources are Lacking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kindergarten to grade 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grades 4-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grades 7-8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** Some boards indicated a lack of resources at more than one level.  <sup>a</sup> N = 43

francophone schools. However, immersion teachers would need a thorough knowledge of available francophone resources in order to decide whether they could be used or adapted for use with immersion students. The scope of such a task for a teacher would be enormous.

One might wonder whether teachers are using English gifted materials as a base and trying to adapt or translate them—also an enormous task.

In addition to the lack of resources at all levels as indicated in Table 14, respondents listed specific subject areas for which they have few or no resources. The summary
included Mathematics, Language Arts, Science, the Social Sciences, and thinking skills.

Sources: School Boards

With such a reported dearth of resources for so broad a range of subject areas and grade levels, the difficulties of offering GI in French or partial French seem to be extensive. From what sources then are boards obtaining curriculum materials to support the current 49 such programs?

The evidence of Table 15 underscores the results of Table 9 (p. 28); not only are individual classroom teachers being relied on to identify GI students, but they are also responsible for finding or producing programs or support materials for their students. The alarming implications of these practices are discussed in the next chapter.

Concerning documents of support resources generated within individual school boards, only six immersion boards indicated that their materials may be purchased (Appendix C, p. 102). If purchasing other boards' materials is one of only four available sources, then the obvious question is how GI educators can find out what other boards are producing. Or if boards are paying educators to generate materials but not sharing them with other boards, are the educators 'reinventing the wheel' many times over? How are the educators finding the time and the training? Maybe it is too idealistic to envision a national centre of resources information for GI programs or
Table 15  
Sources of Gifted Immersion Support Materials for Programs  
Delivered Wholly or Partially in French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Percentage of Boards Relying on the Source (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual teacher's expertise</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents generated within one's own board</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other boards' documents</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** Some boards rely on several of these sources.

\(^a\) \(N = 49\)

resources—perhaps somewhat like PÉLAGIE (Pédagogie en langue française: guides et informations pour les éducateurs) or the Centre franco-ontarien de ressources pédagogiques.

**Commercial Sources**

Commercial resources from publishers ranked second as a source for French gifted materials. To determine what commercial resources are in fact available and from where, Survey 3 was sent to 88 Canadian publishers/distributors of FI resources.
The low return of the publishers’ surveys (53.4%) may reflect the attitude that two well-known school suppliers verbalized (File):

- “Not a priority area for us...not a big call for gifted material”;
- “The market for this type of material is too limited, considering the cost of production.”

The financial consideration is understandable, but boards have been communicating their need for these materials to the publishers; one company admitted that it has had requests from 30 school boards in the last 5 to 10 years and another company estimated that 75 boards had sent in requests for GI materials.

The survey discovered only eight Canadian publishers (Appendix C, p. 102) that produce French resources indicated as suitable for immersion students in general. These eight companies combined produce materials for all levels from Kindergarten to grade 8. However, most of the materials are targeted for Primary use, less for Junior, and the least for Intermediate. This pattern parallels the pattern of levels of implementation of French GI programs (refer to Figure 5, p. 48). The same eight companies anticipate publishing more French gifted materials in the future.

Table 16 indicates that all eight companies have concentrated on Language Arts as a primary enrichment focus
and plan to continue to do so. Two companies that currently have nothing in the Social Sciences will expand publication to include this field. One company will soon include Junior level materials in addition to its present Primary resources.

Table 16
A Comparison of Current and Projected Published Materials by Subjects/Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Subjects/Topics</th>
<th>Number of Publishers</th>
<th>Projected Subjects/Topics</th>
<th>Number of Publishers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from the survey indicates a dearth of French GI materials. The fact that only eight companies publish limited
materials and that only six school boards are willing to sell their materials supports this evidence. School boards are relying heavily on individual teachers but the inevitable questions arise as to how those teachers are being trained to undertake the task and how school boards are supporting the individual teachers with curriculum resource materials.
CHAPTER IV

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The strong response by school boards (84.9%) would indicate the timeliness of the study and high educator interest in it. Interest and an eagerness to find out more information about how other boards are handling GI programs were also expressed in telephone conversations. The many requests for a synopsis of the study (73%) or for further communication with me following its completion provide a clear indicator that there is a need for information about GI education across Canada.

Access of programs, the identification dilemma, program implementation, and the training of personnel emerged as the most significant areas of concern. This chapter elaborates implications related to these four areas and proposes recommendations.

Access of Programs

It is hoped that the growing number of school boards implementing gifted programs indicates a changing attitude toward the children labeled gifted. These children have been neglected for a long time (Mirman, 1971, p. 218; Borthwick et al., 1980, p. 10). Yet evidence from this study indicates that FI gifted students are still disadvantaged compared to mainstream English gifted students in that they do not have the same access to gifted programs as do their English peers.
Table 17

Accessibility of Immersion and Gifted Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Boards</th>
<th>Full Immersion Boards with Gifted Program for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion Plus</td>
<td>Non-Immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Provinces</td>
<td>99(^a)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>158(^b)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Provinces</td>
<td>395(^c)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories TOTALS</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>175(^d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Canadian Education Association Handbook (1988)
\(^b\) Directory of Education (1987-88)
\(^c\) Departments of Education
\(^d\) Number of respondents from a total of 206.
Table 17 indicates that the possibility of FI students being offered gifted education is consistently lower than if they were in mainstream English classes. (It should also be remembered that some boards require FI students to withdraw from immersion if they want gifted education). For example, in Ontario, 97.7% of the immersion boards offer gifted education to mainstream English students but only 74.4% to FI students. None of the four Canadian regions offers FI students the same opportunity to access gifted education as is given the mainstream English students. One has to keep in mind that while Canadian boards are making progress, the ‘minority within a minority’ is still a relatively neglected and disadvantaged group. If the provinces were to legislate gifted programs and support them with funding, access to gifted education might become more equitable. It is not known whether legislation would ensure legitimacy or equality of programs; for while government endorsement can be a catalyst for change, it does not guarantee social acceptance. Trustees’, administrators’, and educators’ support is needed to strengthen the catalyst. With legislation and support in place, educators of the gifted might not have to justify the existence of programs, risk having funding removed, or suffer through having programs being treated as “frills” (Delisle & Govender, 1988; Knopper, 1989).
Recommendation:

that the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, collaborate to legislate gifted education as a permanent and respected part of the curriculum nationwide and that funding be allocated to support its implementation and maintenance.\(^4\)

The Identification Dilemma

It does not make much sense to identify gifted children unless programs will be designed to develop the abilities we are trying to identify. But it is equally foolish to choose identification methods or measures without having a clear definition of the abilities one is trying to find. Given the trend toward a multidimensional definition of giftedness, it would be advisable to review thoroughly the available literature and to incorporate the definition of giftedness into boards'—or preferably a provincial—philosophy. The ideal would be cooperation among the provinces and territories so that a relatively standard definition of giftedness could be established nationwide.

If one accepts a definition including multiple abilities, the next step is to choose the methods and measures for identifying these abilities. Intellectual potential is often among the first to

\(^4\)The gifted legislation and grants for the province of Ontario, as well as the provinces/territories that offer grants but have not legislated mandatory gifted education, were outlined in Chapter III, Provincia!s/ Territorial Support for French Immersion and Gifted Immersion Programs.
be considered and measured. In this study, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children were mentioned frequently as measures used by immersion boards. Both have been criticized for what they fail to measure in depth (visual-figural, auditory-figural, and behavioural information; problem solving and divergent thinking potential) or for what they emphasize (cognition, memory, and semantic information) (Guilford, 1975). The Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability are also being used according to the data collected. Yet they are considered outdated and are not recommended with students who have English language deficiencies (Richert et al., 1982, p. 349). The latter criticism also applies to the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Richert et al., 1982, p. 384). If either measure is used with FL children who have limited or no English instruction—a population for which these measures were not normed—they could create a bias for the FL population.

Twelve boards (N = 49) indicated that they use peer nomination as a method of identification. Unfortunately, despite the amount of published work favourable to the use of peer nomination forms, Gagné (1989) has recently uncovered only 13 studies that examine the value of peer nomination and the validation of the forms; their results are ambiguous. Gagné does not discredit the use of peer nomination as a method of identification, but he does suggest careful interpretation of
results.

A variety of other measures have also come under criticism for many reasons including their tendency to depress scores in the exceptionally high range, their limited ability to measure abstract reasoning, and the discovery that almost half of the gifted population is missed by group tests (Marland, 1972; Levy & Goldstein, 1984; Gallagher, 1985; Meckstroth, 1989). In addition, up to 70% of the exceptionally creative students will be excluded on the basis of IQ tests (Torrance, 1968). One cannot assume that gifted students are creative or that IQ tests indicate creativity. One implication of the study by Reis and Renzulli (1982) is that the majority of creative students will be missed if only students in the top one to five percent in intelligence are selected for gifted education. It has also been found that teachers identify intelligence and academic performance more readily than creativity (Mayfield, 1979). This means that a set of measures or methods must be found for identifying creative ability or potential in students. It also brings into question the role of the teacher.

**The role of the teacher.** While Canadian boards offering FI tend to use multiple sources of identification, teacher recommendation ranked the highest (refer to Table 9, p. 28). This overwhelming reliance on FI teachers to identify gifted students is at odds with research that continually confirms that parents, not teachers, identify their children best (Ciha et al.,
1974; Silverman et al., 1986). Already by 1971, Jacobs had found that while parents were able to identify 61% of their gifted Kindergarten children, teachers found only 4.3% of these children. Teachers, in addition to overlooking large numbers of gifted students, tend to overestimate and select others who are not identified later as gifted. Gallagher (1985) discovered that specific training allows teachers to become much more effective, but he suggests that additional measures supplement teacher recommendation. Given the research on teachers’ lack of credibility in recognizing the gifted, it no longer comes as a surprise to me to hear teachers express amazement over one of their students being identified as gifted, particularly if the child is underachieving, has a learning disability, or is considered to be a “behavioural problem”.

The heavy reliance on FI teacher recommendation raises other serious concerns:

1. Several boards commented that they use teacher checklists (such as the Interest-A-Lyzer or the Renzulli-Hartman Scale) or formal testing, but only after a child has been recommended by a teacher. So if the teacher misses identifying the child, no other methods are in place as “safety valves” and the child cannot access special programming. Since all of the GI boards in Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories indicated that they use no checklists or
formal testing, identification of the gifted rests very heavily on teacher recommendation.

2. Teachers who are inexperienced in the profession or in working with a specific grade or age level may have difficulty recognizing gifted characteristics. The teachers simply may not have had time to establish an idea of which skills or abilities are usual for children at that level and to apply their observations as a measure of reference. Recommendation could also be biased against the gifted child based on factors such as personality conflict, underachievement, non-conformist behaviour, etc.

3. Facility with language is often a characteristic of giftedness (Richert et al., 1982, p. 191); a sort of love of words, of playing with rhyming words, of ease of expression, of looking for exactly the right nuance. But herein lies a special problem distinct to children learning a language other than their mother tongue; their second language ability or verbal skills may hinder them from expressing themselves at the same level as they think, or the level at which they would express themselves in their first language. An FI child usually has only one model for French—the teacher. A GI child may remember most or all of the words that have been reinforced in class, but that child
cannot develop a rich vocabulary without a language-rich environment. Development of vocabulary also requires time and multiple exposures to words. A young GI child, looking at a picture of a fox, might think, “What a beautiful, luxuriant coat he wears! But he is too sly for me to sneak up and touch him.” In the classroom, the child might know only enough to say to the teacher, “J’aime le renard!” Usual indicators of giftedness—such as a high degree of abstract thinking or verbal creativity—cannot be measured if they are not expressed. This situation is a hindrance to identification by teacher recommendation if GI children are encouraged to use only French in the classroom.

4. Using language as an indicator of giftedness could also be diminished in a classroom where the teacher does not give many opportunities for open-ended oral and written participation. The GI child also needs the security of an environment that encourages impartial receptivity to ideas and respect for individual differences.

5. As children advance at school, they may encounter rotary timetables (a homeroom teacher for French Language Arts, a different teacher for Mathematics, yet another teacher for Physical Education, etc.). A GI
child might show outstanding ability in Mathematics, but only moderate achievement in Language Arts. Each teacher may see only one side of that child and may not communicate with the child's other teachers. If the recommendation for gifted identification is left to the homeroom teacher, the child may be missed.

6. If teacher recommendation is the main method of identifying GI children, if enrichment within the FI classroom is the principal method of program delivery (refer to Table 13, p. 43), and if boards' main source of gifted materials is the individual teacher's expertise (refer to Table 15, p. 52), then it seems unrealistic to expect hardworking teachers with little or no training or support to be enthusiastic about identifying gifted students. The teacher may feel overwhelmed in the face of yet another level of program planning. However, there is no way to prevent or check on teachers who do not report suspected GI students as long as boards continue to rely on teacher recommendation.

7. Since teachers' ability in identifying creativity is open to question (Mayfield, 1979) and since IQ tests miss up to 70% of the exceptionally creative children (Torrance, 1968), boards that have included creativity in their definition of giftedness are going to have to
find measures that will identify creativity.

8. Although some boards require training and qualifications in gifted education, many do not. The result is that many boards are asking FI teachers to identify potentially gifted students with little or no training. It is unfair to demand this skill of teachers who are not specifically trained; research indicates that the number of children missed is high because teacher recommendation is unreliable unless supported by other methods of identification. If GI children are to be identified and their abilities developed, changes must be made.

The language factor. Respondents listed only four of the measures of gifted identification as being in French. They indicated that using English measures almost exclusively was not meeting their needs and they would prefer to use a combination of French and English measures (refer to Table 10, p. 29). The current practice of testing FI students almost exclusively in English raises the question of language deficiency and a possible bias for the FI population. There are several concerns about the language factor:

1. An eight-year-old grade 3 FI child was recently given a timed group test. The test required ability in reading and writing in English, although the FI class will not begin English Language Arts until grade 4. The FI
teacher gave the instructions for the test in English. No explanation had been given to the class ahead of time to ease possible test or language anxiety. The results of the eight-year-old were not high; in fact, she had not attempted much of the test. When she talked about it with her parents later on, she was preoccupied with only one aspect of the experience; she kept expressing amazement that her FI teacher knew how to speak English. She was unconcerned about leaving questions unanswered, explaining the she was able to figure out the English for quite a number of the questions, but would have had to write the answers in French. She reasoned that since the questions were in English, the answers should be too (Fle). This child's experience brings with it a myriad of questions concerning language deficiency, bias, and the number of GI children being missed, particularly if multiple methods and measures are not part of the board's identification system. It would be interesting to give FI students the same battery of tests at an early grade, and then again after they had had several years of English Language Arts instruction in order to discover to what degree the results were or were not contaminated by the language factor.

2. From the data collected, the situation described above
is not an isolated case. It is quite possible—particularly in light of the full immersion definition—that a substantial number of Primary FI children are being tested in English without having had English language instruction. These children are competing with peers who have had nothing but English instruction. Not only are the results and distribution comparisons in doubt, but the needs of the GI students may go unmet because they happen to be in FI.

3. However, giving the same FI children age-appropriate tests designed for francophone children may also disadvantage FI children. It seems fair to assume that a test designed for Primary francophone children with five or more years speaking and hearing French would not automatically be appropriate for children who usually learn French only at school and who have worked with the language for only a short part of their life. There is also the question of whether French tests are culture-fair for anglophones. In addition, a given word in one language may be easily recognized by itself or understood in context; in the other language, various meanings of that word may require a completely different word. For example, a child might know or be able to figure out "stained glass windows"
in English, but may never have been exposed to "vitraux" in the immersion classroom where "fenêtres" would be the usual word for windows.

4. Some respondents mentioned that there are some francophone children in FI classes. Testing these children in English is particularly unfair.

5. If tests were designed or modified to meet the needs of FI children and teachers, there would also be a need for trained personnel with competency in French.

Respondents were asked which qualifications their board requires for the person(s) administering the identification measures. With almost no exceptions, boards demand that a school psychologist or psychometrist administer IQ tests. For other measures, there was a variety of responses (File):

- teacher;
- teacher with Special Education training;
- consultant;
- counselor;
- M.A. or Ph.D. graduate.

Given the identification concerns unique to GI education, it seems apparent that cooperation will be needed among boards and provinces in order to define giftedness and to devise a multiple-level identification system. Some fascinating systems have been proposed by Richert et al. (1982) and by Renzulli (1988). Simultaneously, funding should be made available so
that testing FI children can become more fair and so that teachers can be trained in identifying giftedness.

The "hidden" gifted. This study did not include an investigation of the children who are often referred to as the "hidden" gifted (Perry, 1988), but this section is included in order to provoke discussion and further research.

These are the children who are not always recognized by traditional methods: the learning disabled, cultural minorities, underachievers, girls, preschool children, the creative, the physically disabled—the list goes on.

This is not a new area of research; enough research had been done by 1975 to merit a U.S. national conference on the disadvantaged gifted (Fitzgerald, 1975). However, since the boards who participated in this study mentioned only traditional identification methods and since so many boards reported few if any training requirements for teachers of GI, it seems reasonable to assume that many of the "hidden" gifted are not being found and are missing out on opportunities for gifted education.

Recommendations:

1. that, in keeping with recent research on defining gifted and talented, Ministries/Departments of Education adopt a definition that recognizes much more than high intellectual performance or potential;

2. that the Department of the Secretary of State make
funding available so that French identification measures can be designed and/or modified for FI students;¹⁵

3. that a flexible identification system be standardized within a province/territory and preferably at the national level;

4. that all Canadian elementary educators be given a phased-in period of time to attend provincially designed inservice training on gifted and talented characteristics and identification, and that such training be incorporated into preservice teacher training.

Program Implementation

There are three program concerns that emerged as a result of this study:

1. GI programs in Canada are not necessarily continuous from one grade level to the next.

2. If gifted children are withdrawn from the classroom for gifted instruction, what is being done for them the rest of the time they are spending within the classroom?

¹⁵The Department of the Secretary of State has helped fund a project at the University of St. Thomas, New Brunswick. This project was undertaken to develop norms for the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test for Canadian francophone students. It is expected that the test will be published in 1990. However, since it is normed for francophone children, it would be advisable to collect local norms if the test were to be used for immersion children.
3. GI educators seem frustrated by not knowing how or by not having time to find available identification measures or program resources.

**Program continuity.** There is no sense in identifying a GI child unless a program is going to be designed for that child. The program should develop or enhance the ability that first caught an educator’s attention or that was discovered by identification methods. The program needs to be based on a sound philosophy, one that recognizes gifted education as a need and a right, not as a privilege. A philosophy is fundamental because parents, teachers, administrators, and the school board deserve to know the raison d’être of the GI program, the adopted definition of giftedness, the major goals of the program, anticipated outcomes, and continuity guarantees. Such a philosophy might be dubbed a charter of commitment.

Once a philosophy has been established, planners will need to consider program content, implementation, and delivery. The emphasis should reflect the needs of the GI students and show cohesive, sequential planning. I submit for consideration Table 18, a preparatory guideline model.

It is essential that the GI program be continuous throughout the grades and that, where necessary, steps be taken to ensure its support and permanence.

**Program delivery.** Data collected from the survey reveal that the three methods of program delivery used most often for
Table 18
Model of Preparatory Guideline for Gifted Immersion Implementation

- create statement of intent, including definition of giftedness and identification methods
- examine needs of GI students
- estimate funding, strategies, personnel, and resources to meet those needs
- organize policies and procedures
  - example: entry requirements
  - minimum qualifications of staff
  - reporting and evaluating students' work
  - transportation if applicable
  - excursions away from school
  - professional development of staff, etc.

Staff
- personnel required
- desired qualifications and qualities
- initial and/or continuing professional training
- evaluation: how? by whom?

Program
- desired outcomes or goals
- concepts, skills, or abilities to be developed
- methods of delivery (classroom, withdrawal, special groups, etc.)
- content
- teaching strategies
- resources
- evaluation of students' processes/products

conduct evaluations
reexamine and change if needed
GI are enrichment in the regular classroom, withdrawal from the classroom, and special groupings. These are the same three methods used by educators in a U.S. survey (Gallagher, 1985, p. 365) except that the GI respondents ranked enrichment in the classroom first; it was ranked second after withdrawal in the U.S. Withdrawal of GI students seems very haphazard; the practice of withdrawal on a "flexible" or "few times a year" basis seems to be a cosmetic or "band-aid" treatment. It sends a message of a lack of commitment to a continuous program and a lack of respect for the needs of the GI students. It also suggests that further research needs to be done to find out what is happening to children when they are back in their own classroom and what demands are being put on the classroom teacher.

Renzulli (1986), Rogers (1986, pp. 32-33), and Cox et al., (1988) have presented a variety of program models, systems, and opportunities that are worth investigating even if a board already has a GI program in place. Further information is in the Reference of Special Interest (p. 111).

Program resources. Respondents to the survey indicated a need to know how to find FI or GI resources. It seems pointless to have educators in each board or in each province duplicating each others' searches or work. It is a waste of time and highly trained talent that could be reduced by having a national FI reference centre. The centre could conceivably be
set up as a repository library, although its main function—by computer—
would be to supply sources of information or of materials for a
given required topic in or related to FI and/or GI. I suspect
that the cost of setting up and maintaining such a centre would
not equal the amount of money spent by the many FI boards
across Canada as their employees attempt to do the job alone.

Recommendations:

1. that provinces/territories commit to an uninterrupted
   and sequential GI program at all levels of elementary
   education;

2. that the Department of Secretary of the State support
   and fund a national FI reference centre for curriculum
   resources, programs, identification and assessment
   measures, professional reading, children's literature, GI
   resources, suggested reading for parents, an up-to-date
   list of related conferences, names and addresses of FI
   and GI publishers of suppliers.

Training of Personnel

Change in education can be a long process. The
Canadian study on The training and retraining of immersion
teachers: Towards establishing national standards (1986), the
document on French immersion research relevant to decisions
in Ontario (1987), and the Commissioner of Official Languages
(Statistics Canada, 1988) have all made recommendations for
the recruitment and training of FI teachers. Implementation
takes time but some provinces have moved more quickly than others. In Newfoundland, "[b]ecause of teacher shortages, the
Department of Education and various school districts offer
bursaries, fellowships and training programs to help teachers
develop their French skills" (Statistics Canada, 1988, p. 251).
"At the University of New Brunswick, the French Second
Language Teacher Education Centre (FSLTEC) . . . the only
centre of its kind in eastern Canada . . . is involved in
evaluation, program development and professional development"
(Statistics Canada, 1988, p. 253). None of these
recommendations or provinces mentions training for GI.
Evidence from the surveys indicates that such training is
needed. We need to consider projected GI teacher shortages
and look toward the future now.

Clearly, boards are relying heavily on individual teacher
expertise (refer to Table 15, p. 52), but where are GI teachers
getting the expertise? Some boards have Special Education
requirements for their teachers, but how many provincial
Special Education courses deal in depth with teacher training
for the gifted and talented? One coordinator told me that when
she expressed her board's need for such training, she was told
that until there were enough teachers interested, the course
would not be offered (File). It seems unfortunate that teachers
may have to consider training outside of Canada; one western
board is doing so already (File). If teachers are not able to
train what is being done for gifted children in classrooms?

Results of the survey indicated that most GI education is offered in the classroom (refer to Table 13, p. 43). Even if the gifted are withdrawn for one day a week or one week per month, for example, they obviously are spending a considerable amount of time in their classrooms where they still deserve a differentiated program where needed. Even in the 95 boards offering GI, the number of classroom teachers involved is likely high. If universities are not going to train these teachers through inservice courses, the boards will have to take responsibility depending on the commitment they have toward GI. They can try to pressure the universities or they can train a person—perhaps in the U.S.—who would then act as a resource teacher to train colleagues. Eventually there could be a trained resource teacher in each school offering GI. Time and experience are two key factors: in addition to training or experience in most subject areas and with children of all grade levels, the resource person would likely need to be creative and have leadership qualities.

It is interesting to note that only one Canadian board with GI mentioned the requirement of personal qualities or traits besides educational qualifications. There is a large volume of literature on desirable characteristics of teachers of the gifted (Mirman, 1971; Gallagher, 1985; Sisk, 1988; Wendel & Heiser, 1989). Most lists include high proficiency in teaching ability,
creativity and curiosity, and maturity to encourage ideas and inquiry. "We must have teachers (as well as administrators and other school personnel) who truly value diversity and intellectual achievement" (Whitmore, 1988, p. 198).

Even though classroom teachers may be the cornerstone of GI, they cannot do their best without support. In addition to teacher training, there should be training for counselors, principals, coordinators, librarians, and supervisory officers. In short, all those who are responsible for GI must have a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished in GI and the skills needed to implement it. Rogers (1989) has proposed three levels of training: one for classroom teachers; another for resource teachers; and a third for coordinators and administrators. She has also developed a television training series for teachers of the gifted in Minnesota. She believes that "it is wishful thinking to suppose that hardworking teachers, without sufficient content knowledge, without special knowledge of gifted children, without time to plan programs, and with limited assistance from supervisory personnel, will be able to alter the educational situation for gifted children to any meaningful degree" (p. 145).

The 18 boards that indicated that they will be implementing GI within five years should be studying their personnel needs now so that the appropriate personnel can be trained before implementation of the program.
Recommendations:

1. that a trained resource person be placed in each school offering GI for the purpose of assisting and training teachers;

2. that the Ministries/Departments of Education cooperate in planning how to recruit teachers for GI education and how to design inservice training for them and for all related GI personnel.

Conclusion

This study investigated eight research questions. The principal outcomes and the resulting recommendations are summarized below.

1. Ministry grants and guidelines can be considered a factor influencing GI implementation, but other factors may alter the influence of ministry support mechanisms.

Recommendation:

- that the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, collaborate to legislate gifted education as a permanent and respected part of the curriculum nationwide and that funding be allocated to support its implementation and maintenance.

2. Proximity to a francophone community has influenced GI implementation in Ontario and the western provinces. However, the length of time boards have
offered FL has not influenced GI implementation.

3. Teacher recommendation is the most frequently used method of identification. Most measures of identification for immersion children are in English.

**Recommendations:**

- that, in keeping with recent research on defining gifted and talented, Ministries/Departments of Education adopt a definition that recognizes much more than high intellectual performance or potential;
- that the Department of the Secretary of State make funding available so that French identification measures can be designed and/or modified for FL students;
- that a flexible identification system be standardized within a province/territory and preferably at the national level.

4. More research needs to be done in the area of distribution of gifted students in FL classes compared to mainstream English classes.

5. Staffing shortages are already being experienced and are predicted to become even more widespread.

**Recommendation:**

- that the Ministries/Departments of Education cooperate in planning how to recruit teachers for
GI education and how to design inservice training for them and for all related GI personnel.

6. Most GI programs are being delivered in the gifted students' classrooms.

Recommendations:

- that all Canadian elementary educators be given a phased-in period of time to attend provincially designed inservice training on gifted and talented characteristics and identification, and that such training be incorporated into preservice teacher training.

- that a trained resource person be placed in each school offering GI for the purpose of assisting and training teachers.

7. Of GI programs offered in English, few are offered at the Primary level. However, when GI programs are offered in French or partial French, many are available at the Primary level.

Recommendation:

- that provinces/territories commit to an uninterrupted and sequential GI program at all levels of elementary education.

8. There is a need for GI resources in the French language at all grade levels and in all subject areas.
**Recommendation:**

- that the Department of the Secretary of State support and fund a national FI reference centre for curriculum resources, programs, identification and assessment measures, professional reading, children’s literature, GI resources, suggested reading for parents, an up-to-date list of related conferences, names and addresses of FI and GI publishers or suppliers.

Gifted immersion in Canada in 1989 may be likened to three fledglings in a nest. One nestling tentatively tries to fly, and feeling the strength of the wind under its wings, begins to glide with growing confidence. The second novice pauses on the edge of the nest, flaps its wings, then tumbles to the ground where it tries again to fly. The third baby bird stays in the nest and observes but does not fly.

Although Canadians pay lip service to “access to education for all” and “meeting the needs of our children”, through the sheer chance of birthplace or of parental relocation, a child may be denied FI or GI opportunities that other comparable Canadian children can enjoy. The results of failing to help gifted children to reach their potential are immeasurable: we can only partially grasp what personal unhappiness, underachievement, unwritten book, or undreamed-of cure has in some way affected our country. We cannot
predict the difference these children as adults might have made; we can only be reasonably sure that what we are as a Canadian society is not necessarily what we could be.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY 1

Please keep in mind that the survey questions refer only to elementary students (K-8).

A. Grants

1. In your province/territory, is there a specific grant for French immersion students?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

2. If Yes, is it a higher amount per pupil than the grant for a regular English program student?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

3. Are specific grants available as an incentive for school boards to offer gifted programs to English gifted students?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

4. Is the same kind of grant available for French immersion gifted students?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
5. Is the grant available only if the gifted instruction is given in English?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

6. If a student already qualifies for a French immersion grant, can the same student qualify for an additional gifted grant?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

Comments __________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

B. Ministry Policies

1. Does the Ministry of Education in your province/territory have curriculum guidelines for French immersion?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

2. Are there also specific guideline documents dealing with gifted education?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No
3. If Yes, are the gifted education documents appropriate for French immersion gifted students?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

4. Please indicate the titles of policy, guidelines, and resource documents.

   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

5. May these documents be purchased?
   ______ Yes
   ______ No

6. If Yes, where may the documents be purchased?

   Address ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

   Telephone Number ________________

   Comments ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
C. Please note again that this study will be limited to *elementary* pupils (Kindergarten through Grade Eight). The study may include French immersion students who are in *early, middle, or late* immersion programs. However, it is vital to include only schools offering *full* immersion. Full immersion is defined in this study as: *a program in which during at least the first two years, French is the language of instruction for all subjects except formal English language classes.*

1. Please send me a list of the school boards in your province/territory that offer an elementary full French immersion program as defined above.

2. If you would like a synopsis of the study, please indicate below.

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

3. If I need to contact the Ministry of Education for further information for the study, who would be the contact person?

   Name __________________________________________
   Address _________________________________________
   _______________________________________________
   _______________________________________________
   _______________________________________________

   Telephone _______________________________________
   Business Hours _________________________________
SURVEY 2

A. Background Information

Please keep in mind that this survey is limited to elementary (K-8) French immersion pupils.

1. How long has your Board offered full French immersion?
   (Full French immersion is defined in this study as a program of early, middle, or late immersion in which during at least the first two years, French is the language of instruction for all subjects except formal English language classes.)
   _____ years

2. Is your Board in or near a francophone community?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

3. Does your Board have a specific policy or philosophy about gifted education?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

4. Does your Board currently offer a gifted or enriched program to regular English students?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

5. If Yes, how many years has the English gifted program been offered?
   _____ years

6. At which levels is it offered?
   _____ K-3   _____ 4-6   _____ 7-8
7. Does your Board offer a gifted or enriched program to French immersion students?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

8. If Yes in which language is the French immersion gifted or enriched program offered?
   _____ English  _____ French

9. If the gifted program is offered only in English, are parents withdrawing students from immersion programs to put them into the English gifted program?
   _____ Yes  _____ No
   _____ Not to my knowledge

10. If Yes, approximately how often does this happen?
    _____ 1-5 cases per year
    _____ 6-10 cases per year
    _____ more than 10 cases per year
    At which level(s) is this occurring?
    _____ K-3  _____ 4-6  _____ 7-8

If your Board does not offer a gifted program to French immersion students, go to Section E.

If your Board offers a gifted immersion program in English, go to Section F.

If your Board offers a gifted program in French for the French immersion students, go to Section B.
B. Identification of Gifted Immersion Students

1. Check any or all of the following criteria which your Board uses in identifying gifted immersion students.

   ___ intelligence tests       ___ peer identification
   ___ teacher recommendation   ___ parental identification
   ___ creativity tests         or inventory
   ___ sociometric tests        ___ student interest
   ___ teacher recommendation   ___ other (please specify)

2. Please complete the chart with the tests your Board uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Test</th>
<th>Language (English—French)</th>
<th>Appropriate Grade(s) or Level(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: __________________________________________

3. Do you perceive a lack of French language tests suitable for identifying gifted immersion students?

   ___ Yes       ___ No
4. If Yes, please comment on specific areas of weakness.

5. Would you prefer oral tests for the identification of gifted immersion students to be—
   _____ in English only?
   _____ in French only?
   _____ a combination of English and French?

6. Would you prefer written tests for the identification of gifted immersion students to be—
   _____ in English only?
   _____ in French only?
   _____ a combination of English and French?

7. What qualifications does your Board require for the persons(s) administering the tests?

GO TO SECTION C.
C. Program

1. How long has your Board been offering a gifted or enriched program with French as the language of instruction?
   _____ years

2. Please list the levels (K-3, 4-6, 7-8) in the order in which a French gifted program was introduced in your Board.
   __________ __________ __________

3. Is the number of gifted students in immersion programs higher than the number of gifted students in regular English programs?
   _____ Yes  _____ No
   _____ Not to my knowledge

4. If Yes, please comment and indicate an approximate number or range.
   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________

5. Are second language limitations affecting the gifted program (vocabulary, writing skills, reading ability, etc.)?
   _____ Yes  _____ No

6. If Yes, please elaborate.
   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________
7. What qualifications does your Board require of a French immersion teacher teaching in a gifted program?

8. Has your Board experienced any difficulty finding qualified teachers for the program?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

9. Does the Board predict any difficulty finding qualified teachers for the gifted program in the near future?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

10. Which method or methods does your Board use to deliver the French immersion gifted program?
    _____ acceleration
    _____ magnet school
    _____ enrichment in regular classroom
    _____ withdrawal from classroom
    _____ special groupings
    _____ other (please specify)

Comments ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________

GO TO SECTION D.
D. **Materials**

1. Do you perceive a dearth of materials that are suitable for French immersion gifted students?
   
   _____ Yes  _____ No

2. If Yes, is this particularly noticeable at any of the following levels?
   
   _____ K-3  _____ 4-6  _____ 7-8

   Or in a particular subject area? (Please specify.)
   
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

3. Check which of the following sources your Board relies on for gifted immersion materials?
   
   _____ publishers
   _____ other Boards' documents
   _____ documents generated within your Board
   _____ individual teacher's expertise
   _____ other (please specify)
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________

4. If your Board has generated gifted immersion materials, where may they be purchased?
   
   Address: _______________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
   ______________________________________
E. General Information

1. Does your Board anticipate implementing a gifted program for immersion students within the next five years?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

2. If Yes, please indicate
   _____ the year of projected implementation
   _____ the grade(s) or level(s) implemented first
   _____ the language used for gifted instruction

Comments ________________________________

______________________________

GO TO SECTION F.
F. **Follow-up Information**

1. If you would like a synopsis of the study, please indicate below.
   
   _____ Yes    _____ No

2. If I need to contact your Board for further information for the study, who would be the contact person?

   Name _____ __________________________

   Address __________________________

   __________________________

   (Postal Code)

   Telephone (   ) __________________________

   Business Hours __________________________
SURVEY 3

1. Are your enrichment or gifted materials primarily for children whose first language is French?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

2. Do you think that gifted materials designed for Francophone children would also be useful for French immersion children?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

3. a) Have school boards requested materials for enriched or gifted French immersion students within the last 5-10 years?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   b) If Yes, approximately how many? _____

4. Do you have published materials for gifted French immersion programs?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

5. If Yes, for which divisions do you have gifted French immersion materials?
   _____ Kindergarten
   _____ Primary (Grades 1 to 3)
   _____ Junior (Grades 4 to 6)
6. In which subject areas do you have gifted French immersion materials?

- Language Arts
- Social Sciences
- Music
- Math
- Physical Education and Health
- Other (Please specify)

7. a) Do you anticipate publishing more enrichment or gifted French immersion materials in the near future?

- Yes
- No

b) If yes, in which subject areas?

- Language Arts
- Social Sciences
- Music
- Math
- Physical Education and Health
- Other (Please specify)
8. If I need more information from your company, who would be the contact person?

Name _______________________________

Telephone __________________________

Business Hours _______________________

9. If you think your advertisement brochures for gifted French immersion materials would be helpful for this study, please send them to:

V. Collinson
c/o John Campbell School
1255 Tecumseh Road East
Windsor, Ontario
Canada N8W 1B7

10. If you would like a synopsis of this study, please indicate below.

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

INVENTORY OF IDENTIFICATION MEASURES

Alberta Provincial Achievement Tests
Barik (French)
Canadian Cognitive Abilities Test (CCAT)
Canadian Test of Basic Skills (CTBS)
Coquitlam Immersion Tests
CORT
Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude
FIAT (French)
Gates-McGinitie
Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability
IPAT (Intelligence Test - Institute for Personality and Ability Testing)
Interest-A-Lyzer
Kaufman ABC
Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement
Keymath
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
Mathematics Achievement Test (Ottawa)
Matrix Analogies
McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Metropolitan Readiness Test (Ottawa)
Otis-Lennon (English and French)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test
The Renzulli-Hartman Scale
Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT)
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale
Teacher Checklist (Simcoe County)
Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Intellectual Ability)
Toni
Tonrand (French)
Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT)
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-R)
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
Williams Test of Creativity
Woodcock Johnson Psycho - Educational Battery
APPENDIX C

SOURCES OF GIFTED IMMERSION CURRICULUM RESOURCES

School boards
Bureau d'éducation française (Manitoba)
Fort McMurray Catholic School District 32 (Alberta)
Prince Albert RCSSD #6 (Saskatchewan)
Richmond School District #38 (British Columbia)
Sudbury Board of Education (Ontario)
Timmins Board of Education (Ontario)

Publishing houses
Addison-Wesley
Alliage
Arc-en-ciel
Fitzhenry & Whiteside
Ginn & Co.
Guérin
Lidec
Scholastic TAB
APPENDIX D

STATISTICAL REPORT
July 27, 1989

The statistical analysis contained in this thesis has been conducted under contract with Vivienne Collinson.

Because the data she provided was in the discrete (frequency) format and she was primarily interested in the interactions among categories, we recommended the use of a multinomial analysis procedure over the more commonly used Analysis of Variance.

The advantages of the multinomial approach are:

1. Being based upon discrete (frequency) data, no assumptions about underlying scalability are violated.

2. Each interaction can, in this procedure, be tested for significance independently of all other interactions. For this reason, the danger of cross-dependent contamination is reduced.

3. There is no need to be concerned about degrees of freedom or solution/table size complications.

The technique used involves setting up frequency tables specific to the interaction patterns being sought. These tables are then collapsed into 2 by 2 tables around a specific interaction of interest.

The total probability \( P_1 \) for each configuration is determined. Then the probability \( P_o \) for \( K \leq O \) (where \( K \) is a range parameter and \( O \) is the observed frequency being tested) is calculated. The likelihood of this event \( K \leq O \) is \( P_o / P_1 \).

Also given is \( E \) (the "Expected" value) which is the product of the marginal probabilities

\[
\left( p_1 = \frac{X}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad p_2 = \frac{Y}{N} \right)
\]
and the total table frequency. This value is at the .50 probability position for $P_0$. It is merely a reference point and is not used directly in the calculations just described.

Interpretation of the meaning, within her study of statistically significant $/P_0$ values is left to Ms. Collinson.

For more details about this procedure and its use please consult:


or this present consulting firm.

Signed
Jay C. Powell, Ph.D., D.B.A.
Director
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Provides a thorough overview of gifted education, including discussions of program planning and models, enrichment strategies and sources, and thinking skills.


Presents organization and evaluation strategies; has an excellent bibliography of problem solving resources and a reading list for parents and children.


Suggests methods of finding such children and discusses model programs for them.


Provides a comprehensive overview of gifted education.


Reviews issues of identification and presents an identification system.


Provides an excellent guide for designing a statement or philosophy.

Provides assistance in selecting or adapting challenging materials.


Discusses identification of preschool children and what to do to help them, particularly within the family.


Presents a short summary of desirable qualities for teachers and guidance for teacher training.


Provides a wealth of information that would assist in the design of a definition and philosophy for giftedness.


Is a collection of 14 program models that have been successfully implemented.


Includes a thorough description and critique of identification measures, checklists, forms, etc. as well as a model of an identification system.


Lists some available identification measures and sources, pp. 231, 232.

Includes checklists, questionnaires, nomination forms, inventories, and sources of instruments.
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