Analysis of gifted identification instruments

Part I: Administration

The study process involved administering three gifted identification instruments: the Teacher Nomination Packet and Torrance Test for Creative Thinking (TTCT) and the Alternative Uses Tasks test for creativity. The reason for choosing the three tests is because they were easy to use and administer to the sample pre-k group, aged between 4 and 6 years. The two major instruments were the Teacher Nomination Packet and (TTCT), but the Alternative Uses Tasks test was added to complement TTCT in the creativity test.

The assessment process involved four children in the tests and questions of three instruments. The results were then rated based on the scale of each identification instrument. The results of each participant from the three instruments were compared to determine whether there was consistency in giftedness from the three different instruments. The Teacher Nomination Packet majorly involves observing and assessing child behavior, responses and abilities within the classroom under the various questions under the instruments rating case. Each question was analyzed using four criteria, i.e., 'rarely/never, occasional, almost frequent, and always.' Participants predominantly categorized under 'almost frequently' and 'always' were listed as gifted.

The TTCT and Alternative Uses Task involved giving tests to children and analyzing their scores based on their criterion assessments. The TTCT question involved asking the children, "what benefits and problems would occur if they woke up one day to find themselves

invincible?" Their responses were then analyzed using various creativity assessments to develop creative thinking scores and creativity index. Five factors determined indicators of creativity; fluency (no. of relevant answers), originality (unusual responses), elaboration (details and imagination), the abstractness of titles (capturing and organizing relevant details), and resistance to premature closure (avoiding closure that cuts of powerful illustrations) (Torrance 3). Students who illustrated a large number of these determiners were found to be creative.

The creative index was determined by the number of thirteen criterion-referenced creativity measures in their answers. The creative strengths considered were; storytelling articulateness, movement, and action, emotional expressiveness, synthesis of incomplete figures, synthesis of lines, expressiveness of titles, internal visualization, unusual visualization, breaking or extending boundaries, impressive imagery, the colorfulness of imagery, humor, and fantasy (Torrance 4). For example, participants who scored 8 out of 13 were ranked more creative than one with 6 out of 13. The Alternative Uses Task was also similar to TTCT, where the child was asked how a particular household item can have multiple uses. The level of creativity was then analyzed under originality, flexibility, fluency, and elaboration in the answer to determine the creativity score (Torrance Tests 2).

Part II: Reflection

Process

The process of administration of the three test instruments varied**.** The Teacher Nomination Packet mainly involved observing the student's behavior, keenness, social interaction, and interaction with the environment. This instrument was teacher-centered to determine the rating of a child-based observation. On the other hand, the Alternative Uses Task

and TTCT were more child-centered involved asking questions and assessing the quality of the answer under various categories on the rating scale. These two instruments required keen observation, listening, and analysis of the answer compared to the Teacher Nomination Packet that predominantly utilized observation.

Instruments

However, the three instruments showed a quality number of similarities. The instruments focused on the children's other distinct qualities apart from the normal learning process like exams that aim at a correct answer. Instead, the instruments focused on the child's uniqueness, complexity, imagination, and presentation. The Teacher Nomination Packet, for example, involved a keen analysis of children's response to questions, especially in teacher nomination, to determine whether certain types of words qualify to be termed as extensive vocabulary. All instruments focused on the behavioral, thinking, motivation, and generally the child's physical, psychological, and intellectual ability. The rating criteria were easy to determine and observe in the children, thus helping determine giftedness in the sample children. Using the instruments on different students illustrated different types of giftedness, and the lack of one specific illustrator of giftedness does not mean its lack. The study process helped reveal that giftedness can occur at different levels.

All the instruments were equally beneficial in identifying giftedness. Despite having different administration processes, they all connected various attributes, thinking, and behavior of the sample population with giftedness. I found the Teacher Nomination Packet to be more valid and fair than the other instruments. This is because the identification of giftedness was predominantly based on children's observable traits, behaviors, and characters as in the rating

scale. It also essentially included listening and observing various categories of determining giftedness such as behavioral traits, learning, social connection, environmental connect, subjects' emotions, and motivation. On the other hand, TTCT and Alternative Uses Task majorly focused on creativity to identify giftedness. As a result, children who scored high in creativity were viewed as more gifted, contrary to the results from the Teacher Nomination Packet. Generally, the instruments were relevant and essential by providing a broader scope from different approaches to identifying giftedness.

Results

Some results of the assessment came as a surprise to me. First, I did not fully understand the difference between gifted and bright children. In most scenarios, both categories are often confused as one, where the characteristics of bright children are used to identify gifted children. The experiment results helped me learn that there is a big difference between bright and gifted children. At one point in the study, I expected that most bright students, based on academic results, would automatically score high in the 'giftedness' rating. However, it surprised me that even some bright children did not qualify as gifted in some incidences.

After undertaking the giftedness identification process, I would ensure that the gifted children study in schools with teachers who understands them. This would involve institutions with higher levels than the typical curriculum to meet their various characteristics, such as curiosity and boredom from doing the norm. I will also look for a school that groups gifted students on categories based on their abilities since they tend to be closer to adults or people they view as more knowledgeable than them. I would ensure that the children get supplemental learning to offer new challenges further. This will also involve individually addressing their

unique needs and determining the areas for improvement. The gifted students will be introduced to a more advanced curriculum that meets their unique needs and can tap their full potential (*Gifted Children* 2). Also, identification will enable accelerated learning of gifted students (*Gifted Children* 2). Accelerated gifted students perform higher than their non-accelerated counterparts.

Conclusion

The three identification instruments provided an accurate giftedness assessment. The tools enabled extensive exploration of the various aspects of each identification instrument. They helped giftedness through observation, listening, and keen analysis of the child's ability. The tools were also essential in identification by making it possible to identify children who would most qualify as 'gifted.' The tools would be essential in identifying 'giftedness,' especially in children who hide their talents based on fear or shyness.

References

Gifted Children |, www.nagc.org/resources-publications/gifted-education-practices/identification/tests-assessments.

Torrance, E. P. "TORRANCE TESTS OF CREATIVE THINKING; INTERPRETIVE MANUAL." *Scholastic Testing Service, Inc. - STS - (800) 642-6787*, www.ststesting.com/gift/TTCT_InterpMOD.2018.pdf.

"Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking - LightBulbBites." provensal.com/lbb/tag/torrance-tests-of-creative-thinking/.