

Gifted and Black: A Qualitative Evidence Synthesis for Inclusive Gifted Curriculum, Programmatic Options, and Future Research

MISTIE L. POTTS
School of Education
Grace College & Theological Seminary
1 Lancer Way, Winona Lake, IN 46582
UNITED STATES

Abstract: - Recent research has shifted from merely identifying established inequities to focusing on actionable solutions in gifted education, particularly for Black students. Researchers have offered insights into equitable access for Black students, while others have emphasized the need for diversification and culturally relevant improvements in gifted programs. With a practical approach, this Qualitative Evidence Synthesis integrates findings to propose strategies for fostering equity in gifted education underscoring the necessity for a collaborative, functional guide to improve gifted education. Addressing this need, the study draws on prior research findings to present five specific recommendations for school districts aiming to design inclusive and equitable gifted programs. These recommendations focus on comprehensive policy changes, professional development, curriculum reform, identification processes, and community engagement.

Key-Words: - Gifted education, black students, gifted students, curriculum, diverse

Received: February 18, 2024. Revised: August 29, 2024. Accepted: September 29, 2024. Published: October 31, 2024.

1 Introduction

Spurred by differences in access and opportunity across America coupled with domain-wide inconsistencies, K-12 gifted education programs have consistently struggled to conquer disproportionate underrepresentation of students with diverse cultural backgrounds, limited English proficiency, and/or those who have a disability [1]. Varying definitions of giftedness, identification processes, service expectations, and assessment practices have perpetuated a flawed system for meeting gifted students' needs and gaining policymakers' support in gifted education [2]. As such, researchers in the field have attempted to identify related inequities. Specifically examining gifted students from culturally diverse backgrounds who also experience a disability, Davis & Robertson [3] conceptualized the term "3e." The corpus expanded with the intersectionality of race and gender, education, socio-economic status, geographical location, and living costs as barriers to academic achievement, gifted identification, and subsequent performance within gifted programs [4][5][6][7].

2 Problem Formulation

Answering Gentry et al.'s [8] call, and shifting from identifying established inequities, research efforts have aimed for solutions [5]. In doing so, ideas for providing Black students equitable access to gifted education [9][6][5], along with diversification and improvements in cultural relevance for gifted programs have emerged [10]. While these analyses are helpful in isolation, a collaborative and functional guide is needed for improvement. In the following Qualitative Evidence Synthesis (QES) prior research is precisely selected and scoured to generate five specific suggestions for school districts who desire to intentionally design their gifted programming and curriculum to be more inclusive and equitable for gifted students of color and suggest needed future research [11].

2.1 Methods

Mirroring Ames et al. [12] approach, the researcher employed a Qualitative Evidence Synthesis (QES) selecting and configuratively synthesizing primary research articles, specifically addressing gifted Black students' social and emotional needs in school

environments. With a purposive intensity sampling frame [11], five articles [4] [13] [14] [10] [15], with rich contextual details were selected from the comprehensive search. QES exposed the consensus, differences, and gaps remaining among this corpus of literature [16] informing the generation of five solutions for K-12 gifted education programs. To fill the identified gaps of information on this facet of gifted education, future research is suggested (Appendix A).

Inclusion Criteria

Criteria used to determine which studies were included in this synthesis were study date, research design, participants, richness of details, and outcomes measured. Specifically, included articles were published from 2005 to 2020, utilized a qualitative design using semi-structured interview protocol, with participants identified as African American or black and gifted or eligible for gifted education programming, and conveying rich/thick conceptual details. All included studies measured participants' social and emotional outcomes.

Exclusion Criteria

Studies were not included in this synthesis if they did not meet all inclusion criteria, otherwise confounded the outcomes measured with intertwined data, or focused on participants with varying characteristics (e.g., high achievers, individuals with other racial/ethnic backgrounds).

2.1.1 Synthesizing the Studies

Participants across the studies ranged from elementary children to adults in their forties reflecting on their K-12 experiences. All studies utilized qualitative research designs with similarities in data collection methods. While methodologies were similar, the philosophical orientations, samples, methods, and overall quality of qualitative research varied among the studies. The researchers provided collectively similar suggestions for improving educational experiences for gifted Black students, yet varied approaches and samples resulted in findings that were unique and worth noting from each study (see summary and critique in Appendix B). The following synthesis compares the paradigms, research designs, sample populations, and findings across the five critiqued research studies to identify inclusive curriculum and direct future research.

Paradigms

Qualitative researchers addressing social science issues frequently adopt one of four paradigms (or worldviews) as their philosophical orientation toward knowledge. These assumptions undergird one's research inquiry and are important to share with the reader as a way of bridging understanding.

Yet not all qualitative researchers report their paradigms transparently, rather it must be inferred from the written context. Much of the selected research focused on the success factors and barriers for students' success in gifted programs [13][14][10][15]. Anderson [4] was an exception to this with its focus being on the impact of racism on the students' experiences. In this way, Anderson [4] modeled the advocacy/participatory paradigm. While Anderson's [4] discussion does offer suggestions for diversifying gifted programs, improving the cultural relevance of gifted curriculum, and increasing the intercultural development of teachers, the discussion dwells largely on connecting the experiences of the participants with the intersectionality of gender and race in gifted programming. Similarly, Andrews [13] also investigated the experiences of gifted Black students with racial microaggressions in schools, yet Andrews, using a constructivist paradigm, sought to reveal how the participants experienced these events and generated a theory from the analysis. Conversely, Reis et al., [14] exhibited their beliefs of a more objective, measurable reality by approaching the factors associated with gifted Black students' achievement or underachievement and quantifying determinations to convey reasonable predictions. In this way, Reis et al., embodied the postpositivist paradigm in their research [15]. With a different paradigm still, Tomlinson and Jarvis [15] approached their research from a pragmatic worldview. Tomlinson and Jarvis observed what was working effectively in a real-world, practice-oriented, naturalistic setting and sought to provide suggestions for others to be successful. Differences also exist in how the researchers presented students' abilities to exhibit resilience, overcome diversity, and sources of risk factors.

Data Analysis

Not all qualitative research employs a theoretical framework or utilizes a framework when analyzing data. For example, Andrews [13] used grounded theory when analyzing how students perceived microaggressions in school [17]. Andrews [13] allowed the theory to emerge from the data and did not enter the analysis with predetermined codes. Andrews [13] reached the end of analysis by exhausting the emergence of new findings thereby arriving at theoretical saturation [17]. However, Anderson [4] encased the research in CRT [18] using a framework analysis to identify elements of CRT within the participants' narratives. With these predetermined codes/themes in mind, Anderson [4] identified them within the data. Conversely, Sewell

& Goings [10], Tomlinson & Jarvis [15], and Reis et al., [14], employed thematic analyses. Their approaches were more researcher-directed and compared multiple qualitative accounts to discover themes. All the critiqued studies were similar in that they each conducted forms of step-wise coding processes in their data analyses. Still, differences were apparent in their lenses of interpretation.

Conceptual Interpretation

The studies exhibited variance in researchers' conceptual interpretations of data presented in discussions. Reis and colleagues [14] explored the protective factors that helped gifted, ethnically diverse, urban, high school students, who were achieving in school, overcome diversity/risks. Their qualitative study focused on resilience theory, yet the conclusions and discussion implied a deficit perspective of the participants by focusing on students' risks originating from students' home lives and students lacking resilience. Tomlinson and Jarvis [15] sampled high potential, urban, elementary, middle, and high school students who came from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and were also racially or ethnically diverse. Their qualitative investigation explored how teachers and schools contributed to academic success for the sampled students. Contrary to Reis et al.'s [14] work, Tomlinson and Jarvis' (2014) discussion challenged the deficit-perspective of the participants by focusing on how schools create environments that are not conducive to the needs of gifted Black students and offered suggestions for teachers and schools to assist in overcoming these barriers. Similarly, Andrews' [13] challenges deficit perspective by offering a theory for how gifted Black high school students engage resilience and enact resistance strategies to confront microaggressions in school settings. Sewell and Goings [10] furthered this line of research, challenging the deficit perspective, by noting how participants utilized positive peer support and enacted stereotype management strategies to continue to achieve. While the critiqued studies differ in presentation from a deficit perspective or resilience perspective, they provide important insights into the students' experiences.

Findings

Perhaps most importantly, it is critical to consider the findings offered by the examined studies and how these contribute to the body of research on gifted Black education. Anderson's [4] findings revealed how gifted Black girls face invisibility and marginalization in school. Gifted Black girls' access to education is sometimes limited by teachers' deficit views or racist perceptions [4]. Similarly,

Andrews' [13] findings highlighted gifted Black students' experiences of racial ignoring and racial spotlighting in schools. For example, students perceived teachers' lowered expectations when receiving praise for their performance on an assignment when White students received no praise for the same level of performance on the assignment [13]. Students shared how instances of racial microaggressions led them to engage their resilience and use resistance strategies such as being silent or verbally challenging assumptions [13]. Conversely, Sewell & Goings shared stories of thriving gifted Black students who had navigated school transitions with stereotype management by leaning on supportive relationships and community partnerships [10]. Reis et al.'s findings also pointed to factors influencing the achievement of gifted Black students [14]. Like Sewell & Goings, Reis et al., found supportive relationships and community partnerships were protective factors toward gifted Black student achievement [10] [14]. Additionally, Reis et al., noted that being involved in extracurricular activities, gifted programming, and having a strong sense of self were protective factors [14]. Within this sector of the literature, Tomlinson and Jarvis explored characteristics of schools and teachers that were nurturing gifted potential [15]. Their findings highlighted how participants were nurtured by teachers who challenged deficit perspectives, embraced a strengths-based model with adaptive programming, and provided environments with expectations for success. While all the studies acknowledged racial microaggressions or racist perceptions negatively influenced participants' experiences in school environments, the findings suggest there are ways schools and teachers can change to improve experiences for gifted Black students.

Implications

Tomlinson and Jarvis stress the need for schools to share schoolwide definitions of success and to strategies that challenge deficit perspectives [15]. They purport the importance of offering flexible and responsive programming that can adjust to individuals and groups of students. Similarly, Sewell & Goings urge educators and schools to implement culturally relevant and responsive curriculum that accounts for identity affirmation and considers the school environment, and they further recommend that gifted educators support gifted black students early and during transitions [10]. Anderson also challenges educators to take action to ensure equitable access, assessment, and adaptations that will promote success, but also stresses that educators must reframe the way they interpret gifted

Black girls' behaviors [4]. Reis et al., suggest schools offer counseling programs for gifted students to assess students' needs and mitigate factors of maladjustment by recommending appropriate classes, activities, and offering guidance lessons [14]. Across the critiqued studies, it is evident that what is taught is important but the perspective of those teaching the material is also critical. However, little focus was placed on sampling certain types of teachers or exploring the specific beliefs of the teachers across the critiqued studies.

Samples

Although the sampled groups from the critiqued research ranged from elementary urban students to adults in their forties, they shared commonalities. All sampled groups across the studies involved students who were identified as having high potential, being high achieving at one point in time, or gifted by some measure relevant to the participants' school environments. Additionally, all studies involved majority participants who self-identified as African American or Black (while some studies also included other students of color) and had been or were currently receiving some form of gifted or high ability programming or were enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) courses in a K-12 urban school setting in the United States. Although Tomlinson and Jarvis did conduct observations and interviews involving teachers within the three sites of their multiple case study, the focus of their research remained on the characteristics and behaviors of teachers who took steps to nurture potential, the nature of their classrooms, and the experiences of the gifted Black students in those schools [15]. Of the synthesized studies, none specifically interviewed teachers of gifted Black students to explore teachers' cultural competence. Additionally, none of the studies specifically examined gifted SES disadvantaged Black students living in suburban areas attending mostly White schools. Finally, the critiqued studies offered majority perspectives from adolescent or adult age participants, with only Tomlinson and Jarvis involving younger students in a portion of their sample. Across the studies, little effort was shown to sample from suburban and poor communities or to involve participants who were White teachers in suburban schools [15]. Still, these critiqued studies provide helpful insight about the sampled groups and create new pathways to explore in future research.

Inclusive Curriculum and Programmatic Options

The body of literature on gifted education suggests that the effects of depriving gifted students

the opportunities to progress through curriculum at appropriate pace and challenge levels is equivalent to the negative effects of retaining students in the same grade level for a repeated year [19]. School districts seeking to intentionally design their gifted programming and curriculum to be more inclusive and equitable for gifted students of color should consider factors affecting students in their educational environments such as negative peer pressure, self-views, bias curriculum, teacher bias, rigid programming structures, and social pressures. Gifted students of color may face difficulties navigating social dilemmas and negative peer pressures, even being accused of "acting white," when they are displaying academic language [20]. School personnel can support students and parents by instilling scholar identity, strong racial pride, positive feelings of self-efficacy, internal pride [21] and resilience [10]. Educators can ensure their abilities to provide inclusive educational experiences by improving their cultural competence [22], and seeking professional development for administering relevant curriculum and strategies [23].

3 Problem Solution

The following section elaborates on these recommendations for program and curricular improvements.

1. Scholar identity

African American gifted students often face resistance to achieve from unsupportive peers and an anti-achievement ethic that permeates their environments [24] [25]. Schools can assist gifted students to adopt a scholar identity by setting a standard for high expectations and adopting a supportive approach to assisting students who face unsupportive peers or negative peer pressure to underachieve. If left to persist with no interventions, "acting white" peer pressure may contribute to gifted African American students' underachievement [25]. Counselors, teachers, and other school personnel who understand the race-specific negative peer pressures facing African American gifted students can better assist them by offering training on conflict-resolution, problem-solving, and anger management techniques [25]. Additionally, administrators, teachers, and counselors can encourage students to lean on positive peer relationships for support. Sewell & Goings reported gifted Black students employed stereotype management in school through supportive peer relationships [10]. Teachers can also nurture scholar identity by sharing their own stories

of perseverance toward success. Tomlinson & Jarvis reported that teachers' personal stories of tenacity and grit were perceived as uplifting by the student participants [15].

2. Develop racial pride/racial identity

Positive self-perceptions have been associated with students' academic performance [26] [27] [28]. African American students must develop healthy racial identities as part of their positive self-perceptions. When students hold positive self-perceptions including healthy racial identities, as with the internalization exemplar offered by Cross and Vandiver, they are more likely to engage in positive relationships and display positive social skills [27] [11] [29]. These individuals can cope with negative emotions or beliefs and uphold positive beliefs about being African American. Conversely, African American students with maladaptive racial identities may exhibit elements of self-hatred and behaviors of disassociation with their African American communities to avoid perceived racial barriers. Individuals who have undergone racial assaults or insults may become overtly anti-white and avoid participation in activities they perceive as white activities. Gifted African American students will be more likely to remain in gifted programming if they can develop internalized racial identities because they will have a bicultural identity with high racial salience, inner peace, racial pride, and a sense of justice. Racial identity development acts as a protective factor for African American students against acts of racial discrimination, positively impacts academic achievement [30], and is correlated with positive self-esteem [31]. Ford et al. suggest gifted underachievement among ethnically diverse students begins early, therefore, interventions should be stressed with early childhood educators [29]. Educators will be more equipped to develop and provide appropriately engaging curriculum and instruction for gifted ethnically diverse students when they have "culturally relevant and accurate information and nuanced knowledge about their languages, literacies, cultural practices, and histories," [29] (p.50). Providing this nuanced curriculum and instruction, informed by culturally responsive pedagogy and Cross and Vandiver's racial identity development, early childhood educators can guide gifted students to develop self-knowledge, positive self-identities, and subsequently perform better academically and socially in schools [27] [29].

3. Strengths-based Approach

Educators can make a difference in students' lives [32]. However, individuals' beliefs, values, and

assumptions about culture can shape their professional practices [33]. When educators do not provide challenging rigor and high expectations, student learning ceases [33]. Cochran-Smith and colleagues reported that most preservice teachers are White, females from middle-class socioeconomic backgrounds and have limited experiences teaching in diverse settings [34]. Levels of white racial awareness may predict racism [35]. The more aware you are of your white identity, the less likely you are to exhibit acts of racism. Understanding that educators may unknowingly be lowering expectations or removing challenges from students as ill-conceived acts of mercy, it is even more imperative that educators receive training for culturally competent practices that will positively promote learning and resilience for gifted students of color.

One way school districts can create positive educational experiences for gifted students of color is to adopt a strengths-based approach [36]. Educators with underdeveloped cultural competence may hold deficit views of diverse students. Ladson-Billings explains that deficit perspectives result in lowered teacher expectations for students of color and those who live in poverty [37]. This deficit perspective contributes to the achievement gap and opportunity gap. For example, educators may assume students of color lack cognitive abilities or face difficult external circumstances therefore, they withhold challenging learning opportunities. Some educators may assume differences in culture equate to deficiencies in intellect [33]. Instead, teachers should embrace a strengths-based approach to education [36]. Educators with the strengths-based approach believe that all students have potential and seek ways to foster that potential. Several strategies teachers can use to enact a strengths-based approach is to empower students with choice in the classroom environment and involve students in curricular and assessment decisions. For example, teachers focused on student-centered strengths-based orientations might provide students' choices for assignments [36], affirm students' contributions to academic discussions [38], involve students in assessing their own learning and setting their own learning goals, and structure a collaborative, relational, classroom environment [39].

A strengths-based approach can increase student engagement & achievement [36]. This approach is integral to a nurturing educational environment in which educators notice students' patterns of coping and encourage students' self-efficacy and build from the skills and abilities students have thereby valuing

students' contributions and knowledge [39]. Kitano and Lewis identified self-efficacy and opening opportunities as two of four factors related to fostering resilience in youths [40]. Rather than focusing on perceived deficits or problems, the strengths-based approach places emphasis on what students can do/know and values potentials therefore fostering students' beliefs in themselves and their own resilience [39].

Resiliency contributes to students' abilities to enact coping skills when faced with microaggressions and other forms of racism/discrimination in schools [13]. When students are able to engage resilience, they can utilize strategies to resist microaggressions and hostile climates within their schools [13] [10]. Resiliency can be encouraged for African American gifted students by forming positive relationships with like-minded peers who can act as supportive role models and positively influence goal-oriented motivation [13], nurturing school environments [41], and supportive strategies targeting transitions through gifted programming [10]. When educators fully understand cultural competence and embody the strengths-based approach, they can offer a supportive and protecting educational environment in which gifted students of color can flourish.

4. Family Interactions

Culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse (CLED) students have been shown to thrive in gifted programs that make concerted efforts to involve parental participation [42]. Family interactions include involving parents as classroom volunteers, involving parents as program leadership/advisory board members, making family and cultural connections in curriculum, and providing families access to program/educational information. Family and community involvement have been evidenced to positively influence academic achievement and engagement across cultural groups [43] [44]. Further, gifted African American students' academic achievement and motivation toward success has been associated with their sense of connectedness/belonging in the educational environment [45]. Goudelock stresses that parents of gifted minority students should embrace their roles as advocates and collaborators in gifted education for their children's success [46]. Similarly, Ford and colleagues suggest that family and community orientations are indicative of culturally responsive and psychologically appropriate educational environments for African American students [45]. Rather than adopting deficit views of students' family socioeconomic backgrounds, educators can encourage communication and therefore trust with parents by

inviting them to take part in the gifted programs with their students. Parents of African American gifted students from lower income families may face barriers in connecting with schools/teachers due to work schedules or lack of communication with teachers [47]. One way schools can address this barrier is to offer programs outside of regular school hours. By offering after school, Saturday, or summer gifted programs, schools can provide economically disadvantaged minority students more access to advanced learning opportunities and access for parents to interact with teachers outside of traditional school hours. Another way schools can engage parent involvement is to develop parent networks [42]. Regular communication between gifted program administrators/teachers and the parent groups will assist with relationship development and the sharing of important information about educational opportunities and choices. Parents may also be involved by serving as members of an advisory board for the gifted program of a school. Teachers can promote parental involvement by inviting parents to be guest speakers, classroom volunteers, cultural leadership group facilitators, and by integrating family and culture into curriculum. When family/parental participation is a priority in gifted education programs, Diverse gifted students can enjoy a greater sense of connectedness with their educational environments.

5. Relevant curriculum

Excelling above the expectation that teachers should have the appropriate knowledge for multiple identification methods (not just testing) and the awareness of their own bias, means supporting the necessity for all school personnel to enact culturally responsive teaching with multicultural content [48]. Gifted students from minority backgrounds should not be expected to adapt to predetermined rigid curriculum or gifted programs in schools. Tomlinson & Jarvis noted that nurturing teachers of high potential ethnically diverse students exhibited flexibility in program structure to meet students' needs and fill educational gaps [15]. Prior studies have demonstrated that mismatches in curriculum/programs can be barriers to academic success or participation for students from diverse backgrounds [49] [50]. Instead, schools should seek to make their curriculum relevant, flexible, and engaging for students. One way schools can address this need is by understanding how to provide culturally responsive strategies and resources, along with social justice ideologies in programs steeped with academic rigor appropriate to meet the needs of gifted students [51].

To guide the use of culturally responsive strategies and materials, schools could utilize the multicultural curriculum model “Approaches to Integrating Multicultural Content,” to integrate culturally responsive curriculum into their plans [52] [53]. Banks’ multicultural curriculum model consists of four levels which infuse multicultural content into the curriculum – contributions level, additive level, transformation level, and social action level [52] [53] [29]. From this model educators can learn how to make their curriculum more culturally inclusive to gifted minority students while recognizing students’ cultural differences [45]. This awareness assists educators when preparing or considering the use of literature, tests, media, and other educational materials and strategies to ensure they are accepting of cultural differences, allowing for diverse students to feel safe in their environments and positively influencing their academic and social outcomes in school. Culturally responsive pedagogy includes practices of identity affirmation and providing successful role models for students with whom they can identify “Classroom teachers, educators of gifted learners, and others who are charged with identifying talent must make pointed efforts to provide role models in science that reflect students’ ethnic and culture backgrounds, inspire and motivate students, and educate and value all,” [54], (p.13).

Davis and colleagues also suggest the interweaving of social justice ideologies for relevant curricula [3]. Selecting and utilizing multicultural literature and other resources to affirm the value of gifted students of color within society can further assist them in visualizing the differences and similarities between and among people, facilitate their understanding of social justice issues, provide deeper insight into their own cultures, and help them become acquainted with various perspectives [29] (p.53). To do this, Ford and colleagues suggest educators reference Keifer and Tyson’s literature guide to evaluate whether a children’s book is appropriately portraying a cultural group [29] [55].

To address the needs of gifted students living in rural areas, critical place-based education has been suggested as an integral pedagogy [56]. Place-based education goes beyond concepts of race/ethnicity to include the intersectionality of gifted diverse students living in rural areas. It views place as a strength that contextualizes the learning in the community [56]. Place-based education can be integrated by engaging critical reflection on realities, student identities, hands-on lived experiences, and providing opportunities for

students to envision success within their rural places [56].

Five suggestions have been offered for school districts desiring to intentionally design their gifted programming and curriculum to be more inclusive and equitable for gifted students of color. These suggestions include instilling scholar identity, encouraging the development of racial pride, enacting a strengths-based educational approach, encouraging family interactions, and providing a culturally relevant curriculum. Additionally, school districts can support gifted programs for all types of students by becoming informed and trained within the field of gifted education concerning the socio-emotional, psychological, and cultural needs of gifted Diverse learners and by making concerted efforts to enact necessary changes.

4 Future Research

Through careful synthesis of this research, information was gained regarding the influence of microaggressions and racist misperceptions of behaviors on gifted Black students in urban schools (Anderson, 2020; [13]. Several studies shared factors that were perceived as positively contributing to the success of gifted Black students (Sewell & Goings, 2019; Tomlinson & Jarvis, 2014). Consistent with Hattie (2003), findings suggest teachers have an impact on students’ achievement despite students’ surrounding environments (Anderson, 2012; Sewell & Goings, 2019; Tomlinson & Jarvis, 2014). Still, the ability to display resilience in school settings may be limited by risk factors and the absence of protective factors (Reis et al., 2005). While these studies emphasized the realities of gifted Black students’ experiences in urban settings, none provided details regarding the conceptual views (i.e., deficit perspective or strengths-based perspectives, or cultural competence levels) held by students’ teachers. We need to better understand the beliefs and experiences of teachers of gifted diverse students. Not only would this research address unanswered questions among the presently reviewed studies, but it would also answer a call to action for research on this topic incited by prior studies [57] [58]. Further, the sampled research explored samples from urban areas and urban schools. Consistent with the need in extant literature and displayed in the current sampling of studies, future research must explore the attitudes and beliefs of educators in suburban impoverished settings [59]. Addressing this issue could reveal information approaching the root of experiences perceived by gifted Black students who have been identified and

are receiving services for gifted education. Prior studies of teacher candidates suggest tendencies for deficit views toward students who differ racially/ethnically from the teacher candidate [60], yet research exploring the attitudes and beliefs/cultural competence of in-service teachers serving impoverished, gifted Black students in suburban areas is scant.

To explore this phenomenon with rich description and compare the perceptions of teachers and gifted students living in impoverished suburban environments, future researchers may study the beliefs and perceived experiences of suburban White elementary educators teaching gifted Black 4th-5th grade elementary students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Additionally, researchers may offer differing perspectives within this context by including gifted Black 4th-5th grade elementary students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds as participants. The suburban lower socioeconomic setting is appropriate because little is known about the gifted diverse students or teachers in this environment [59]. These methods will provide rich descriptions of the participants' natural setting/context, give voice to participants who may be underrepresented in the literature as well as different perspectives to be highlighted, and allow the flexibility for participants' subjective realities to be shared, and a study that adds to the body of literature on the topic of gifted African American education. For detailed future research study design see Appendix A.

Appendix A

Future Research Study Design

Future Research Study Design: Exploratory Instrumental Case Study

RQ1: What are the beliefs and perceived experiences of suburban White elementary teachers toward teaching gifted Black 4th-5th grade elementary students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds?

RQ2: What are the perceived experiences of gifted Black students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds in a suburban elementary school?

Study design rationale: To explore the beliefs and attitudes of White teachers working in a suburban elementary school teaching impoverished, suburban, gifted African American students, I selected a qualitative research design because there is a

possibility that participants in the study are silenced voices. Qualitative research designs can allow researchers the flexibility to explore social issues without the constraints of predetermined variables [61]. I also selected the case study design because I want to collect detailed information about the context of a particular issue and the experiences of the participants within the context dealing with that issue, therefore the instrumental case study fits my purpose [61]. The exploratory instrumental case study design will allow me the ability to communicate directly with participants, to spend time in their natural settings, and to gather details without reliance on predeterminations or what has been published in prior literature [61] [62]. Further, the qualitative aspect of the case study design will empower participants to collaborate with researchers on data analysis and interpretations of data thereby reducing potential power relationships that may otherwise stifle participants' realities. More specifically, the qualitative case study design is fitting because the research is focusing on the beliefs and experiences of White teachers and African American gifted students in poverty that may involve issues of cultural competence or Critical Race Theory, and it is important to understand the context of their settings when interpreting these politically-charged issues [61].

Sampling Procedure: The principal researcher will utilize purposive sampling to identify a case study site meeting the inclusion criteria for the study [61]. The principal researcher will access her professional network to elicit suggestions for potential suburban elementary school sites and more closely examine potential sites to determine inclusion for the study using the inclusion criteria and in-person visits to the potential sites. The principal researcher will contact potential site administration to confirm willingness for participation and access to the site, teachers, and students for the study purposes. Within the selected site, the researcher will conduct purposive maximal sampling to identify participants that meet the specific inclusion criteria for the study's purposes. By employing purposive maximal sampling, the researcher will be able to include different perspectives on a similar issue [61].

Inclusion criteria for the study: public elementary school in the United States, located in a suburban setting, majority teaching staff White, and the student population must include high achieving/gifted Black students who receive free/reduced lunch and live in the suburban area

Sites not included in the study: any site that is not a public elementary school in the United States, or is not located in a suburban area, or a school that does

not have students who can be identified as high achieving/gifted Black students who receive free/reduced lunch and live in the suburban area

Participants:

Teachers who self-identify as White, from a mostly White-populated, suburban, elementary school who teach gifted/talented Black students who live at or below the poverty level in a suburban setting.

Gifted 4th-5th grade elementary students who self-identify as Black/African American and who live at or below the poverty level in a suburban setting (as indicated by qualification for free/reduced lunch benefits) and attend a mostly White, suburban, elementary school.

“Watch list” participants: to reduce underrepresentation the sample may include Black/African American students who live in poverty that are considered “high potential” and were on the cusp of being identified or “watch list” for gifted services however, they did not meet all the school’s academic/behavioral criteria according to the school’s identification plan. “Watch list” participants’ criteria will be clearly described and defined if included in the sample

To improve inclusivity, prior research has included students from diverse ethnic and socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds who were considered “high potential” [10].

Instruments/Measures:

Semi-structured interview protocol for teacher interviews with open-ended demographics questions (gender, educational degree, teaching experience, grade level, certification, and ethnicity) and open-ended questions adapted from the Cultural Awareness and Beliefs Inventory (CABI) along with concepts from the Center for Culturally Proficient Educational Practice [63] will guide interviews with teachers [64] (see Semi-structured interview protocol, below). Questions will be structured to encourage discourse around cultural awareness and teacher beliefs. These types of questions are being asked to learn more about the teachers’ attitudes and beliefs around culture and students’ deficits or resiliencies. Teachers’ cultural competence influences their professional decisions and actions and can counteract or compound barriers to students’ learning [63].

Semi-structured interview protocol for focus group with probes to encourage discussion around students’ experiences as gifted Black students, issues of racial microaggressions, how students perceive microaggressions in the school setting and how students perceive factors that influence their

success in the school setting will guide focus group discussion with gifted Black students.

Unstructured observations (shadowing of gifted Black students)

Researchers will keep field notes and reflexive journals

Procedures

Data collection will be multi-modal and will include the following methods [62].

Individual, in-person, audio recorded and transcribed, 60 min., semi-structured interviews with each teacher-participant in a private room in the school

One 60 min., in-person, audio recorded and transcribed, focus group interview with a purposive sample of gifted Black students in a private room in the school

Student-Participant observations, (researcher will observe while spending 2 days of shadowing each gifted Black student in the school)

Data will include:

Researcher field notes conducted during interviews, focus group, and participant observations

Transcribed interviews and transcribed focus group data

Audio recordings of individual interviews

Audio recording of focus group coding analysis recorded in researcher notes/reflexive journal

Coding chart with exemplars and examples of raw data

Appendices will include:

protocol for teacher semi-structured interviews

protocol for student focus group

transcribed interviews

transcribed focus group

Addressing Potential Internal Validity Threats:

History: The threat of history is controlled by selecting a cluster of all 4th-5th grade students, who will likely have experienced the same historical events and be impacted similarly.

Selection bias: Selection bias could be an issue with this research study since the participants will need to willingly consent to participate. This could create a sample of individuals with more outgoing or motivational characteristics, more optimism toward the research topic, or more openness. In this study, the participants’ demographic details will be transparently reported along with multiple samples of participants’ responses. Additionally, the

researcher will note the possibility of selection bias as a limitation to the study.

Instrumentation: Training for the researchers will assist in reducing validity threats of instrumentation. Also, interviews and the focus group meeting will occur on consistently concurrent days and times to reduce this threat. Further, all teacher-participants will be interviewed using the same semi-structured interview protocol associated with their group (i.e., teachers' interview protocol) and procedures, in the same room of the school individually. All student-participants will be interviewed using the semi-structured interview protocol for students in one focus group meeting, in the same room of the school. Researchers will be trained on the use of the semi-structured interview protocol as a guide for interviews and the focus group. Therefore, instrumentation will be similar among all participants and between teachers and students.

Researcher Bias: To reduce the threat of researcher bias, the principal researcher will transparently report her positionality, background, orientation/assumptions, and potential bias at the outset of the study [65]. The principal researcher will report details regarding the backgrounds, orientations, and experiences and potential bias of the other research members involved in data collection and data analysis processes of the study.

Regression: The current study is not collecting assessment scores or conducting testing for performance that could be impacted by regression effects.

Testing effect: The testing effect is not a threat to the current study. No repeated testing or tests measuring participant performance will be conducted.

Maturation: The study (interviews, focus group, and observations) will be conducted within a reasonable amount of time (approximately one academic semester), and therefore, maturation of participants should not impact the participants' responses to questions. All participants will be experiencing the focus group at the same point in time therefore the process of maturation and development will affect participants in the focus group at similar rates.

Experimental Mortality: Given this is an uncontrollable event, if there should be an event occurring which leads to additional sessions, new participants, or involvement that may skew the results of the study, the event and all impacted details will be transparently reported.

External Validity Threats

Transferability: The researcher will take steps to ensure that the research results transfer to situations with similar populations and characteristics by

providing rich thick descriptions about the participants, setting, and procedures of the study [66].

Under coverage of population: Under coverage of population will be reduced by including students in the focus groups and observations who were on the cusp of being identified by the school for gifted services.

Attrition: Attrition rates will be discouraged by providing buy-in by expressing the importance and purpose of the study to participants, convenient scheduling of interviews/focus groups/observations, and by conducting a cross-sectional rather than a longitudinal study.

Other quality strategies

To improve trustworthiness and thwart concerns that the study lacks credibility and confirmability, the researcher will conduct member checks, collect referential materials, and engage in peer consultation [65].

Member Checks: During the process of data analysis, the researcher will initiate and maintain corroboration with the participants (i.e., member checks) regarding the interpretation of interview and focus group data [66]. The researcher will meet with participants to review transcripts and initial coding of information to allow participants opportunities to clarify, elaborate, and provide accurate interpretations of events.

Peer Review/Debriefing: During data analysis and prior to composing the final draft of the research report, the researcher will engage in consultation with expert colleague(s) who has background/experience in gifted education, qualitative research, and the topic of racial microaggressions and/or cultural competence in education. This process will help to establish validity in the reported material.

Substantive Validity: The principal researcher will draw upon CRT when conducting data analysis and interpreting data for coding and themes. Messick refers to substantive validity as a "theoretical rationale for the observed consistencies in the test responses" [67] (p. 745). By cross-checking the responses of questions to the expected answers as guided by literature on CRT [18], and common knowledge, the researcher will improve the substantive validity of the data analysis process. Additionally, the principal researcher will complement the collected data from the case study with peer-reviewed research and extant literature support (referential materials). For example, the researcher will refer to published empirical research on the topics of deficit paradigm in education,

discontinuity paradigm in education, and strengths perspectives in education.

Intercoder Reliability: During the analyses of transcript data, the researchers will conduct intercoder agreement checks. These intercoder agreement checks will establish the stability within the ways researchers assign codes to passages in the transcribed data sets. This process will involve creating an initial codebook, then independently coding a set number of additional transcripts, and comparing coders' results on passages that all coders coded to see if they have coded them in the same way. As Miles & Huberman recommend, the goal will be to reach a minimum of 80% intercoder agreement [68].

Ethical Precautions:

The researcher will take actions and adhere to the principles of ethical research involving human subjects. Application of these principles will be displayed by the following actions:

To assure that participants' rights and welfare are protected, this research project will be reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Informed Consent: Participants will be required to give informed consent prior to participating in the study. The researcher will be required to inform all participants regarding the following items prior to receiving informed consent:

The researcher will inform the participants of the study's purpose, content, duration, and potential risks and benefits.

The researcher will inform the participants that they can stop participating in the study at any point.

The researcher will inform the participants that they do not have to answer all the interview or focus group questions.

The researcher will seek consent from the legal parents/guardians for all children-participants under legal age.

Confidentiality: No participants' identifiers will be linked to their interview/focus group responses. Pseudonyms will be used in place of participants' actual names for reporting to protect the identities of all participants. Raw data with any identifying information (i.e., actual participants' names on consent forms) will be kept in a password protected, university-maintained digital file storage.

Paradigm: Social Constructivism will be the underlying philosophical orientation of the researcher's approach toward the study. The researcher will remain open to the possible relationships and the multiple, subjective realities shared through participants' data [61].

Data Analysis: Thematic Analysis

Data will be analyzed through an iterative process of reviewing and analyzing multiple qualitative accounts (answers to interview questions, answers to focus group questions, and observations). The researchers will reflexively review their analyses and compare with one another's analyses seeking 80% or higher intercoder agreement during the analysis of data to improve validity of findings [61] [68]. The coding will have two main stages yet will remain an iterative process and will continue until data saturation is met [62].

Stage 1: Initial Coding- The purpose of this stage will be to define, understand and explain what is happening in the data. The analysis team will number each line in the transcribed data, and code every new concept by summarizing key points of a concept briefly in one-two word phrases.

Stage 2: Focused Coding- The purpose of this stage will be to synthesize the most significant or frequently used codes across cases/data to create categories/themes. In this stage, the analysis moves from initial descriptive codes to generating groups of codes. The data is then compared to see if the same codes are appearing.

Data Saturation: The coding and analysis process will continue until there are no new findings emerging and the research analysis team has determined they've reached the point of data saturation.

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol: Teacher Interviews

1. Demographics questions: Please describe yourself in terms of age, gender, race/ethnicity, and years spent teaching.
2. Tell me about the gifted students who perform well in school.
3. What does the term "acting White" mean to you?
4. Tell me about the gifted students who are most eager to learn.
5. In your observations, do students that are referred for gifted services usually qualify for gifted services in your school? Who deserves to receive gifted services? Tell me more about this process.
6. What strengths do you see African American gifted students bringing to the classroom? How do these compare with the strengths White gifted students bring?
7. Tell me about the weakness or at-risk factors for African American gifted students. How do these compare with the weakness or at-risk factors for White gifted students?

8. How do you feel when working with students and parents whose cultures are similar to yours? Different than yours?
9. Tell me about your approaches to getting families from African American communities involved in the education of their students. How is this effort compared with involving families from White communities? Tell me about the difficulties or successes in either of these situations.
10. Tell me how you handle academic engagement with African American gifted students. What has worked? What has not worked?

Appendix B Critique of Selected Studies

While quantitative research can be critiqued by empirical research standards and the familiar tenants of validity, generalizability, objectivity, and reliability for quality purposes [69], qualitative research can be similarly evaluated based on its trustworthiness [66] and by comparing it with standards for empirical research as established by professional organizations and experts in the field [70] [71] [72] [73] [74] [75]. Yet, as qualitative research is a creative body arriving in multiple forms, it is paired with a plethora of potential criteria and standards of goodness [75]. Perhaps a most tried and true resource stems from the four components that work together in establishing trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as established by Lincoln and Guba [66]. Creswell suggests qualitative research can be considered quality work if it upholds certain criteria [73]. These criteria include rigorous data collection, framing the study within the principles and characteristics of qualitative research (e.g., evolving design, presenting multiple realities, focused on participants' views), ensuring that a qualitative approach to inquiry is used, including detailed methods, the researcher analyzing the data multiple times to reflect deeper thinking, the researcher writing persuasively, the study reflecting the personal and cultural experiences of the researcher (i.e., discussing the researcher's role, how the researcher's experiences shape aspects of the study), and the study being ethical (addressing ethical issues throughout all study phases) [73]. Bogdan and Biklen report that qualitative research should contribute either to the body of literature, the research tradition, a general understanding, or a

particular field of study [72], (p.217). And the American Educational Research Association (AERA) provides empirical research standards specific to the domains of social sciences and humanities-oriented research [70] [71]. More recently, Tracy developed eight broad criteria for goodness in qualitative research moving away from specificity of paradigm [75]. It is important to note that quality empirical research must not meet every single criterion of each standard or professional checklist to be considered acceptable. However, these standards and quality checklists are helpful in identifying the nature of the research and the importance of the research results [70], (p.33). While I acknowledge the benefits of focusing on one set of overarching quality standards, as argued by Tracy [75], I also value the area-specific criteria offered by others as a relatively new researcher to this field. Therefore, as I critique the following qualitative research articles, I will oscillate between multiple references while identifying quality or deficits throughout the reports.

Qualitative Study 1

Tomlinson and Jarvis brought the case study research design to focus on the work being done in three seemingly successful schools, while investigating how teachers and schools contribute to the academic success of minority students of high potential from economically disadvantaged and ethnically diverse backgrounds [15]. This multiple case study provides some insight into the researchers' observed successes for teaching strategies and school-wide philosophies toward educating students of high potential who come from ethnically diverse and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. In the following paragraphs I summarize the study as indicated by the researchers' published report and offer a critique of the research methodology.

Sample

To identify the sample schools, researchers conducted purposive sampling and followed recommendations from colleagues and others about schools who may fit their criteria for inclusion. Researchers then reviewed assessment performances of these schools and visited potential sites before selecting the three sites for the study. The sample consisted of teachers and students from three schools given pseudonyms, (Sunnydale High School with grades 9-12, Flagstaff grades PreK-8, and Lionel Elementary grades PreK-6) within urban settings and different regions of the United States. The sample varied widely on student population with Sunnydale servicing the most students (n=1400). In comparison, Flagstaff serviced

approximately 800 students and Lionel Elementary serviced 350 students. Student demographics within the schools also varied widely. Many Sunnydale students were white (n=69%) with a small portion being African American (n=16%), while Flagstaff students were mostly African American (n=95%). Lionel Elementary students were reportedly Hispanic (n=51%), African American (n=33%), or White/Other with many of the White/Other students also being English Language Learners (n=16%). Teacher race/ethnicity was also different among the schools. Most of the teachers at Sunnydale were reportedly White (80% of 129 teachers), and researchers indicated almost all of the teachers at Flagstaff were African American. The focus of the study was on three teachers and their students from Sunnydale High School, with whole school focuses for Flagstaff and Lionel Elementary.

Methodology

Tomlinson and Jarvis selected a multiple case study design. The methodology involved qualitative research approaches to data collection including semi-structured interviews, observations, and focus groups [15]. Instrumentation included researcher-developed semi-structured interview protocol. Researchers kept field notes and reflexive journals that later became part of each site's case record data. Data collection at each site involved approximately 80 hours on-site and occurred across a period of four years with at least two on-site researchers collecting data and collaborating over data at a given site across two years during the four-year time period. Data analysis involved on-site researchers organizing and cleaning data during and after collection while applying codes to identify the sources for all data pieces. Field notes, researcher journals, observations, interview transcripts, and focus group transcripts became part of each site's case record. On-site researchers collaborated with the principal researcher during the data collection process to review initial findings, reformulate questions, and discuss emerging themes. The principal researcher identified and finalized emerging themes after data collection was complete from all three case records.

Critique

Tomlinson and Jarvis bring some valuable strategies to light that may guide teachers and school administrators in forming educational opportunities for minority students of potential who come from economically diverse backgrounds [15]. The researchers support emerged themes by corroborating them with similar findings in extant literature. However, there are several flaws and inconsistencies within the written presentation of

this study that result in limited transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The following section serves to critique important issues from the research report regarding the sample, overall methodology, and conclusions the researchers provide.

Tomlinson and Jarvis provided a research citation as well as a rationale for selecting the multiple case study design [15]. The researchers explained that the case study design allowed them the ability to investigate phenomena within a natural setting and address the why and how questions in-depth [15]. Their rationale aligns with Creswell who suggests case studies are useful when researchers seek in-depth understanding of the cases or a comparison of several cases [61]. The researchers' choice of purposive sampling for a multiple case study also aligns with expert recommendations for qualitative research [61]. However, concerns arose as I attempted to comprehend the sampling as reported by the researchers.

Dependability is limited by the way processes for sampling and work with focus groups were reported. Tomlinson and Jarvis stated their sampling approach was purposive and shared several ways they located potential schools for the sample, however, the specific inclusion criteria or reasoning for not including certain schools in the study, as well as the number of schools considered were not clearly detailed in the report [15]. The information provided about the schools in the sample lacked demographic information to allow for comparisons between the schools. Information regarding teacher race/ethnicity or quantity employed was not provided for Flagstaff or Lionel Elementary. While researchers did provide more details for the staff of Sunnydale High School, it is important to note that the study focused on three teachers from this site rather than the entire school faculty, yet the researchers did not report the race/ethnicity of those three teachers. AERA standards for social science research provide sources of evidence, such as the relevant characteristics of units of study, as well as judgments through which they were selected, be clearly reported [70] [71].

Further, the researchers mention focus groups, suggesting more than one focus group existed, as part of the data collected, yet they explain a singular focus group of eleven students was formed by inviting eleven African American AVID students from Sunnydale High School to join. The formation of other focus groups or those group demographics were not reported. The frequency of focus group meetings or how many researchers

facilitated the focus groups were also not provided. Additionally, the researchers do not describe the reasoning for selecting the eleven students from Sunnydale for the focus group. Bogdan and Biklen advise planning focus groups with intentional strategies to allow participants to feel valued and know that their opinions will remain confidential [72]. Further, focus groups should be structured to provide diverse perspectives rather than being dominated by a singular type of people with similar skin color [72]. The focus group described at Sunnydale included only African American students of potential. This structure is inconsistent with recommendations for fostering diverse perspectives in focus groups. If Tomlinson and Jarvis promised confidentiality to focus group members, emphasized students' ideas being important, or utilized certain scripts for the focus groups, they neglected to share those details in the research report [15]. Not only do these lacking details limit dependability, replication of the study, particularly the formation of focus groups and role of the facilitator(s) becomes increasingly difficult. Researchers should be transparent in their rationale for selection of units of analysis and provide descriptions of the processes in data collection which would enable another researcher to replicate the data collection processes [70].

Further complicating transferability and clarity of the study is the researchers' definition, or lack of defining, key terms in the study. Each site within the sample measured student success differently and placed students in classes with advanced/special programming for different reasons. The researchers also identified special programming inconsistently across sites. At one site they considered the curricula for English language learners as fitting criteria for high potential learners while at another site they considered enrollment in advanced placement (AP) courses fitting criteria. Further, researchers did not provide detailed information about the students and teachers they observed at each site. Making comparisons of students' experiences across these sites is difficult because the students do not fit a distinct or consistent criteria as being identified as gifted or having high potential. This makes it challenging to transfer or apply the findings of this study to similar populations, particularly when information about the students being quoted within the study at each site is scant. Furthermore, comparisons between sites cannot reasonably be made given the differences in students sampled, lack of information about those students, and lack of information about the teachers and programs.

Tomlinson and Jarvis explained the on-site researchers met regularly with the principal researcher and larger research team to discuss emerging patterns, future data collection, and to refine questions to improve the credibility and confirmability of their findings [15], (p.200). This collaboration may have contributed to ensuring the perspectives were consistent with those of the participants' rather than the researchers' views thereby positively impacting confirmability and may also be interpreted as improving credibility since several researchers would have witnessed the events. To further ensure confirmability, Lincoln and Guba suggest using member checks to verify that data analysis is consistent with participants' views [66]. Another method of improving confirmability would be to include details of participants' perspectives and raw data from transcripts or field notes in the report [76]. Tomlinson and Jarvis do cite multiple quotations from raw data throughout the report and offer codes to describe the sources for each selection.

Additionally, the principal investigator is described as having experience teaching at the school and university levels as well as experience conducting research within the field of education for diverse students; while the other researchers involved hold advanced degrees in education and are familiar with qualitative research [15]. While listing that other on-site researchers also have advanced degrees in education and "familiarity" of qualitative research may provide some surface credibility, the term lacks clarity and does little to incite a specific degree of rigor within the field of qualitative research. Although the researchers briefly describe the educational background, research experience, and professional experience of the principal researcher there is no effort to describe potential researcher bias or to convey the researcher's role or paradigm. It can be assumed the paradigm is advocacy perspective, however more is needed regarding the researchers' experiences or views shaped specific aspects of this study. Specifically, the report lacks information about the principal researcher's and on-site researchers' demographics, personal backgrounds, experiences, and potential views coming into this study and neglects to overtly discuss a research paradigm.

Still, Tomlinson and Jarvis took steps to instill trustworthiness in their work through data collection. Data were collected from multiple sources in multiple forms to "triangulate" the data and ensure trustworthiness of findings [15]. For example, each researcher kept individual field notes and reflexive journals which became part of each

case record. These records created a suitable audit trail which increases the confirmability of findings. However, Bogdan and Biklen suggest researchers avoid the use of the term triangulation completely [72]. They propose it is overused and misused imprecise language [72]. Aside from controversy regarding the use of the term triangulation, Tomlinson and Jarvis conducted adequate data collection to provide dependable and confirmable results in their study [15]. However, concerns remain regarding the analysis of data.

Notwithstanding lacking details in sampling information, dependability is limited due to the way Tomlinson and Jarvis reported aspects of data analysis regarding coding. Specifically, Tomlinson and Jarvis concisely explain the data analysis process sharing few details and no examples of how participants' statements or researchers' observations were coded into themes [15]. To increase dependability, the researchers could have detailed the coding process more explicitly and provided a table with exemplars and examples from transcripts displaying their methods for ascribing codes to certain types of statements. Further, a rationale and/or research citation to support Tomlinson and Jarvis' choice of coding process for analysis would have added to the dependability of the data analysis and provided confidence that they ensured qualitative approaches were utilized.

Regardless of concerns, many scholars focus directly on results and discussion sections of research articles when conducting reviews of relevant literature. It is important to recognize there are strengths within some aspects of Tomlinson and Jarvis' interpretation of the findings, yet I take issue with their methodology in arriving at these conclusions and suggest alternate explanations may exist [15].

The culminating discussion provided multiple strategies consistent with existing literature for improving academic success for students of potential who come from minority or economically diverse backgrounds. The championed strategies are reasonable and make sense for students fitting the criteria of gifted or high potential with minority or economically diverse backgrounds. Further, the researchers' hypothesized that teachers/schools with successful minority students of potential would be implementing these types of strategies. Their reporting of the results seems tailored to fit their hypothesis. From the outset of the report, it was evident the researchers were purposefully seeking these strategies within each site rather than observing what was occurring. With careful dissection of the results, I question the conclusions

drawn from the case studies. For example, Flagstaff is celebrated throughout the report as a model for implementing appropriate gifted instruction and curriculum to students from diverse backgrounds. Yet, I conclude Flagstaff's approach was consistent with recommendations for teaching students with a trauma-informed approach and this highly structured routine setting may have been beneficial for the population of students within those classrooms due to their individual experiences. It does not indicate this approach is particularly beneficial for all gifted students from minority backgrounds. Additionally, Flagstaff shared a school-wide vision for student success, but it appeared to be focused on achievement. The teachers were observed teaching academic language consistent with the standards and preparing students with test-taking skills. These are helpful skills for academic success to be sure, however they are not considered as curriculum or skills one would teach specifically for gifted students. Instead, these skills are required by all students. They did not provide intentional differentiation but did offer individual instruction as needed. My conclusion regarding Flagstaff is that researcher bias may have clouded some of the interpretation of these observations. What is provided in the results appears to be teaching that promotes academic achievement, but I question if any of these students were challenged to be more creative or innovative.

Regarding the interpretation of Lionel, it seems the researchers overlooked or discounted some of the observations. Lionel was depicted as a failure that did not meet the researchers' criteria by their second year of observation. However, careful examination of the results made me wonder why the researchers did not offer a perspective from the new principal or interview a wider variety of teachers or students. Instead they shared information from "administration," regarding a goal of having awareness of differentiation [15], (p.212). Is it possible the teachers who were interviewed had a conflict with the new principal? Quotes from the reading specialist suggested negative feelings toward the change in administration. This seemed to be the focus of the Lionel case study rather than perspectives from students or positive quotes from any teachers. Perhaps interviews with other teachers or students would have offered more information than what was provided. What was observed and reported suggested Lionel was implementing push-in support programs for differentiated groups. They were intentionally differentiating students by grouping, and the researchers saw posters with information about Gardner's Multiple Intelligences

[15]. Although the researchers stated, "...little evidence of differentiation was observed once students were in groups or classes," I propose alternate interpretations for Lionel's data [15], (p.212). It is evident some positive strategies were in place. It is unclear how many groups were observed or the variety of teachers that were observed teaching in those groups. Lionel offered grouping for a multitude of reasons, and researchers do not specify which type of group or grade level they observed. Additionally, the teachers who were interviewed seemed smitten by the first principal and biased against the new principal, as did the on-site researchers. This conflict may have tarnished the presentation of results for the Lionel site.

Finally, Tomlinson and Jarvis proposit the importance of offering gifted students from minority or economically diverse backgrounds flexible and responsive programming that can adjust to individuals and groups of students [15]. Yet, throughout the report, they hail the structure and routine of Flagstaff. I agree with the conclusion that gifted students of diversity benefit from flexibility rather than expectations to fit within a rigid pre-established gifted program, as this concept is consistent with well-established research findings in the field [29]. However, Tomlinson and Jarvis seem to fluctuate their message about program structure by acclaiming the teacher-led, militant style of Flagstaff.

Qualitative Study 2

Across a three-year comparative case study, Reis et al. qualitatively examined ways in which academically talented high school students from economically disadvantaged and ethnically diverse backgrounds develop and utilize strategies of resilience to reach high levels of achievement [14]. Findings from this cross-case study provide insight into protective factors that may assist academically talented students in reaching high achievement levels.

Sample

The sample population was obtained through purposive sampling processes. Reis et al. explained their rationale for this strategy was due to their desire to make generalizable comparisons and to identify participants that met specifically defined criteria for the study [14]. The sample consisted of thirty-five high school students who had been identified as high ability students (N=35). All students were either freshman or sophomore in academic standing at the start of the study and were recommended for the study by their high school guidance counselors or administrators. Eighteen students meeting all four of the following criteria

were considered as high achieving participants in the study: 1) identified/enrolled in academic gifted elementary or middle school program, 2) evidence of superior academic achievement as indicated by grades, 3) nominated by teacher/counselor, and 4) received various academic awards and honors (n=18) [14]. Seventeen students meeting the following four criteria were considered as underachieving participants in the study: 1) identified/enrolled in academic gifted elementary or middle school program and had previously achieved superior levels academically according to grades/teacher observations/awards/honors, 2) previously displayed consistent and strong academic performance (grades of B or higher in elementary and junior high), 3) currently maintaining a GPA of 2.0 or lower, and 4) enrolled in non-college-bound or general classes, and 5) were no longer attending school, had dropped-out, or were truant (n=17) [14].

Methodology

Reis et al. examined the resilience strategies developed and used by gifted high school students from economically disadvantaged and ethnically diverse backgrounds by employing a mixture of comparative case study and ethnographic research methods [14]. Data collection included unstructured observations in a variety of settings and semi-structured interviews. Instrumentation involved a researcher-developed semi-structured interview protocol with open-ended "grand tour" questions [14], (p.6) for which there was no sample provided. These qualitative approaches were coupled with the framework of Resilience theory situating the researchers' interpretation of findings within an existing theoretical framework. Reis et al., stated they selected the comparative cross-case study design to increase generalizability, provide "sophisticated descriptions" and provide "powerful explanations" [14] (p.5). They further explained and provided research citations to support their rationale for selecting this study design. Reis et al., explained that their research was led by prior theory and since they were attempting to describe and account for the context of a specific situation, the case study design was fitting [14].

Critique

Reis et al. meticulously addressed Lincoln and Guba's degrees of quality for qualitative research in their report [14] [66]. They expressly described how they approached their study with qualitative methods and supported their choices for design with research citations and reasonable rationales. Dependability was established by their clear descriptions of the entire research process including sampling, collecting data from the participants, and

the process of analyzing the data was also fully detailed. To establish transferability, Reis et al., provided detailed criteria for participant inclusion and clearly defined terms in the study [14]. A weakness in this area was noted as they did not offer details about the participants' ages, gender, or specific ethnic/racial backgrounds. Additionally, few details were reported regarding the high school research site. Credibility, the internal validity of the study, could be considered established as Reis et al. consistently addressed the research questions as they introduced the purpose of the study, reported findings, and provided discussion [14]. In addition to this, credibility was ensured through frequent research partner checks on the data and interpretations, debriefing and critical questioning, testing rival hypotheses, and conducting a data audit [14]. According to Reis et al., participants can be certain the study reports their views/perceptions rather than those of the researchers, increasing the study's confirmability, because Reis and colleagues documented the data through multiple media (video, field notes, photographs, audio recordings), utilized triangulation of methods, and practiced frequent cross-checking to be sure their findings were accurately reported [14]. However, one aspect of this could be strengthened. The researchers offer no personal or cultural information about their own backgrounds or potential bias in the report. Creswell suggests good qualitative research includes studies that reflect the personal and cultural experiences of the researchers [73]. By not clearly addressing potential bias on the part of the researchers, this is left as an area of concern. Tracy stresses the importance of researchers showing self-reflexivity and honest transparency [75]. In these contexts, Reis et al. lack sincerity in their report [14]. However, consistent with expectations presented by AERA [71] for ethical implications, Reis et al. do provide a statement about the funding received to conduct this study at the end of the report, but they do not mention any potential conflicts of interest or provide a disclosure statement [14]. Further, the amount of raw data from participant interviews/transcripts is scant within the body of the report yet can be found in the appendices to support the formation of emerging themes. Reis et al. have adequately provided detailed descriptions of their research processes and rationales for their methodology, and clearly took steps to ensure dependability and credibility, their study could be improved in the areas of transferability and confirmability by including more details for participants, the research site, and by involving more raw data within the body of the report and possibly including member

checks for verification [14]. Additionally, the research is lacking several hallmarks of goodness established by traditional qualitative research such as researcher positionality, and sincerity in reporting. Measuring trustworthiness, according to standards established by Lincoln and Guba [66], Reis et al., have provided a trustworthy research report with few areas of concern [14]. However, by most professional standards for goodness in qualitative research, Reis et al., should have elaborated more on their own positions as researchers coming into this study and address their own bias potentials [71] [73] [75]. Further, qualitative researchers utilize iterative questioning and deeper levels of thinking as they conduct data analyses. These items are not clearly communicated through Reis et al.'s report [14]. Still, they do meet the criteria set forth by Creswell regarding rigorous data collection, use of a qualitative approach, detailed methods, and persuasive writing within an apparently ethical study [73]. Aside from these measures of quality in qualitative research, it is also important to note the findings and interpretations provided by the researchers.

Reis and colleagues sought to explore what factors high achieving students in an urban high school identify as contributing to their resilience [14]. Findings indicated certain protective factors emerged across the study of high achieving participants that positively influenced their implementation of resilience and resulting high levels of achievement. These factors included having belief in self, positive personal characteristics, support systems (e.g., supportive families, peers and adults who could serve as positive role models, caring teachers and counselors), and actively participating in special programs (e.g., summer enrichment, challenging classes, gifted programs, extracurricular activities) [14].

Reis and colleagues also explored what factors may contribute to the inability to display resilience in underachieving students placed at risk in an urban high school [14]. Findings indicated the risk factors reported by the underachieving gifted students were like those reported by the achieving gifted students, and included family challenges (e.g., parental divorce, abuse, absent parenting, lack of parental monitoring) and school-related issues (e.g., mismatch of academic opportunities with abilities, negative interactions with teachers, lack of challenge, questionable counseling) [14]. Individual and contextual risks included negative outcomes for students such as: students who had few peers who were achieving in school, students who had

relatively few positive adult role models, students who participated in few after-school or summer activities, and students with siblings who had dropped-out of school or had drug problems [14]. Although the gifted students who were achieving at high levels reported similar risk factors to those gifted students who were underachieving, Reis et al. posited it was the lack of protective factors in conjunction with the risk factors that separated the two groups of students by outcomes [14].

The implications of Reis and colleagues' work are beneficial to the body of literature on gifted education because they provide a path forward for educators and school counselors that may prevent more gifted students from economically disadvantaged and ethnically diverse backgrounds from underachieving [14]. Yet, there is cause for concern when considering the final decision of factors affecting underachieving gifted students as provided by Reis and colleagues. The authors' implications are that risks impacting underachieving gifted students are largely sourced from students' home environments. This assumption seems to close-off the possibility that underachieving gifted students may be encountering racial microaggressions or other race-related assaults within their school environments which may have perpetuated/hindered abilities to develop resilience strategies [58]. Reis et al.'s findings could have been strengthened by exploring this option as well, rather than focusing on a deficit-perspective that embraces the idea of risk factors and resilience being associated with students' home lives [14].

Still, Reis et al. provide some insights into potential approaches schools can employ for building resilience within underachieving gifted students from ethnically diverse and economically disadvantaged backgrounds [14]. For example, Reis et al., suggest proactive counseling services be provided to at-risk gifted students in high school and an alternate school schedule that encompasses a longer duration of the school day and incorporates mandatory participation in activities such as sports, extracurricular activities and counseling services [14]. To continually facilitate growth and resilience among gifted students of diversity Reis et al. further suggest gifted coordinators or school counselors consider the implementation of summer programs, after-school programs, more challenging classes, time with additional adult counselors and positive role models, gifted programs, and peer-support programs (p.14). These suggestions are practical and actionable in ways that focus on improving the learning environments to be more responsive to the cultural needs of gifted students of color and are

derived from the credible and dependable research of Reis et al.'s work [14].

Qualitative Study 3

Pulled from the participant pool of a larger study, Anderson interviewed three gifted black females working in higher education between 2018-2019, to explore their counternarratives and identify ways to improve the experiences in education for future adolescent gifted black females [4]. Anderson explains this topic as necessary because it fills an important gap in current literature on gifted education. While the number of black females attaining higher educational goals has increased through the years, the little research that exists has focused on their deficits [4].

Sample

The purposive sample for this study was drawn from a larger convenience sample involving fifteen participants collected by the researcher for a prior research study. The convenience sample had been gathered by establishing inclusion criteria for the study and connecting with individuals through the researcher's professional networking connections. The present study consisted of three gifted African American females (N=3) employed in higher education institutions during the 2018-2019 years. Participants' ages ranged between 30- 40 years. Inclusion criteria for the present sample were participants identified as a Black female, has obtained a doctoral degree, has been identified for gifted services/programming in K-12, and/or was accelerated at any time during the K-12 education. Anderson (2000) noted the three cases selected for this study from the larger fifteen data set were selected because these participants specifically commented about their academic experiences as gifted black adolescent females.

Methodology

Anderson employed a single case study design approach with counternarratives of three high-achieving Black women [4]. To gather participant's discourse around the following topics in academics: gifted programming, familial socialization and involvement, social supports, and social-emotional development Anderson conducted semi-structured interviews with each participant that lasted approximately 90-120 minutes each [4]. Anderson encouraged participants to share their perceptions and descriptions of events in a process described as narrative inquiry [4]. Instrumentation included a researcher-designed semi-structured interview protocol which was provided in the report appendices. Data were analyzed through inductive and process coding. Anderson identified emerging

themes and reported these in the findings as the experiences of the adolescent gifted black girls [4].

Critique

Research Paradigm and Positionality. Placing herself at the center of the research and analysis, Anderson transparently positioned herself as the researcher in this autoethnographic approach by openly sharing her personal experiences as a gifted black female in rich description. While autoethnographies may risk overemphasis on the author's personal narration or personal memories as sources of data [77], Anderson efficiently linked her personal tale with the accounts of participants and related these to the larger societal/educational/cultural issue at the heart of her research purpose.

Anderson's work clearly falls into the advocacy/participatory worldview; Anderson executes a Black feminism worldview and seeks to bring about change in educational environments, contains suggestions for action, advocates for a specific group of oppressed people, and was completed with participants rather than to participants by allowing them to tell their stories as they desire which are hallmarks of advocacy/participatory paradigms [61]. AERA shares this hallmark of quality in humanities-based research purporting it should clearly state the researcher's position and potential bias or impact on analysis [71]. Anderson approached this study from the lens of Critical Race Theory (CRT) [4], specifically utilizing counternarratives and intersectionality and applying CRT in the data analysis process [18]. In keeping with her goal to use qualitative research as a voice for the discriminated/oppressed, Anderson allowed participants to tell their stories in detail around academic events. Use of the CRT methodology indicates Anderson considered race and racism pervasively throughout the entire research processes [4]. AERA stresses the importance of framing humanities-based qualitative research with strong conceptual facets [71]. But can Anderson's study be considered quality research?

Lincoln and Guba express trustworthiness is the key feature of a research study in evaluating its worth [66]. To determine trustworthiness, you must consider credibility (the truth of the findings), transferability (the applicability of the findings in other contexts), dependability (consistency and ability for the findings to be repeated), and confirmability (neutrality of findings or the extent that the findings are shaped by the respondents rather than the researcher's bias) [66]. Anderson established credibility by using triangulation and

member-checking. She established transferability by using thick description which was largely provided by respondents' stories. Based on the research report, there is no evidence of an inquiry or external audit during the research process, therefore it is unclear whether or not this means to dependability was established. However, Anderson did report details of her research process throughout the sampling and data collection sections of her report. To establish confirmability, Anderson utilized triangulation in data collection. She offered multiple details about the research steps taken from the start to reporting the findings, however she did not offer information about field notes, data reduction and analysis products, data reconstruction and synthesis products, or many process notes. Confirmability would have been stronger if several of these aspects had been employed in the study and reporting process. Still, Anderson's study is framed within the principles of qualitative research and clearly reflects her personal and cultural experiences as a gifted black female as well as the principal researcher for the study [4]. This aligns with several elements of Creswell's [73] description for quality in qualitative research as well as AERA [71] standards for humanities-based research and Tracy's [75] reflexivity and transparency in terms of sincerity in quality qualitative research. In summary, I conclude Anderson's study meets most criteria for quality in the field of qualitative research and positively contributes to the body of literature on gifted education [4].

Anderson's work provides insights into the perspectives of gifted African American female students that should incite educator awareness and action [4]. Through narrative inquiry, and analysis using inductive coding, Anderson identified important themes involving talent identification and development, support from educators, and social support relevant to academic experiences for adolescent female African American gifted students [4]. These themes include barriers to identifying gifted black girls (with teachers focusing on bias perceptions of behavior or attitude), gifted black girls feeling marginalized due to gender and race (the intersectionality of their struggle), and gifted black girls feeling discouraged by teachers' expectations or comments. Anderson suggests educators employ the four A's toward gifted black females in schools. These include attitude (reflecting on the stakeholder's bias toward negatively perceived behavior), access (taking action such as professional development to ensure bias views are not limiting students' opportunities/referrals), assessment (utilizing multiple criteria and

strengths-based lens to assess eligibility), and adaptations (creating equitable opportunities through culturally relevant pedagogy to ensure programs are appropriate and meeting needs) [4]. Anderson further suggests educators use Frasier's Traits, Aptitudes and Behaviors (TABS) assessment for the gifted to also identify the interests of gifted students and build curriculum that will continually spark their engagement [4]. The insights offered by Anderson's study are critical to improving educational experiences for gifted female African American students and shine light on deficit views and microaggressions toward gifted female African American students [4]. The findings offered are corroborated by prior research findings which indicate teachers do impact student achievement regardless of students' external circumstances [78] and low teacher expectations negatively influence minority gifted students' achievement [79]. The implications and suggestions offered are supported by and congruent with the statements offered by the participants in the study. This article offers credible, practical and actionable suggestions for educators.

Qualitative Study 4

Sewell and Goings explored the reflections of gifted Black adults regarding their transitioning through and experiences in gifted programming in New York City schools as children [10]. The qualitative study resulted in interviews and demographic data that were analyzed under the lens of framework of Schlossberg's transition model through coding and thematic generation processes [80]. Findings include four salient themes representing the experiences of participants as they transitioned through gifted programs. Sewell and Goings offer four suggestions for schools/teachers to improve the experiences of gifted Black students in schools and specifically during transitions to higher grade level buildings or schools with differing demographic majorities [10].

Sample

The purposive snowball sample of seventeen Black gifted adults (N=17), was derived from the sample group of a larger study initiated by the authors. Potential participants were harvested via personal networking by the researchers and snowball sampling methods wherein the researchers asked current participants to contact others who fit the criteria. In total, seven females and ten males joined the study who met the following inclusion criteria: 1) self-identified as African American or Black, 2) had been identified as gifted at some point during K-12 New York City schooling, and 3) attended the gifted and talented programming prior to the testing and placement shift in 2007. Participants were

vetted for criteria fit through initial conversations with researchers prior to beginning the study and data collection [10].

Methodology

Under the umbrella of the Schlossberg transition model as a theoretical framework, the data collected in this qualitative case study involved 45–90-minute semi-structured phone interviews with each participant and a demographic survey [80]. The semi-structured interview protocol contained questions specific to each gender of participant and the development of probes was guided by the Schlossberg [80] transition model framework with questions exploring participants' experiences and the influence of the experiences on their lives [10]. The full protocol was provided in the appendix of the report [10]. Audio recordings of the phone interviews were transcribed for analysis using Dedoose data management software followed by coding and thematic analysis. Participants engaged in member checking of the transcribed interviews [10]. Sewell and Goings also collected and compared their own reflective notes during data analysis and engaged in cross-checking and eventually peer debriefing with an experienced gifted education expert [10]. Final codes were combined into four themes that Sewell and Goings stated represented the lived experiences of the participants [10].

Critique

Focusing on the experiences of Black gifted students during their time in gifted programming and transitions through educational programs Sewell and Goings shed light on the consequences of certain educational practices that reportedly affected the participants [10]. This type of advocacy research and its findings give rise to alternative suggestions that could improve educational experiences for gifted Black students in future situations. Given the nature of the Sewell and Goings' research and its implications on educational practice, critiquing the work by humanities-oriented standards seems fitting [10]. Therefore, I consider the AERA standards of quality including significance, methods, conceptualization, substantiation, coherence, quality of communication, and ethics as I critique this report [71]. In addition to these standards, I refer to familiar hallmarks for eminence in qualitative research as noted by other experts of the field.

Sewell and Goings cited the trustworthiness of their report as akin to the expectations of [10] [75]. Although Tracy does not list specifically list trustworthiness as a one of the eight criteria for quality, Sewell and Goings were accurate in mentioning the importance Tracy placed on

transparency and honesty in revealing the researchers' own biases and research decisions [75] [10]. To this effect, Sewell and Goings provided thick descriptions of their own positionalities as researchers [10]. According to Tracy, quality research shows sincerity by providing this type of self-reflexivity where authors recognize and question their own subjective feelings and impact on the scene [75]. To this effect, Sewell and Goings admitted the possible impacts of their own biases on data analyses and described what they did to ensure trustworthiness in their research [10]. Not only did Sewell and Goings address potential researcher bias, but the researchers also provided a disclosure statement consistent with quality in the ethics of research [71]. Consequently, Sewell and Goings did not cite a conflict of interest, report outside funding nor do their author biographies indicate any areas for concern with these matters [10]. Tracy also highlights the importance of a worthy topic [75]. Along this line of thinking, I consider the AERA expectation for significance in research [71].

The topic of gifted Black students and their experiences in educational settings in general is relevant in the zeitgeist of today's world. AERA states topics should be relevant, addressing a neglected issue, filling a gap in the literature, or raising a significant question [71]. Given the present need for equity and racial harmony in the United States, I believe research that provides insight into these topics could be considered timely and important. Additionally, few studies have focused on the reflections from adults regarding their transitions and time spent as gifted Black students within gifted programs. Ford and Whiting stress the importance of examining the quality of life for gifted students and ensuring their sense of belonging [81]. Sewell and Goings present a contribution to the body of research on gifted education with perspectives on the life trajectories of gifted Black students that may provide guidance for gifted programs or spark conversations around the topic of improving social and emotional conditions for gifted Black students [10]. In this way, Sewell and Goings presented a significant topic for study. Following is a closer examination of the methodology behind this work.

The qualitative methodology of Sewell and Goings is framed in the principles and characteristics of qualitative research as seen in their approaches to data collection and analysis [10]. The researchers identified their method, explained the study design, and applied the design consistently with a qualitative approach. Methods should be identified, appropriate for the aim and

conceptualization of the study, and executed in a manner consistent with and effective for the criteria applying to those methods [71]. Creswell also cites the importance of conducting qualitative research that is framed within the principles and characteristics of qualitative research [73]. The researchers ensured the reader of qualitative methodology by providing their positionality, detailed and thick descriptions, context of the study, framing the analysis in a theoretical framework, and giving voice to an underrepresented group of individuals by utilizing qualitative data collection and qualitative analysis processes. Quality in the qualitative research is also demonstrated by the transparent rationale Sewell and Goings offered for selecting the participants [10].

Sewell and Goings detailed their rationale for selecting the adult participants and conducting reflective interviews as a focus of the study while prior studies have explored the perceptions of children currently living the gifted educational experiences [10]. Tracy explains the importance of self-reflexivity where authors are honest about the research process and their decisions [75]. Further, Sewell and Goings supported their choice of sampling from an adult population with Schlossberg's model for adapting to transitions which includes consideration for whether individuals lose or gain from transitions [10] [80]. The adults were able to provide perspectives on long-term outcomes having lived these experiences of transition years ago.

Not only were the adults a suitable group for the purposes of this study's aims, but the report of participant characteristics also included participants' first names, gender, age, racial predominance for each school level attended, high school type (e.g., specialized public, gifted and talented, private day school), and current occupations [10]. The researchers also provide specific details explaining how the sample was gathered and vetted to meet their criteria for inclusion. Lincoln and Guba state the importance of providing sufficient details such as these to allow for transferability [66]. By specifying the rationale for this sample, and how the perspectives could be applied to a gap in the literature surrounding transitions within K-12 gifted programs for Black students, Sewell and Goings provided sufficient conceptualization for the scope and limits to their inquiry [71]. The researchers also took steps to establish the adequacy of their portrayals.

It is well-established in extant literature that gifted Black students encounter roadblocks to success and continued aspirations for achievement

[57]. A dominant view has been that stereotype threat results in lowered achievement for these students. Sewell and Goings made use of scholarly literature to establish the credibility of their argument that participants may share life stories about managing these stereotypes (stereotype management) and experiencing academic success [10]. By using empirical data, appropriate examples, and relating to scholarly literature, the researchers effectively substantiated their argument [71].

While aspects of Sewell and Goings' findings are counter to some literature suggesting gifted Black students are less likely to receive gifted services [10], the researchers maintained quality with their approach by addressing anticipated questions. Did Sewell and Goings' participants experience identification due to their environments being predominantly Black or racially diverse? Or were their teachers also Black or racially diverse? Sewell and Goings openly posit that findings could be swayed because of these unknowns [10]. Additionally, they confessed no data were collected regarding the demographics of participants' teachers. Again, I evaluated the research as transparent given Sewell and Goings' honest and vulnerable admissions of possible conclusions. Although, it would be interesting to explore if relationships existed between race of teacher and referral to gifted programming for these participants. Still, Sewell and Goings provided clarity with the research they chose to explore [10].

AERA stresses the value of quality communication in research to promote clarity [71]. Similarly, Lincoln and Guba provide that documenting processes for data collection and analysis specifically and clearly yields more dependable research [66]. Sewell and Goings' descriptions for data collection included details regarding the manner, duration, aim, and instrument used for the semi-structured phone interviews [10]. By providing the protocol in the appendix, the researchers ensured other researchers could replicate similar interviews using their instrument. Additionally, Sewell and Goings explicitly described the iterative process of coding and finalizing themes from their data [10]. Creswell stresses the value of researchers analyzing data multiple times to reflect deeper levels of thinking [73]. These details ensured clarity and dependability in their study. There were few steps in their processes lacking clarity. One issue I noticed was when the researchers explained participants were engaged in member checking with the transcribed data [10]. The researchers did not provide details on how or when the participants received the transcripts

or provided feedback. Aside from this single lapse in clarity, the report presents with effective communication. While describing these processes, Sewell and Goings also reported their use of cross-checking and peer debriefing. Following, I will explain how these practices, along with member checking, improve the quality of the research.

Sewell and Goings provided the transcribed phone interviews to participants for member checking so participants could check the accuracy and add context as needed [10]. Lincoln and Guba explain member checking can be an approach to verify data analysis with participants and improve the confirmability of research [66]. Other practices Sewell and Goings employed like cross-checking their individual understandings of the codes with one another and peer debriefing, by consulting a gifted education expert to evaluate their findings, further add to the confirmability of their study and ensure its rich rigor [10].

Overall, the research presented by Sewell and Goings upholds criteria for goodness in qualitative research across multiple checklists and sets of standards in the professional community [10]. The findings consist of four themes describing how gifted Black students recalled their identification for gifted programming, experiences during transitions between gifted programs and implications for the field of gifted education. Some of the experiences shared in Sewell and Goings are counter to deficit perspectives and stereotype threat. Instead, participants offered unique insights about the powerful influence of positive experiences early in elementary school gifted programs that assisted them in developing voices and positive self-perceptions as scholars who grew in asset-based learning environments [10]. An important finding came from the discussion of transitioning from elementary school to middle school or from middle to high school when some participants shared experiences of struggling with shifts in their identity ranking and seeing themselves as Black but gifted [10]. The participants explained they utilized supportive peer relationships to overcome these difficult transitions and manage the stereotype. Other important implications for education included the necessity of providing culturally relevant and responsive classrooms that affirm racial identity and the student's intersection with one's academic environment, targeted efforts to ease transitions between school levels, communication and partnerships with families and organizations to ensure Black students are supported and represented in gifted programs, and flexible expanded

opportunities to provide programming opportunities and encourage retainment in programs [10].

Qualitative Study 5

Utilizing a Grounded Theory case-study research method to examine, how high-achieving, high school, Black students' perceived experiences with racism in school environments and how they manage those experiences through use of resilient strategies, Andrews, provided insights into racial spotlighting and ignoring. Findings revealed high school students enacted resiliency strategies within the school environment when encountered by microaggressions or racism behaviors [13]. Andrews offers suggestions for improving the educational environments of Black high-achieving students by promoting cultures of achievement, preparing teachers with the framework of Critical Race Theory (CRT), educating in-service teachers through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) structured with CRT, and making classrooms identity-affirming constructivist environments [13].

Sample

To secure the target sample of African American high-achieving students from within a majority White high school environment, Andrews utilized purposive sampling methods. Andrews requested volunteers by recruiting from students who met the study criteria of high achiever [13]. Andrews determined high achievers to be those enrolled in college prep or honors/advanced placement (AP) courses, involved in at least one extra-curricular activity, and meeting one of the following additional criteria: GPA 2.8 or higher, consistent honor roll status, and/or teacher recommendation [13]. High achievers who responded to Andrews' request for volunteers were interviewed to determine if they met the final inclusion criteria which were: identifies as Black/African American, is a high achiever, is a METCO or non-METCO student, does or does not perceive shifts in his/her behavior within the school context [13]. METCO students are students who are bussed to the suburban school location from other neighborhoods, usual urban, as part of a district initiative to provide opportunities to desegregate urban/suburban students and schools (Andrews, 2012, p.41). The resulting sample included nine high school students (N=9), who were within the age range of 15 to 18 years old between 2003-2004, identifying as African American and meeting criteria as high achievers according to the study definition. Four of the students identified as female (n=4 females, n=5 males) (Andrews, 2012, p.10). The school research location is located in a

suburban upper-class, mostly white populated area in eastern Massachusetts, United States [13].

Methodology

Andrews utilized a researcher-developed semi-structured interview protocol for use during the interview and focus group portions of data collection in this grounded theory case study [13]. Data collection methods included three semi-structured interviews with each participant, two days of shadowing each participant in the school, and a one-hour focus group involving five of the participants who were available at that time [13]. Additional qualitative data included field notes, and audio recordings of the interviews and the focus group [13]. Data were analyzed with a grounded theory approach using open and focused coding followed with thematic and narrative analysis [13]. Andrews reported using cross-case matrices to compare narrative summaries and participant profiles when determining the themes and resilient behaviors [13].

Critique

When considering the critique of Andrews' study, the basic methodology of sample selection and case study design can be evaluated under the standards for social science research [70]. To better support my critique of Andrews' analysis regarding the conceptual emphasis argued in the report around the topics of racial microaggressions and participants' use of resilient strategies, I believe the humanities-oriented research standards are most fitting [71]. Therefore, my critique will include references to multiple criteria for publication standards as I convey strengths and weaknesses of various aspects of the report.

To begin, it is important to consider the way participants were selected for involvement in the study and how this fits with the study design and claims. Creswell suggests selecting cases that show different perspectives "purposeful maximal sampling" to provide varying perspectives on the problem or event [61], (p.75). By selecting students who were both METCO and non-METCO students and also including students who perceived a shift in their behavior within the school context and those who did not during the initial inclusion screening, Andrews displayed efforts to provide purposeful maximal sampling and give voice to varying perspectives within this targeted purposive sample [13]. Specific details regarding students' demographics and definitions for inclusion criteria

in the study were provided. These elements of careful description and transparency can improve the transferability of research findings [66]. Although qualitative case study research is not always intended to be generalizable to larger populations, Andrews' discussion of implications implies the findings should be generalized to "other Black students in predominantly White school contexts," and "other students of color," [13], (p.39). In this way, Andrews clearly specifies the group to which the findings may be generalizable in a broader context, however, to more effectively prescribe this generalization, AERA suggests authors connect case study findings to published research on similar phenomena to establish the plausibility of such inferences [70]. Herein, there is room for improvement in the transferability of the study. Additionally, case study design is often selected because of its ability to provide rich description or comparisons among cases. Clear descriptions and careful documentation of processes were not consistently observed throughout Andrews' (2012) report as I elaborate in the following section.

Andrews provided specific details regarding the small, private room within the school that was used for interviews, yet Andrews neglected to indicate the timing during the school year when the interviews occurred, the duration of interviews, and a sample of semi-structured interview protocol probes [13]. Although the study is described as occurring between 2003-2004 involving three interviews for each participant, a focus group, and two days of shadowing, it is unclear when any of these events occurred during that time period. Therefore, determinations regarding any influences or non-influences of variables such as individual maturation across time on the perceptions of the participants are difficult to conclude. Given the details of data collection processes are missing key information, the dependability of the study's findings is weakened [66]. Further, the internal coherence of Andrews' findings may be questioned given that readers are unable to confirm/disconfirm events or re-experience educational events around the data collection time periods [13] [71]. Still, it is important to consider how the data were analyzed.

Grounded theory guided the analysis of data for Andrews [13]. Cresswell describes several embedded structures for approaching the presentation of grounded theory research [61]. Andrews coherently offered an approach consistent with these expectations when analyzing how students perceived their experiences with

microaggressions in school and the purposes of the research fit the grounded theory's capabilities [13]. Through this inductive grounded theory analysis, Andrews presented a model "Resistance behavioral strategies for experiencing racial microaggressions," showing how students' perceived microaggressions and their proceeding resilient strategies [13], (p.15). Grounded theory involves stepwise inductive processes aimed at reaching conceptual understandings [82]. Andrews' implementation of grounded theory brought forth a conceptualization of the students' experiences and a theory for how they responded to these perceptions [13]. In addition, Andrews connected the theory with empirical research on the topic as suggested in grounded theory reporting [82]. However, several concerns remain regarding other processes of data analysis and the integrity of Andrews' work.

The American Educational Research Association (AERA) standards for reporting on empirical social science research suggest quality research involving coding processes should provide verification by the participants and transparency regarding the level of agreement from participants with the researchers' classifications/codes/themes identified [70]. Andrews reported focused coding and thematic and narrative analysis however the data analysis description lacks information regarding the extent to which the participants agreed with the classifications or identified themes (i.e., member checking) said to have emerged from the data [13]. Reports lacking verification of participants' views through processes such as member checks could call into question the confirmability of findings [66]. Further, AERA [71] standards suggest reports involving humanities-oriented research, such as Andrews, include explanations, whether in the text or in footnotes, about the presentation of and analysis of data to ensure participants' voices and versions of events are "respected and honored," [13], (p.486).

Aside from the concerns with Andrews' report, the findings offer relevant information and serve to further advance conversations about gifted African American students who may experience racial spotlighting in school settings [13]. Findings revealed the students employed resilience by using their resistance strategies (i.e., being silent, making verbal challenges to assumptions, using problem-solving approaches) when they were confronted by microaggressions in school settings [13]. These findings contribute to the body of literature for gifted education and can be used to inform and instruct preservice and in-service teachers in ways that may improve the educational

experiences of gifted Black students. Specifically, Andrews suggests teachers nurture cultures of achievement and undergo training in CRT. Other actionable suggestions are provided for in-service teachers and schools. Andrews clearly identified the study's aims and substantiated findings by citing scholarly literature and providing numerous examples of raw data, and thereby giving voice to gifted Black individuals within a predominantly White school context [13]. While the external coherence of the study could have been improved by providing discussion of competing cultural/political perspectives [71], and the confirmability of the study lacked inclusion of participant verification, the overall portrayal meets many criteria for quality in this type of research and offers valuable insights for gifted education.

Acknowledgement:

Being a white, female author who has not lived the experiences of a person identified as gifted and Black, the author of the present study acknowledges her own potential biases and limitations when interpreting these data and providing recommendations.

References:

- [1] Peters S. J., Gentry M., Whiting G. W., McBee M. T. (2019). *Who gets served in gifted education? Demographic representation and a call for action*. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 63(5), 273–287.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986219833738>
- [2] Peters, S. J., Makel, M. C., Carter III, J. (2023, Oct. 30). *Gifted education advances school integration and equity*. *Kappan Connecting Education Research, Policy, and Practice*.
<https://kappanonline.org/gifted-education-integration-equity-peters-makel-carter/>
- [3] Davis, J. L., Robinson, S. A. (2018). *Being 3e, A new look at culturally diverse gifted learners with exceptional conditions: An examination of the issues and solutions for educators and families*. in Scott Barry Kaufman (ed.), *Twice Exceptional: Supporting and Educating Bright and Creative Students with Learning Difficulties* (New York, 2018; online edn, Oxford Academic, 18 Jan. 2018), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190645472.003.0017>, accessed 15 June 2024.
- [4] Anderson, B. N. (2020). "See me, see us": *Understanding the intersection and continued marginalization of adolescent gifted Black girls in U. S. classrooms*. *Gifted Child Today*, 43(2), 86-100.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217519898216>
- [5] Peters, S. J., & Brulles, D. (2021). *Designing gifted education programs and services: From purpose to implementation*. Routledge.
- [6] Novak, A. M. (2022). *Peter Parker principle: From white privilege to gifted critical discourse*. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 66(2), 128–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00169862211037704>
- [7] Redding, C. & Grissom, J. A. (2021). *Do students in gifted programs perform better? Linking gifted program participation to achievement and nonachievement outcomes*. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 43(3), 520-544.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211008919>
- [8] Gentry M., Gray A., Whiting G. W., Maeda Y., Pereira N. (2019). *Access denied/system failure. Gifted education in the United States: Laws, access, equity, and missingness across the country by Locale, title I school Status, and race*. Purdue University. Jack Kent Cooke Foundation: Lansdowne, VA.
- [9] Ford, D. Y., & King, R. A. (2014). *Blacked out: Racial and gender segregation in gifted education 60 years after "Brown vs. Board of Education."* *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 14(2), 3–11.
<https://doi.org/10.56829/2158-396X.14.2.3>
- [10] Sewell, C. J. P., & Goings, R. B. (2019). *Navigating the gifted bubble: Black adults reflecting on their transition experiences in NYC gifted programs*. *Roeper Review*, 41(1), 20–34.
<https://doi-org.proxy.bsu.edu/10.1080/02783193.2018.1553218>
- [11] Ames, H., Booth A., Noyes J. (2024). *Chapter 6: Selecting studies and sampling (Draft version)*. For inclusion in: Noyes J., Harden A., editor(s), *CochraneCampbell Handbook for Qualitative Evidence Synthesis, Version 1*. Cochrane.

- [12] Ames H., Genton, C., Lewin, S. (2019). Purposive sampling in a qualitative evidence synthesis: a worked example from a synthesis on parental perceptions of vaccination communication. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 19(1), 26.
- [13] Andrews, D. J. (2012). Black achievers' experiences with racial spotlighting and ignoring in a predominantly white high school. *Teachers College Record*, 114, 1-46.
- [14] Reis, S. M., Colbert, R. D., Hebert, T. P. (2005). Understanding resilience in diverse, talented students in an urban high school. *Roeper Review*, 27(2), 110-120. https://gifted.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/961/2015/02/Understanding_Resilience.pdf
- [15] Tomlinson, C. A. & Jarvis, J. M. (2014). Case studies of success: Supporting academic success for students with high potential from ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(3), 191-219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214540826>
- [16] Dixon-Woods, M. (2011). Using framework-based synthesis for conducting reviews of qualitative studies. *BMC Medicine*, 9, 39.
- [17] Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- [18] Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (1994). *Critical race theory: An annotated bibliography 1993, A year of transition bibliography*, 66 U. Colo. L. Rev. 159. : https://scholarship.law.ua.edu/fac_articles/545
- [19] Wardman, J., & Hattie, J. (2019). What works better than the rest? The impact of various curricula provisions for gifted learners. In B. Wallace, D. A. Sisk, & J. Senior, *The SAGE handbook of gifted and talented education* (pp. 321-334). Sage Reference. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526463074.n27>
- [20] Ford, D. Y., Grantham, T. C., & Whiting, G. W. (2008). Another look at the achievement gap: Learning from the experiences of gifted Black students. *Urban Education*, 43, 216-239.
- [21] Ford, D. Y., Dickson, K. T., Davis, J. L., Scott, M. T., & Grantham, T. C. (2018). A culturally responsive equity-based bill of rights for gifted students of color. *Gifted Child Today*, 41(3), 125-129.
- [22] Milner, H. R. IV. (2012). Beyond a test score: Explaining opportunity gaps in educational practice. *Journal of Black Studies*, 43(6), 693-718. <https://doi:10.1177/0021934712442539>
- [23] Briggs, C. J., Reis, S. M., & Sullivan, E. E. (2008). A national view of promising programs and practices for culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse gifted and talented students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(2), 131-145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986208316037>
- [24] Ford, D. Y. (2010). *Reversing underachievement among gifted Black students* (2nd ed.). Prufrock Press.
- [25] Ford, D. Y. (2011). *Multicultural gifted education* (2nd ed.). Prufrock Press.
- [26] Parker, M., & Flowers, L.A. (2003). The effects of racial identity on academic achievement and perceptions of campus connectedness on African American students at predominantly white institutions. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 22, 180.
- [27] Cross, W. E., Jr., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory and measurement: Introducing the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 371-393). Sage Publications, Inc.
- [28] Moore III, J. L., Ford, D. Y., & Milner, H. R. (2005). Recruitment is not enough: Retaining African American students in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(1), 51-67.
- [29] Ford, D. Y., Collins, K. H., Grantham, T. C., & Moore, J. L. (2021). Equity-based gifted and talented education to increase the recruitment and retention of Black and other underrepresented students. *Conceptions of Giftedness and Talent*, 141-161.

- [30] Eccles, J. S., Wong, C. A., & Peck, S. C. (2006). *Ethnicity as a social context for the development of African-American adolescents. Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 407-426.
- [31] Swanson, D. P., Spencer M., Dell'Angelo, T., & Harpalani, V. (2002). *Identity processes and the positive youth development of African Americans: An explanatory framework. New Directions for Youth Development 93*(95), 73-99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.17>
- [32] Hattie, J.A.C. (2003, October). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Paper presented at the Building Teacher Quality: What does the research tell us ACER Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia.* Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2003/4/
- [33] Milner, H. R. (2011). *Culturally relevant pedagogy in a diverse urban classroom. Urban Review, 43*(1), 66–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-009-0143-0>
- [34] Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). *Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education, 2*, 931-975.
- [35] Sue D. W., Lin A. I., Torino G. C., Capodilupo C. M., Rivera D.P. (2009). *Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*, 183–190
- [36] Lopez, S. J. & Louis, M. C. (2009). *The principles of strengths-based education. Journal of College and Character, 10*(4). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1041>
- [37] Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [38] Loewenberg Ball, D., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). *The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348479>
- [39] Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2018). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success* (research brief). Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- [40] Kitano, M. K., & Lewis, R. B. (2005). *Resilience and coping: Implications for gifted children and youth at risk. Roeper Review, 27*(4), 200–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190509554319>
- [41] Kim, M. (2015). *Enhancing resilience of gifted students. TEMPO: Journal of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented, 36*(3), 17-21.
- [42] Briggs, C. J., Reis, S. M., Sullivan, E. E. (2008). *A national view of promising programs and practices for culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse gifted and talented students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 52*(2), 131-145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0016986208316037>
- [43] Allen, J. (2007). *Creating welcoming schools: A practical guide to home- school partnerships with diverse families.* Teachers College Press.
- [44] Davis, J. L. (2010). *Bright, talented and Black: A guide for families of African American gifted learners.* Great Potential Press.
- [45] Ford, D., Moore, J., & Scott, M. (2011). *Key theories and frameworks for improving the recruitment and retention of African American students in gifted education. The Journal of Negro Education, 80*(3), 239-253. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41341131>
- [46] Goudelock, J. D. L. (2019). *High-ability African American children: Navigating the two-edged sword of giftedness. Parenting for High Potential, 8*(2), 2-5, 20-22.
- [47] Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Thomson, D. L. (2010). *Gifted programming for poor or minority urban students: Issues and lessons learned. Gifted Child Today, 33*(4), 58-64. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ898573.pdf>
- [48] Scott, M. T. (2012). *Socio-emotional and psychological issues and needs of gifted African-American students: Culture matters. Interdisciplinary Journal of Teaching and Learning, 2*(1), 23-33.

- [49] Ogbu, J. U. (2004). *Collective identity and the burden of “acting White” in Black history, community, and education*. *The Urban Review*, 36, 1–35.
- [50] Nguyen, M., Callahan, C. M., & Stevenson, D. L. (2010). *The AP challenge program: Advancing gifted minority student achievement in high school and beyond*. *Gifted Children*, 4(1), 12–17. <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/giftedchildren/vol4/iss1/3>
- [51] Davis, J. L. (2020). *Reframing professional learning of teachers working with culturally diverse students*. In A. Novak & C. Weber (Eds.) *Professional Learning Strategies for Special Topics in Gifted Education*. A co-publication of the National Association for Gifted Children and Prufrock Press.
- [52] Banks, J. A. (2009). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies (8th ed.)*. Allyn and Bacon.
- [53] Banks, J. A. (2020). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (9th ed.)*. John Wiley.
- [54] Cotabish, A. (May, 2020). *Socially scientific: Inspiring the next African American scientist. Teaching for High Potential: Quality Classroom Practice for High-Ability Students*, 13.
- [55] Keifer, B., & Tyson, C. A. (2018). *Charlotte Huck's children's literature: A brief guide*. McGraw-Hill.
- [56] Novak, A. M. (2020). *Gifted rural learners: Exploring power, place, and privilege with a focus on promising practices*. *Rural Education Institute: Theory & Practice in Rural Education*, 10(2) <https://doi.org/10.3776/tpre.2020.v10n2p1-10>
- [57] Ford, D. Y. (2013). *Recruiting and retaining culturally different students in gifted education*. Prufrock Press.
- [58] Goings, R. B., & Ford, D. Y. (2017). *Investigating the intersection of poverty and race in gifted education journals: A 15-year Analysis*. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 62(1), 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.11770016986217737618>
- [59] Grissom, J. A., & Redding, C. (2016). *Discretion and disproportionality: Explaining the underrepresentation of high-achieving students of color in gifted programs*. *AERA Open*, 2(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858415622175>
- [60] Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.
- [61] Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.)*. Sage.
- [62] Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.)*. Sage.
- [63] The center for culturally proficient educational practice (CCPEP) (2020). *The conceptual framework for culturally proficient practices*. <https://ccpep.org/home/what-is-cultural-proficiency/the-framework/>
- [64] Webb-Johnson, G., & Carter, N. (2005). *Cultural awareness and beliefs inventory*. Unpublished manuscript.
- [65] Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research*. Jossey Bass.
- [66] Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- [67] Messick, S. (1995). *Standards of validity and the validity of standards in performance assessment*. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 14(4), 5–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3992.1995.tb00881.x>
- [68] Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.)*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [69] Winter, Glyn. (2000). *A comparative discussion of the notion of 'validity' in qualitative and quantitative research*. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2000.2078>.
- [70] American Educational Research Association (2006). *Standards for reporting on empirical*

social science in AERA publications. Educational Researcher, 35(6), 33-40.

[71] American Educational Research Association (2009). *Standards for reporting on humanities-oriented research in AERA publications. Educational Researcher*, 38(6), 481-486.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09341833>

[72] Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (2007) *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. (5th ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon.

[73] Creswell, J.W. (2013) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (4th ed.)*. Sage Publications, Inc.

[74] Hesse-Biber, S. (2010). *Qualitative approaches to mixed methods practice. Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 455-468.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364611>

[75] Tracy, S. J. (2010). *Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>

[76] Swaminathan, R., & Mulvihill, T. M. (2018). *Teaching qualitative research: Strategies for engaging emerging scholars*. Guilford Publications.

[77] Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Routledge.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315433370>

[78] Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

[79] Diamond, J. B., Lewis, A. E., & Gordon, L. (2007). *Race and school achievement in a desegregated suburb: Reconsidering the oppositional culture explanation. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(6), 655-679.

[80] Schlossberg, N. K., & And, O. (1981). *Adult transitions. Counseling Psychologist*, 9(2), 2-51

[81] Ford D., Whiting G. (2010). *Beyond testing: Social and psychological considerations in recruiting and retaining gifted Black students. Journal of the Education of the Gifted*, 34(1),

131–155.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/016235321003400106>

[82] Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Contribution of Individual Authors to the Creation of a Scientific Article (Ghostwriting Policy)

The authors equally contributed in the present research, at all stages from the formulation of the problem to the final findings and solution.

Sources of Funding for Research Presented in a Scientific Article or Scientific Article Itself

No funding was received for conducting this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (Attribution 4.0 International, CC BY 4.0)

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en_US