A Critique of the Literature on Parenting Gifted Learners

Journal for the Education of the Gifted
35(3) 259–290

DOI: 10.1177/0162353212451703
http://jeg.sagepub.com
SAGE

Jennifer L. Jolly[1] and Michael S. Matthews[2]

Abstract

Despite numerous calls for research on parents of gifted learners, researchers have given only cursory treatment to the topic. In this article, the authors review and synthesize 53 sources, published since 1983, on parents of gifted learners. Existing research on parents of gifted learners may be categorized into three thematic areas that include (a) parent influence, (b) parent perceptions of giftedness and ability, and (c) parent satisfaction with gifted programming. Theory-driven research is conspicuously absent from this body of work, and study designs emphasize self-report measures and lack control groups. The analysis of this literature reveals gaps in the research record and offers recommendations about where future research should be focused. These areas include attitudes, values, and expectations of families of underserved gifted children; relationships between parents and schools; parents' understanding of giftedness; parents of gifted underachievers; and how parents support and influence their children at home.

Keywords

gifted, parenting, review

Introduction

Research points to a direct link between parents' involvement in their child's education and subsequent achievement, attitude, and behavior toward school (Bloom, 1985; Campbell & Verna, 2007; Cotton & Wikelund, 2001; Freeman, 2000; Hill et al., 2004). Parents and families have also been described as "the most critical component in the translation of talent, ability and promise into achievement for gifted individuals"

[1]Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, USA
[2]University of North Carolina at Charlotte, USA

Corresponding Author:
Jennifer L. Jolly, Louisiana State University, 223 Peabody Hall, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
Email: jjolly@lsu.edu

(Olszewski, Kulieke, & Buescher, 1987, p. 6). This connection begins with parental influence on their child's development and extends into the child's subsequent achievement by the daily interactions, encouragement, and motivation from parents that shape their environment (Robinson, 2000). The uneven nature of gifted education from state to state (Brown, Avery, VanTassel-Baska, Worley, & Stambaugh, 2006) and even from district to district (Clarenbach, 2007) compels the parents of many gifted children to become highly involved in schools (Hackney, 1981; Ma, 1999). This process can be especially frustrating for parents after their child has been identified and begun gifted services, if no appreciable differences appear in their child's perceptions of the school experience (Rotigel, 2003).

Parents face unique challenges in raising gifted children. In addition to their role in the school setting, parents also play an integral role in the home setting with regard to problem prevention and solution finding in relation to their children's education (Webb, Gore, Amend, & DeVries, 2007). The complex variables at work in parenting children, in combination with the distinctive characteristics and needs of gifted children such as markedly asynchronous development, heightened sensitivity in emotional and other areas, and tendencies toward nonconformity (Neihart, Reis, Robinson, & Moon, 2002) make parenting of gifted children much more complicated and multifaceted.

Historical Development

Interest in parents of the gifted can be traced back to the earliest studies on gifted children (Galton, 1869). Half a century later, Lewis Terman's (1926) seminal longitudinal research collected some of the first data on the parents of gifted children in an attempt to build an extensive database about this specific population. Today, nearly a century and half after the first efforts to study parents of the gifted, it appears that surprisingly little progress has been made in this area despite well over a century of formal study.

Soon after these seminal studies, Goertzel and Goertzel's (1962) study of 400 eminent persons illustrated the influence of parents and home environment on a person's development of his or her special abilities. Bloom's immensely influential work on talent development emphasized that parents are crucial to the development of a child's talent and abilities (Bloom, 1985). More recent studies of talented teenagers have confirmed the central influence of parents on talent development (Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1996). These studies provide a *lens* on talent development, a term that denotes a broad focus that may include the visual and performing arts, athletic performance, and other areas of expertise, in addition to the primary focus on academic aptitude and performance.

More than 25 years ago, a national survey of teachers, administrators, and parents provided a snapshot of the needs of gifted students as perceived by their parents, teachers, and school administrators (Gallagher, Weiss, Oglesby, & Thomas, 1983). Colangelo and Dettmann (1983) at around the same time conducted a review of 20

years of literature on parents and families of gifted children. Seven distinct themes emerged in their review; these included (a) family characteristics, (b) parental attitude and values, (c) family problems with gifted children, (d) achievement and underachievement, (e) role of parents in identification, (f) parental encouragement and enrichment activities, and (g) parents and schools. Colangelo and Dettmann encouraged future scholars to develop an expanded research agenda focusing on the interaction between gifted children and their parents, the role of the parent, and the motivation behind parents' interventions.

In the gifted education literature, a review by Keirouz (1990) identified six concerns of parents of gifted children that appeared in the research literature, and she suggested that these areas should be used as the basis for future research. These concerns included family roles and adaptations, sibling relationships, parental self-concept, neighborhood and community issues, educational issues, and the development of the child—issues similar to those identified in 1983 by Colangelo and Dettmann.

A more recent review published as a handbook chapter on the topic of families of gifted children (Reichenberg & Landau, 2009) emphasized families' influence on the child's cognitive development, especially in the early childhood years. Specific themes these authors identified included families' roles in providing enriched language and learning experiences and the potential roles of affective differences in areas such as family environment, sibling issues, emotional development, and growing up. Other recent research that captures parents' understanding and perceptions of giftedness can be characterized as including concerns within specific cultures, parents' perceptions of giftedness and ability, their attitudes toward gifted programming, and views on nontraditional services (see, for example, Campbell & Mandel, 1990; Jarosewich & Stocking, 2003; Shumow, 1997; Strom, Johnson, & Strom, 1990). This literature also hints at the perceived slights and actual inadequacies that parents may encounter when engaging with schools about the education of their children (see, for example, F. A. Karnes & Marquardt, 2000). Still, many of these studies were published prior to 2000, leaving out a newer generation of parents who may have experienced gifted programming themselves, as students, to a much greater degree than parents in earlier studies—an experience informing their perceptions of giftedness and interactions with their gifted children and the schools like no other previous parent population. Today, nearly 140 years after the first efforts to study parents of the gifted, it appears that surprisingly little progress has been made in this area despite well over a century of formal study.

The Present Study

In addition to the research conducted over the past 25 years, the past decade has also witnessed a dramatic shift in the focus of public schools toward struggling, low-achieving students and efforts to bring this population to proficiency. This emphasis has had the unintended effect of causing teachers and schools to ignore the needs of the gifted and other highly able learners (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2008). Although we now appear to be emerging slowly from its shadow, the era of No Child

Left Behind may be when gifted education has fallen into one of its most fallow periods of public and federal support (Golden, 2003). Ignoring the extensive research findings that consistently support homogeneous ability grouping, some administrators (e.g., Smith, 2007) have gone as far as arguing that special programs for high-ability learners are no longer necessary or desirable. How this zeitgeist has impacted parents' views of giftedness, programming, and advocacy has yet to be fully explored. In a first effort toward responding to this need, we have conducted a comprehensive review, synthesis, and critique of the research literature in an attempt to identify what we know about parents' current understanding of the state of gifted education, to examine whether the focus of this work has changed over time, and to consider how parents' perspectives can identify inadequacies in the existing literature, thereby informing future research directions, advocacy efforts, and policy formulations.

Method

Locating Articles

We searched the EBSCO, ERIC, and ProQuest online databases to identify articles and dissertations in psychology and education published from 1984 (following the last literature review on this topic, published by Colangelo and Dettman in 1983) to 2010, using the keywords or title words "gift*" and "parent*," where the * indicates a wildcard search term to return different endings (i.e., "gift*" would return gifted, gifts, giftedness, etc.). We also searched through back issues of the journals *Exceptional Children, Gifted Child Quarterly, Journal for the Education of the Gifted, Roeper Review*, and *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education* (continued since 2007 as the *Journal of Advanced Academics*), and we cross-referenced bibliographies from identified articles against our inclusion criteria.

Selection Criteria

We eliminated studies that did not include U.S. parents or children (e.g., Dwairy, 2004; Landau & Weissler, 1993; Li, 1995; Morawska & Sanders, 2009; Morrissey & Brown, 2009; Patchett & Gauthier, 1991; Penney & Wilgosh, 2000; Sankar-DeLeeuw, 2007) because the intent in this review was to focus on parents and parenting in the cultural context of the United States. We also excluded studies whose participants were college students or adults, even though a few of these sought to generalize their findings to K-12 gifted learners.

Studies that met inclusion criteria defined gifted students in a variety of ways, including membership in already existing gifted school programs, membership in talent development programs, and evidence of scores above the 95th percentile on standardized aptitude and achievement tests (e.g., Stanford-Binet, Iowa Test of Basic Skills). We excluded studies that considered parent involvement but defined "advanced learners" more broadly; for example, Ma's (1999) study defined "high ability" to

include students in "average" and "high" eighth grade mathematics courses, as well as those enrolled in any mathematics coursework at or above pre-algebra at the high school level. Studies in the broader area of "talent development" that focused on students showing high performance in nonacademic contexts were also excluded (e.g., Olszewski et al., 1987), as were studies or groups of studies of creativity and those focused on adult productivity (e.g., Freeman, 1994; Subotnik & Arnold, 1994).

We discarded articles that did not specifically address the parenting of high-ability or academically gifted children, were not primary research articles, or did not present empirical research. Articles that were strictly advice, opinion, or thought pieces were also discarded. These procedures yielded 53 sources (which is included in the appendix), including 43 articles from 12 journals plus 10 dissertations.

Data Analysis

Using a content analysis approach (Krippendorff, 2004), we categorized the remaining articles into three broad thematic areas that included (a) parental influence, (b) parent perceptions of giftedness and ability, and (c) parent satisfaction with gifted programming (see appendix). Each of these thematic areas contained subareas, which we discuss below. These factors emerged from the literature that we found important and feasible to study; they represent aspects of parenting, but not necessarily parenting as a global construct. The language we have used in the results section, particularly the demographic descriptors, reflects the language and terminology of the original research article. Finally, articles that overlapped more than one thematic area were placed into the theme that received greater emphasis from the article's author(s); due to the nature of our inclusion criteria, some degree of overlap is unavoidable. Discussion among the authors continued until we reached 100% interrater agreement on the placement of articles into the three thematic areas we identified within this body of research.

Results

Theme 1: Studies of Parent Influence

Parents' influence can have positive and negative impacts on a child's educational success. Studies on this topic focused on parental views on the achievement of their children, the nature of parental influence, and other familial variables that affect these parents' involvement. Specific subpopulations emphasized in the corpus of research on parental influence include very young children and economically disadvantaged children.

Achievement. Parental influence on achievement has been of great interest in mainstream and gifted education (Jeynes, 2010). Parental definitions of academic success varied according to gender and ethnicity. Of the 10 studies on this topic, 9 focused on

Asian American families. White and Asian American parents were the most likely to identify self-satisfaction in their definitions of academic success, whereas fathers of all ethnicities were more likely than mothers to emphasize external definitions of success such as high grades or entry to a successful college or career path (Ablard, 1996/1997). Fathers of high-achieving gifted males were also found to hold high standards for their sons and to share in their son's sense of accomplishment (Hébert, Pagnani, & Hammond, 2009).

In a related study, Ablard and Parker (1997) examined White and Asian parents' achievement goals for their gifted children. Parents of gifted children placed an emphasis on intellectual growth rather than academic performance, which supports previous research findings (e.g., Bloom, 1985). Ablard and Parker additionally examined children's perfectionism in relation to their parents' performance and learning goals. Again, White and Asian parents were the focus of this study. Parents who held a performance goal orientation had children who were more likely to display dysfunctional perfectionism, whereas parents who held a learning goal orientation reported either healthy perfectionistic behaviors or no perfectionistic behaviors at all for their children.

In addition to the Ablard (1996/1997) study, four other studies have also focused on Asian American parents of gifted children (Campbell & Mandel, 1990; Wu, 2007, 2008; Yang, 2007). These studies find that Asian American parents exert influence on achievement through high levels of monitoring, pressure, and support, but in contrast to parents of other ethnicities, these parents refrain from offering actual help (Campbell & Mandel, 1990). In a qualitative case study of three participants, Wu (2007, 2008) found that Asian American parents also believed that hard work on the part of the child and good parenting had a greater influence than innate ability on the performance of the child. Additional research by Yang (2007), who administered a survey to a random sample of 209 Chinese American parents, substantiated Campbell and Mandel's (1990) findings that Asian American and particularly Chinese American parents maintain high academic expectations for their children by exhibiting high levels of interest, support, and monitoring, regardless of whether their child was identified as gifted in school. These parents reinforced the belief that performance was not necessarily tied to innate ability, but resulted from effort (Wu, 2007, 2008).

Social competence and family distress have also been examined as parental factors influencing student achievement (Gullesserian, 2008). In a qualitative study of 29 families, Gullesserian found that despite occasional episodes of family distress, student achievement was not negatively impacted. Beyond successful academic achievement, participating African American or biracial families emphasized both intellect and morality in their definition of student success.

Studies of parental influence concentrated primarily on the role of ethnicity and gender, particularly for Asian American families. Parents' ethnicities and gender affect their child's achievement in differing ways. In addition, we note that the methods for studying parental influence have changed over time. Studies from the early 1990s sampled fairly large samples of parents using mixed methods, whereas more recent studies have concentrated on qualitative methodology and have had smaller sample sizes.

Family or home environment and its influence on achievement. Research on achievement has highlighted the importance of the family or home environment for general education learners as well as for gifted children. Parents' and gifted children's perceptions of family environment formed the focus of the studies we describe in this section.

Family or home environment studies centered on the *Family Environment Scale* (FES; Moos, 1979), self-esteem, and underachievement. The FES addresses interpersonal relationships, personal growth, and systems maintenance within the family from a stress and coping theory perspective (Moos, 1979). The FES consists of 90 true/false items yielding 10 nine-item subscale factors. Research conducted with the FES and families of gifted children has yielded mixed results, with different groups of parents placing importance on different factors. Families from the southern United States identified more heavily with Moral-Religious, Cohesion, Control, and Organization factors (Foxworth, 1986). Midwestern families studied by Cornell and Grossberg (1987) scored high on Intellectual-Cultural Achievement and Active Recreational Orientation. Differences also existed between mothers and fathers. F. A. Karnes and D'Ilio (1988, 1989) found that fathers and mothers had similar scores on Conflict, Achievement Orientation, Moral-Religious, Organization, and Control factors of the FES. However, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation was more highly valued by mothers and Active Recreational Orientation more strongly related to by fathers. Cornell and Grossberg (1987) and F. A. Karnes and D'Ilio (1988, 1989) suggested that rather than changing an activity for a child, parents should change how the activity is approached or the environment in which the activity is conducted, to be consistent with their child's preferences.

Baker, Bridger, and Evans (1998) also used the FES along with a measure of individual behavior to develop a logistic regression model to evaluate the ability to predict group membership as either an achiever or underachiever. Their combined (individual and family) model showed promise in accounting for factors that impacted underachievement, suggesting that interventions addressing the three areas of school, individual, and family variables were most helpful in reversing underachievement. Baker et al. concluded that through a coordinated effort between school and home, the family environment can intercede with underachieving behaviors.

After an initial cluster of five articles, studies using the FES appear to have ceased as a line of research, despite (or perhaps due to) lack of consensus from the studies that used it. Nine additional studies of the family and home environment's relationship to achievement examined specific groups of gifted learners, including underachievers, preschoolers, and racial/ethnic subpopulations (Campbell & Verna, 2007; Clausing-Lee, 1992; M. B. Karnes & Shwedel, 1987; M. B. Karnes, Shwedel, & Steinberg, 1984; McDowell, 1992; Rimm & Lowe, 1988; Snowden & Christian, 1999; Strom et al., 1990; Windecker-Nelson, Melson, & Moon, 1997).

Rimm and Lowe (1988) initially characterized underachievers' home environments as child-centered yet lacking consistency in parental expectations. Although parents of underachievers valued achievement and intrinsic and independent learning, they did not exhibit behaviors that supported these outcomes. These parents also expressed

unhappiness in their careers, and mothers were particularly resentful about having to stay at home, possibly contributing to an unhealthy home environment supporting their child's underachievement (Rimm & Lowe, 1988).

Parents of high-achieving children from African American, Latino, and Asian American backgrounds were examined in terms of the home environment's contributions to effective parenting (Campbell & Verna, 2007). These authors identified a set of components of effective parenting that together formed what they called the Academic Home Environment. These components included taking responsibility for school, fostering flexibility, buttressing a child's academic self-concept, motivating their child, positively supporting the child's goals and attitudes toward school, respecting authority, and encouraging and engaging cooperation between home and school (Campbell & Verna, 2007). Gifted preschoolers in a different study were found to have greater perceived competence when their mothers formed environments that included support networks and had fewer concerns about parenting a gifted child (Windecker-Nelson et al., 1997).

Parent support networks therefore appear to be important in effective parenting of younger children. Taken together, these studies all convey the importance of a home environment that encourages self-competence, models positive behavior, and seeks out supportive relationships with school and family. Several authors (Cornell & Grossberg, 1987; F. A. Karnes & D'Ilio, 1988, 1989) also suggest that how parents engage their children in activities (i.e., in incorporating these components) may be more relevant than the specific type of activity.

Young gifted children. Studies of young gifted children (Pre-K to third grade) and their parents reveal that parental behaviors can profoundly influence the child's academic and social development during these years. Parents of these young gifted children reported engaging their children in intellectual activities more often compared with parents of nonidentified children, supporting independence, encouraging responsibility in the home, and providing unconditional love and support (M. B. Karnes et al., 1984). Interviews with middle-class to upper-middle-class parents revealed that they were more often engaged in academically focused activities when compared with parents of nonidentified children (M. B. Karnes et al., 1984). M. B. Karnes and Shwedel (1987) also interviewed fathers of young gifted and nongifted children. Fathers of gifted children emphasized academically geared activities such as reading, oral language, and fine motor activities, as well as "unconditional positive regard" (M. B. Karnes & Shwedel, 1987, p. 81) for their child's curiosity and unique point of view.

Clausing-Lee (1992) focused exclusively on fathers of gifted and nongifted preschoolers (5- to 6-year-olds), who echoed the behaviors reported by fathers from the study by M. B. Karnes and Shwedel (1987). These fathers of gifted children provided greater opportunities for learning in the home, in comparison with fathers of nongifted children.

Mothers also repeated the sentiments of unconditional support in a study of dyads of gifted and nongifted preschoolers (McDowell, 1992). McDowell, however,

concluded that mothers' attitudes and practices strongly influenced young children's behaviors regardless of gifted identification.

Strom et al. (1990) and Snowden and Christian (1999) examined behaviors reported by parents of gifted children (4- to 8-year-olds) using the Parent as a Teacher Inventory, and their findings also supported qualitative data gathered in earlier studies (M. B. Karnes et al., 1984; M. B. Karnes & Shwedel, 1987; McDowell, 1992). The studies by Strom et al. and Snowdon and Christian included Anglo and Hispanic parents who encouraged their children to ask questions and use their imaginations, expressed relatively low levels of frustration, and reacted to their child's developmental behavior appropriately. Supportive parents also allowed their young gifted children to make decisions (commensurate with their age), valued play, and were not controlling. Both studies reported that these parents were accurate and effective in gauging their child's ability level and motivation, and observed among these parents high levels of engagement with their children in family activities.

Economically disadvantaged gifted learners. These individuals' families encourage their gifted children to build on their strengths; parents underscored the importance of schooling and academic achievement in interactions with their children. Parents and families of disadvantaged gifted children also draw on a broader network of resources (particularly social ones), in comparison with parents of average-ability children, to support and foster their child's potential. Struggling disadvantaged families, in contrast, appear to be characterized by more chaotic households and inconsistent expressions of the types of behaviors that support the gifted child in other, less stressed settings (Davis, 2007; Robinson, Lanzi, Weinberg, Ramey, & Ramey, 2002; Robinson, Weinberg, Redden, Ramey, & Ramey, 1998; VanTassel-Baska, 1989).

Families of disadvantaged learners emphasized the importance of gifted children capitalizing on their talents to achieve more than their parents and grandparents (VanTassel-Baska, 1989). Integral to a child's success was the ability to draw on a family's social capital (Bourdieu, 1977), which includes extended family members as well as close family friends (Davis, 2007; VanTassel-Baska, 1989).

Despite a low-income designation and often high residential mobility, families with high-ability children tend to report more stable home environments and slightly higher incomes when compared with their economic peers in the Head Start setting (Davis, 2007; Robinson et al., 1998; Robinson et al., 2002). These parents also indicated greater educational achievement for themselves, with parents of high-ability children reporting one-third the likelihood of lacking a high school diploma and three times the likelihood of an AA or other college degree than other parents in the sample (Robinson et al., 1998), although the potential causality of this relationship remains unclear. These families appeared to be effective in drawing on the resources in their environment and negotiating their use.

Due to the emphasis these parents placed on schooling and educational achievement for their children, the authors of these studies have suggested additional research should examine the link between the successes of disadvantaged gifted children and the additional supports their families are able to access.

Theme 2: Parent Perception of Giftedness and Ability

The perceptions parents hold about giftedness and ability have been widely studied, relative to other aspects of the literature. Much of the research literature to date that has examined parental perceptions in relation to giftedness has addressed issues of the role of parent perceptions in the gifted identification process, parents' views about the concept of giftedness, and their use of labels to describe students with gifts and talents.

Identification. Parents often possess additional information about their child's intellectual abilities that may not be recognized in the regular classroom setting. This input can be a powerful component in identifying highly able learners to receive gifted education services. The literature emphasizes the importance and need for parents to share this information, especially for identifying gifted learners who may be Black, Hispanic, or English language learners. Lee and Olszewski-Kubilius (2006) noted, "parent nomination can be very useful in the identification of gifted students because parents are most knowledgeable about the strengths and weaknesses of their children . . . [they can] provide different views of giftedness from teachers" (p. 164).

As Solow (2001) noted, "how parents raise their gifted children has a lot to do with how they perceive them" (p. 15). This belief that parental perceptions are a useful addition to the perceptions of classroom teachers appears to be held widely in the literature on identification of diverse gifted learners (McBee, 2006, 2010), a position that is reflected in gifted education's national standards (e.g., M. S. Matthews & Shaunessy, 2010). A longstanding perception of biases in teacher nominations (McBee, 2006) also supports the use of parents as sources of additional information about their children.

Referral or nomination to gifted programs is the first entry point to being considered eligible for gifted programming. Research indicates that parental referral rates for gifted programming are higher among White parents and among middle and high socioeconomic status (SES) groups (McBee, 2006, 2010; Scott, Perou, Urbano, Hogan, & Gold, 1992). Discrepancies by racial group may occur in part due to differential parental nominations, with Black and Hispanics generally experiencing lower parent referral rates in comparison with White, Asian, and Native American parents (McBee, 2006, 2010). Despite these differences in referral rates, it appears that Black, Hispanic, and White parents describe the gifted characteristics observed in their own children in a similar manner.

Parent nomination also appears to offer a viable alternative identification procedure for English language learners and other students not typically identified by traditional measures such as standardized aptitude and achievement tests (Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006). Parent nominations may also be affected by family organization, as Ford, Wright, Grantham, and Harris (1998) reported that Black students who came from two-parent households were somewhat more likely to have been identified as gifted than those from single-parent families. This is consistent with the lower parent ratings of achievement obtained from single-parent households in a 1989 study by Gelbrich and Hare (1989), though neither study disaggregated SES from household category.

The concept of giftedness. Knowledge of their own child's ability informs parents' perceptions and understanding of the gifted label. In a study with high-ability preschoolers, Louis and Lewis (1992) found that parents of children with higher IQs felt that specific skills such as memory and abstract thinking were good indicators of giftedness for high-ability children; creativity and imagination also differentiate children of lower and high-IQ groups in these parents' perceptions, and parents of higher IQ children also report holding a more child-centered orientation (Buckley, 1994).

In the literature on subject-specific giftedness, parents of mathematically precocious children identified similar behaviors such as general intellectual ability, memory, spatial reasoning, and relational knowledge (Pletan, Robinson, Berninger, & Abbott, 1995), whereas linguistically precocious children were accurately identified by measures, including the Early Language Inventory, Vocabulary Checklist, and the Bayley Scales of Infant Development (Dale, Bates, Reznick, & Morisset, 1989) that focused on factors such as receptive and expressive language, language facility, and total vocabulary. When parental perceptions changed focus from academic to social skills, parents reported their gifted children's behavior to be more assertive, whereas their teachers rated the child's behavior as cooperative, suggesting that gifted children are able to tailor their behavior to differing environments (Galloway & Porath, 1997).

The gifted label. Though some parents may be reluctant to nominate their children for the gifted identification process or subsequently label them as gifted, other parents may be overly likely to see gifted behaviors in their children. Despite some instances to the contrary, most parents appear to be reasonably accurate in their evaluation of their child's ability (McBee, 2006).

Although parents may think of their child as gifted, they often refrain from labeling their child as such. Cornell (1989) reported that children of parents who did use the term displayed a higher incidence of maladjusted behavior; however, no significant differences were reported across these two groups of children on measures of ability or achievement. Mothers who were "users" of the term *gifted* were more critical of their children's school performance and placed greater value on intelligence. "Avoider" mothers were more flexible and positive about their child's school performance (Wingert, 1997). Makel (2009) found parental attitudes toward the value of gifted placement for their children increased following the child's identification as gifted, whereas favorable attitudes toward the gifted decreased over time among parents whose children were not ultimately placed in the gifted setting. Long-term use of the gifted label (5 or more years) does not appear to have any long-term negative effects on the gifted child, his or her siblings, or parents (Colangelo & Brewer, 1987). Some parents reported that the labeling of their child as gifted provided an impetus for seeking out information about the concept of giftedness and its accompanying emotional and educational issues (Foster, 2000).

Parents' decision to use the term *gifted* was not based on semantics but on a belief that the word accurately described their child. Parents of children identified as gifted by schools should be provided supports and resources regarding academics, social and emotional development, and the differences gifted children may exhibit in comparison with other nonidentified children of similar chronological age.

Theme 3: Parent Satisfaction With Gifted Programming

A third theme in the literature on parents of gifted learners has examined parent perceptions of the education their child is receiving. Specifically, parents' satisfaction with gifted programming and their experiences with nontraditional programming form the basis for this theme. Parents' satisfaction appears to inform the choice to move their children from public schools into other types of educational programming.

Programming satisfaction. Although parents may be adept at identifying their children's giftedness, this does not guarantee that they will be able to secure what they believe to be adequate services. However, those parents whose children participated in gifted programs found their child's experiences to be mixed in quality and quantity. Parent familiarity with what happens in their child's gifted programming varied widely, yet the lack or elimination of programming caused great consternation for parents (Chapey, Trimarco, Crisci, & Capobianco, 1986/1987; Damiani, 1996; Huff, Houskamp, Watkins, Stanton, & Tevegia, 2005; F. N. Matthews & Burns, 1992; Purcell, 1993; Shichtman, 1999; Shumow, 1997).

Parents, especially parents of color (Huff et al., 2005), identified a lack of training in gifted education for administrators and teachers (F. N. Matthews & Burns, 1992). Parents also supported teachers' need for additional time to prepare special education paperwork (F. N. Matthews & Burns, 1992).

Many parents voiced overall satisfaction with their child's gifted programming but still were critical of schools in four main areas. First, some parents did not believe that schools could fulfill all of their child's academic needs (Shichtman, 1999). Second, despite their child being identified as gifted, parents felt that the gifted programming options available to their child were limited and/or lacked appropriate challenge (Huff et al., 2005). Third, parents expressed concerns about teasing by other children or about their child being required to complete regular classroom work missed while attending the pullout gifted programming (Purcell, 1993). Fourth, parents felt that schools often did a poor job of communicating the nature of their child's giftedness and its associated school programming (Damiani, 1996) and did little to help familiarize them with the system and its bureaucracy (Huff et al., 2005). Parent familiarity with schools' day-to-day practices may have mediating effects on parents' perceptions of the gifted program's effectiveness (Shichtman, 1999); parents who worked within the school system or who had close relationships with faculty and staff did report having developed more cooperative, advocacy-focused relationships with the schools their child attended (Huff et al., 2005). Interestingly, Chapey et al. (1986/1987) reported that parents of gifted and talented children were not very involved in school activities, whereas most other accounts have reported high involvement by parents of students with gifts and talents.

In many cases, gifted programming went beyond simply meeting the academic needs of their children; parents also appreciated gifted programs as a place where their children

were able to find peers of similar ability and interests (Shichtman, 1999). The elimination of gifted programming exacerbated the isolation felt by parents (Purcell, 1993).

Nontraditional programming. Four studies of nontraditional programming examined the views of parents whose gifted children participated in programs outside public education in specialized schools (Hishinuma, 2000), early entrance programs (Noble, Childers, & Vaughan, 2008), talent search programs (Jarosewich & Stocking, 2003), and homeschool settings (Hopper, 2003).

Private schools for gifted and twice exceptional children are relatively few in number. However, due to their unique mission, parents in this particular setting reported finding greater satisfaction in their child's schooling and becoming involved in their child's education in different ways than they had in prior school settings (Hishinuma, 2000).

Parents also sought out early entrance college programs to help meet the educational and social emotional needs that their children's regular schools had not been able to address. Parents reported satisfaction overall with early entrance programs, but some reported struggling to adjust to the expanded level of freedom their children found in the early entrance environment (Noble et al., 2008).

Parents' encouragement of their child's participation in talent search programs was primarily due to their desire to learn more about their child's abilities using above-grade-level testing (Jarosewich & Stocking, 2003). Perceptions among parents of students who attended talent search summer programs (Jarosewich & Stocking, 2003; Lee, Matthews, & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2008; M. S. Matthews & Farmer, 2008) may differ from parents whose children only participate in talent search testing (Gelbrich & Hare, 1989; M. S. Matthews, 2006; M. S. Matthews & McBee, 2007).

Homeschool families were aware of gaps or challenges in the homeschool experience but believed the benefits outweighed the higher levels of responsibility and time commitment that homeschooling required of the mothers (Hopper, 2003). As families of children with gifts and talents increasingly join the homeschool ranks, more research should be focused on these learners and on their parents' motivations for pulling their children out from other school settings that would have required fewer resources on the parents' part.

Parent satisfaction seems closely related to parents' decisions to pursue nontraditional educational options for their gifted children, whether these are used in addition to or even in place of the education offered in the traditional school setting. It seems clear that parents (and mothers, in particular) currently shoulder much of the responsibility for meeting the educational needs of their high-ability child or children within and outside of the regular school setting. Although this state of affairs seems to work out well in the long run for gifted learners from mainstream and high-SES populations, the widespread failure of public schools to offer effective enrichment and acceleration to all children who could benefit from these interventions contributes to the ongoing socioeconomic and cultural inequity in U.S. society.

Discussion and Conclusions

Critique of the Literature

The results from this review of the literature were somewhat surprising in that relatively few studies have been conducted about parents of the gifted. On average, approximately two new empirical studies per year have appeared on this topic over the past 25 years. Each of the 53 studies that met our search and inclusion criteria indicated that additional research needs to be conducted to better understand the parents of gifted children, thereby better to understand how to meet more effectively the needs of the children themselves. We suggest that although a few of the studies we reviewed did approach the issue in this manner, parental influence cannot fully be understood by examining single traits in isolation. Rather, the complex interrelations between variables must also be considered (cf. Campbell & Verna, 2007).

The literature over the last quarter century about parenting the gifted has centered on a handful of related themes. As Robinson et al. noted in 1998, "we find the essential ingredients of parental responsiveness, time, involvement, and high expectations reappearing" (p. 155). Additional research themes we have identified in this body of work include how parental influence is expressed in different cultures, what behaviors parents report engaging in with their gifted children, parental satisfaction with their child's educational experiences, and how parents perceive giftedness.

Our findings from the literature confirm that parents exert strong influences on the achievement of their children in all cultures, although there do appear to be some cultural differences in how these influences are expressed. Asian American parents, especially those from traditionally high-achieving backgrounds such as Chinese Americans and Korean Americans, influence their children's achievement through high levels of monitoring, pressure, and support; high effort rather than high ability is viewed as the key to their children's academic success. African American parents clearly exert a positive impact on their children's achievement, but we know less about the specific practices through which this influence occurs. More work clearly needs to be done to learn about parents of gifted and high-achieving learners from nonmajority backgrounds, particularly among the varied ethnicities that make up the rapidly growing Latino population in the United States and among parents from low-income households.

Parent behaviors toward their children appear to have been directly observed only rarely and then only with preschool-age learners. Parental behaviors toward school-age children appear to have been examined entirely through self-report mechanisms such as surveys.

Effective parents of children of all ages encourage their children to ask questions and use their imaginations through play; they react to their child in a developmentally appropriate manner, and they allow their young high-ability children to make decisions commensurate with their age. At younger ages, in their capacity as their child's first teacher, these parents gauge their child's ability level and motivation and are highly engaged with their children in family activities. These parents report

engaging their children in intellectual activities more often than parents of average-ability children do, and they also report supporting independence, encouraging the development of a sense of responsibility, and providing unconditional love and support for their child. Although we would not disagree with any of these suggestions, gaining support from further studies based on direct observation rather than self-reported data alone would strengthen our confidence in the validity of these recommended practices.

As far as can be determined from the existing literature, effective parenting practices for high-ability children appear to look much the same among families from low-income environments. These parents create a home environment that encourages self-competence, they model positive behaviors, and they seek to develop supportive relationships with schools. Effective parents and families of disadvantaged gifted children draw on broader networks of extended family members, community resources, and schools, in comparison with similar parents of average-ability children, to support and foster their child's potential. These effective parents also reinforce the importance of academic achievement in interactions with their children.

All of these recommendations remain limited by the lack of an underlying theory of parenting, and by the self-reported nature of the evidence that supports these assertions. It is apparent that not all parents are willing or able to navigate the terrain of school and community successfully, and the widespread failure of schools to offer program options such as academic acceleration to all children who could benefit from such programming contributes to ongoing socioeconomic and cultural inequity in U.S. society.

Studies of parents' perceptions of giftedness and of gifted identification emphasize the importance of parent nomination, especially for identifying gifted learners who are African American, Latino, or who are English language learners of any race or ethnicity. Parents possess information that may be overlooked in the classroom about their child's abilities. Although some parents may be reluctant to label their child as gifted, most parents appear to be reasonably accurate in evaluating their child's abilities.

In nearly all studies, parents viewed their child's participation in gifted programs as a valuable experience, regardless of the specific gifted program setting. The research in this area leaves open many questions about the range of parental satisfaction with school programming, including parents' relationships with teachers and administrators, how these relationships may affect parents' views of the effectiveness of programming, and the degree to which parents perceive various programming options as being sufficient to address the academic, social, and emotional needs of their children.

Parent familiarity with what happens in the gifted setting varied widely, suggesting that parents could benefit from greater communication about the gifted program. Although no strong shift in research questions or findings was evident at the implementation of No Child Left Behind, some relevant research may still be in the process of being published on this topic.

Limitations of the Literature

Limitations of the existing literature are substantial. These include sampling design and sample size, which often are inadequate to detect small or even medium effect sizes (cf. M. S. Matthews et al., 2008); a general failure to consider how parenting practice may differ with the age of the child, beyond the simple dichotomy of preschool versus school-age children; and a substantial degree of variation in how well studies describe participating students and parents, their educational setting, and the criteria by which students may be considered to be either academically gifted or high achievers.

Sample sizes have grown in more recent studies in this area, but additional research should strive to use larger populations drawn from multiple areas (as exemplified by Campbell & Verna, 2007) in preference to convenience samples drawn from a single locale. Many of these studies also tended to compare narrow subgroups of parents or convenience samples, rather than examining the overall population or a random sample of the population of parents of gifted children. The lack of substantive theory invoked to explain parent perceptions and practices is also troubling. Of course, the overarching problem lies in our apparent inability to translate the outcomes parents say they want their gifted children to obtain from schools into effective practice in the school setting.

Implications

Due to the inconsistent and sporadic nature of the research base, there exist substantial gaps in what we know about the parents of gifted children and their parenting practices. Alarmingly, the great majority of the studies we reviewed lacked a theoretical basis and connected only tenuously to the extensive parenting literature concerning children not specifically identified as academically gifted. Due perhaps to the tendency of parents wanting to believe that their child ‘‘is gifted’’, or perhaps to the relative ease in conducting this type of research, the majority of studies focus on parental perception of their child’s ability. Additional research focused on developing our understanding of how parents understand giftedness, gifted children, and gifted programs can lead toward improved advocacy efforts, to the provision of more effective specialized training for teachers who work with gifted learners, and to improved efforts to focus and prioritize future research in gifted education settings.

Future Research

Parents’ role in gifted identification and the relationships between parents and schools have been recurring themes in the gifted education literature for decades. Based on our evaluation of this literature published since 1984, there are several specific topical areas where we believe future research should be directed:

- The attitudes, values, and expectations of minority, low-income, single-parent, and nontraditional families whose children participate in gifted programs.
- The range of parental satisfaction with school programming, including parents' relationships with teachers and administrators, how these relationships may affect parents' views of the effectiveness of programming, and the degree to which parents perceive various programming options as sufficient to address the academic, social, and emotional needs of their children. These parent–school relationships include those parents who opt to homeschool their high-ability children due to reasons other than religious convictions.
- The understandings parents hold about giftedness (this might be particularly difficult to investigate, since as a field we have not yet come to a consensual definition of academic giftedness; at present, the population identified as academically gifted changes from district to district and state to state). At the very least, future research should strive to convey more clearly the working definitions of "gifted" and "high achievement" used within a given study.
- How the understandings parents hold are translated into supportive and influential behaviors in the home, and how teachers and schools respond (or fail to respond) to these parents' understandings and desires for their children's education. In other words, research informing the effective use of parents' knowledge by schools.
- Investigating the parents of gifted underachievers. A greater understanding of how the parent–child–school relationship may differ for children who are underachieving in school may help in designing effective interventions to improve the performance of these learners.

Future studies should not be based solely on convenience samples of children and families referred to clinics or similar settings but should strive to identify and study the range of expression of behaviors of interest in naturalistic settings (e.g., in actual homes or in authentic settings with parent and child interactions).

The existing literature only scratches at the surface of these topics. Again, the qualitative studies we found were limited by convenience samples having unknown sampling biases and necessarily small sample sizes—purposeful sampling aside—whereas the few quantitative studies that have been conducted with larger populations are also in many cases limited because they rely on data that were collected for other purposes. Theoretical grounding in these studies is conspicuous by its absence. The manner in which "giftedness" has been operationalized has varied from one study to the next and is not always clearly defined. Although all of these limitations apply to some degree in other research in gifted education (cf. M. S. Matthews et al., 2008), the fact that these problems are widespread does not mean that they are unimportant.

In addition to topical research, the inclusion of specific theoretical frameworks could enhance the nearly atheoretical research literature regarding this particular population. Bronfenbrenner's (2005) Ecological Systems Theory offers a range of possible research streams when each of his five proposed systems is taken into account, examining the various sociocultural points regarding gifted children and their families. These include microsystems—the setting in which an individual lives, comprising of family, peers, school, neighborhood; mesosystems—relationships between microsystems such as family experiences to peers or school to church experiences (this may prove useful when examining a family's relationship and experience with schools in trying to obtain appropriate academic services for a gifted child); exosystems—a social setting in which a nondirect context still has relevance and implications for self, including trends, policies, and positions taken by organizations supporting the academic and socioemotional needs of gifted children; macrosystems—larger cultural principles that impinge on an individual, which can comprise the general populace's attitude and understanding of gifted children and their learning needs; and chronosystems—environmental events that affect an individual over their life span that can influence whether an individual attains eminence or achievement in a given field or career.

Another potentially rich theoretical framework to understand the parenting practices of gifted students is achievement goal theory (Ames, 1992; Dweck, 1986). Specifically, examining the type of motivational climate that parents create at home could provide a solid structure for explaining and predicting gifted students' academic engagement and behavior (Ames, 1992). According to Ames, the motivational climate represents situational factors created by significant others (i.e., parents, teachers) that influence how children define competence. Situational factors that emphasize self-referenced competence (e.g., rewarding personal effort and improvement, developing personalized tasks) form a mastery climate, whereas situational factors that emphasize normative competence (e.g., rewarding high ability over effort, or assigning tasks that promote academic competition and social comparison) are conceptualized as a performance climate. Stressing a mastery climate has been linked to a host of positive outcomes, including persistence in the face of challenge and enhanced intrinsic motivation, whereas emphasis on a performance climate has been associated with increased academic anxiety, self-handicapping, and decreased confidence (Elliot, 2005).

Parent–school–child interactions seem to be so multifaceted that much more experimental and quasi-experimental research needs to be conducted to develop a robust understanding of how gifted learners' needs may be both similar and different from those of the general student population. Further descriptive research also seems to be warranted as we attempt to develop a sophisticated theoretical understanding of the role that parents play in the education of their high-achieving and academically gifted offspring. Developing these understandings will be critical in ongoing efforts to foster the positive academic and social development of children who are of high ability and/or identified as academically gifted by their schools.

Appendix

Literature on Parents of Gifted Children: 1984–2010

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
			Parent Influence	
Achievement				
Ablard (1996/97)	MM	Mothers (n=547) Fathers (n=547)	Mothers were more likely to value internal standards of academic success; fathers were more likely to value external standards of academic success. Education, gender, and ethnic group also impact tendency toward internal or external standards.	Lack of long-term findings in terms of academic success.
Ablard & Parker (1997)	MM	Parent sets (N=460)	Parents do not necessarily focus on academics; relationship exists between parents' performance goals and child's perfectionism and can also predict if a child will manifest non-perfectionism or dysfunctional perfectionism.	Achievement goal orientation treated as a discrete variable instead of continuous.
Campbell & Mandel (1990)	QT	Gifted students (n=437) Non gifted students (n=364)	Ethnicity is strongly tied to parental influence in relation to pressure, help, monitoring/time management, and ultimately student achievement.	CC
Gullesserian (2008)	QT	Families (N=29)	Multiple data points collected to help identify underserved students who could be successful.	CC
Hebert, Pagnani, & Hammond (2009)	QL	Males (n=10) Fathers (n=10)	Father-son relationship revealed unconditional belief in son; strong work ethic; encouragement and guidance; pride in accomplishments; maintaining high expectations; and mutual respect and admiration.	Based on biographical data
Wu (2007)	QL	Parents (N=5)	Chinese American parents place a greater emphasis on hard work rather than innate ability.	BB
Wu (2008)	QL	Parents (N=3)	Parents used a combination of traditional Chinese and Western parenting strategies.	BB
Yang (2007)	MM	Families (N=136)	Chinese American parents placed greater emphasis on effort towards education and tended to use a training type parenting style.	BB

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
Home Environment				
Baker, Bridger, & Evans (1998)	QT	Families of gifted underachievers (n=26) Families of gifted students achieving (n=30)	A coordinated effort among family, school, and child systems can help to intercede with underachieving behaviors.	CC
Campbell & Verna (2007)	MM	Parents (n=2,866) Students (n=10,026)	Effective parents build positive Academic Home Climates; the greater continuity between Academic Home Climates and school climates, the higher student achievement.	All research done outside the educational establishment.
Cornell & Grossberg (1987)	QT	Families (N=83)	Family environment has both positive and negative effects on a child's personality adjustment.	CC
Foxworth (1986)	QT	Parents (N=463)	Families of the gifted differed on several of the subscales of the FES when compared to non-gifted families.	CC
Karnes & D'Ilio (1988)	QT	Families (N=63)	Children and families perceived family dynamics differently. Home environments can be improved through a change in supportive attitudes.	CC
Karnes & D'Ilio (1989)	QT	Mothers (n=55) Fathers (n=46)	Home environment perceptions differed among both mothers and fathers and their children.	CC
Rimm & Lowe (1988)	MM	Students (N=22) and their families	Family environments of gifted underachievers are influenced by family structure, climate, and values with specific parenting behaviors identified.	Results from this study cannot be assumed to be the only causes of underachievement.
Windecker-Nelson, Melson, & Moon (1997)	QT	Preschool children (N=28) and their parents	Children's perceived competence was impacted by their mothers' attitude toward independence, her own concerns, and social network.	CC

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
Young Gifted Children				
Clausing-Lee (1992)	QL	Father of Gifted (n=10) Fathers of Non-Gifted (n=10)	Parenting difference were noted between fathers of gifted and non-gifted preschoolers.	BB
Karnes & Shwedel (1987)	QT	Father of gifted children (n=9) Fathers of non gifted children (n=10)	Fathers of gifted children differed from fathers of non-gifted children in terms of length and types child interactions.	CC
Karnes, Shwedel, & Steinberg (1984)	QL	Parents of gifted children (n=10) Parents of non gifted children (n=10)	Parents of gifted children spent more time with their child, encouraged independence, and indicated unconditional love.	CC
McDowell (1992)	QT	Gifted mother/child dyad (n=10) Non-gifted mother/child dyad (n=10)	Mother's influence on cognitive and social emotional development essential regardless of gifted identification. Mothers of gifted children presented more positive encouraging behaviors in comparison to mothers of non-gifted children.	CC
Snowden & Christian (1999)	MM	Families (N=46)	Parents with support behaviors practiced authoritative style of parenting, fostered creativity, and provided a flexible environment.	Lack of longitudinal data.
Strom, Johnson, & Strom (1990)	QT	Parents (N=69)	Anglo and Hispanic parents groups both supported the needs of their gifted children. Additional supports provided by the school could help to ensure future growth.	AA
Disadvantaged Gifted Learners				
Davis (2007)	MM	Families (N=5)	Mothers were central to positive family environment; importance of extended family members and social capital held by family to help them overcome challenging experiences.	CC

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
Robinson, Weinberg, Redden, Ramey, & Ramey (1998)	QT	Students (N=154) and their families	Parents of high achieving Head Start participants had slightly higher incomes, slightly greater educational achievement, and slightly smaller family size, in comparison to their Head Start peers.	Descriptive approach; a strong design in other respects
Robinson, Lanzi, Weinberg, Ramey, & Ramey (2002)	QT	Students (N=113) and their families	High-ability students from 1998 study continued to thrive and families tended to have more resources and fewer stressors.	Descriptive approach; a strong design in other respects
VanTassel-Baska (1989)	QL	Students (N=15) and their families.	Families provided encouragement and support for the gifted adolescent. Mothers also played a central role in these students' lives along with extended family members.	BB
			Parent Perceptions	
Identification				
Ford, Wright, Grantham, & Harris (1998)	MM	Families (N=140)	Students from single-parent homes were less likely to be identified compared to students from two-parent homes. Students' and parents' achievement goals were closely tied.	Need for systemic studies.
Gelbrich & Hare (1989)	QT	Parents (N=382)	A negative relationship was found between school achievement and gifted children from single-parent homes.	CC
Lee & Olszewski (2006)	QT	Students (N=26,564)	Parent nomination maybe a viable alternative to school nomination for talent search programs.	CC
McBee (2006)	QT	Students (N=705,074)	Parent referrals were rare but occurred more often and were more accurate from high-SES homes. Parent nominations also varied across racial groups.	Automatic referrals inflate the quality indices.

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
McBee (2010)	QT	Students (N=326,352)	The probability of a student being indentified as gifted is strongly influenced by SES and race.	Lack of true student academic ability variables.
Scott, Perou, Urbano, Hogan, & Gold (1992)	QT	Families (N=277)	White parents requested gifted evaluation more often than Hispanic and African American parents, though all groups indicated similar characteristics for giftedness.	AA
Concept of Giftedness				
Buckley (1994)	QT	Parents (N=287)	Parents valued a child-centered approach to instruction; their conception of giftedness included creativity, motivation, and IQ.	AA
Dale, Bates, Reznick, Morisett, (1989)	QT	Children (N=226)	Parents accurately identified their children's language ability.	
Galloway & Porath (1997)	QT	Families (N=23)	Parents and teachers rated children's social behaviors similarly.	CC
Louis & Lewis (1992)	QT	Families (N=118)	Parents are good judges of giftedness in young gifted children and base their beliefs on creative ability, memory, and abstract thinking.	CC
Pletan, Robinson, Berninger, & Abbott (1995)	QT	Parents (N=100)	Parents identified behaviors in mathematically precocious children similar to those of general giftedness.	
Gifted Label				
Colangelo & Brower (1987)	QT	Parents (n=53) Siblings (n=28) Gifted (n=38)	Siblings and family units were not impacted negatively by using the term "gifted." In fact, all members of the family reported having a positive feeling about the label.	AA

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
Cornell (1989)	QT	Mothers (n=424) Fathers (n=317)	Children of mothers who used the term "gifted" reported lower self-concept and higher levels of anxiety than non-users.	Correlational study; a causal relationship cannot be made between parent "users" and child adjustment.
Foster (2000)	QL	Families (N=6)	Perceived greater need for academic and emotional supports for gifted students and their families.	BB
Makel (2009)	QT	Gifted (n=9) Non-gifted (n=36)	Attitudes about giftedness changed according to identification.	CC
Wingert (1997)	MM	Users (n=27) Non-users (n=21) Comparison (n=20)	User mothers of the term "gifted" and nonusers perceived giftedness differently in their children.	CC
			Parent Satisfaction With Gifted Programming	
Programming Satisfaction				
Chapey, Crisci, Trimarco, & Capobianco (1986/1987)	AT	Parents (N=1,000)	Parents of gifted and talented children were not very involved in school activities.	AA
Damiani (1996)	QL	Parents (N=46)	Counseling and support necessary for families of at-risk gifted children.	CC
Huff, Houskamp, Watkins, Stanton, & Tavegia, (2005)	QL	Parents (N=15)	Parents expressed dissatisfaction with programming, whether at private or public schools; teachers lacked an understanding of the needs specific to African American gifted learners.	CC
Matthews & Burns (1992)	QT	Parents (N=146)	Parents recognize the need for preschool children to have educationally appropriate environments; parents can provide essential feedback on a program's successes and challenges.	Evaluation rather than research design.

(Continued)

Appendix (continued)

Reference	Type of Research	Participants/Subjects	Main Findings	Limitations
Purcell (1993)	MM	Parents (N=19)	Elimination of gifted programming caused a variety of effects on families of gifted children.	BB
Shichtman (1999)	QL	Families (N=10)	Parents indicated greater concerns for socialization rather than academic issues.	BB
Shumow (1997)	QL	Students (N=3) and their families	Parents maintained stable home environments and managed to supplement their children's limited academic opportunities.	BB
Non-Traditional Programming				
Hishinuma (2000)	QT	Parents (N=98)	Parents perceived that the specialized school for twice-exceptional learners was more successful at serving 2e student than previous schools.	AA
Hopper (2003)	QL	Families (N=4)	Homeschooling is a viable alternative for gifted students.	BB
Jarosewich, & Stocking (2003)	QT	Families (N=900)	Parents want to learn more about their child's abilities through talent programs; however unclear if they want to pursue additional services.	Low return rate; perceptions of families who did not respond not included and may differ.
Noble, Childers, & Vaughan (2008)	QT	Parents (N=95)	Early college entrance is a viable option for parents to consider for their gifted child.	AA

Note. **Types of** research indicated by MM = mixed methods; QT = quantitative; QL = qualitative. Limitations indicated by AA = self-report instrument; BB = lack of generalization; CC = sampling issues.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Ablard, K. E. (1996/1997). Parents' conception of academic success: Internal and external standards. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 8*, 57-64. (Original work published 1996)

Ablard, K. E., & Parker, W. D. (1997). Parents' achievement goals and perfectionism in their academically talented children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*, 651-667.

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goal, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 261-271.

Baker, J. A., Bridger, R., & Evans, K. (1998). Models of underachievement among gifted preadolescents: The role of personal, family, and school factors. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 42*, 5-14.

Bloom, B. (1985). *Developing talent in young people*. New York, NY: Ballantine.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (Ed.). (2005). *Making human beings human*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brown, E. F., Avery, L. D., VanTassel-Baska, J., Worley, B. B., II., & Stambaugh, T. (2006). Legislation and policies: Effects on the gifted. *Roeper Review, 29*, 11-23.

Buckley, K. C. P. (1994). Parent's views on education for the gifted. *Roeper Review, 16*, 215-216.

Campbell, J. R., & Mandel, F. (1990). Connecting math achievement to parental influences. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 15*, 64-74.

Campbell, J. R., & Verna, M. A. (2007). Effective parental influence: Academic home climate linked to children's achievement. *Educational Research & Evaluation, 13*, 501-519.

Chapey, G. D., Trimarco, T. A., Crisci, P., & Capobianco, M. (1987). School-parent partnerships in gifted education: From paper to reality. *Educational Research Quarterly, 11*, 37-46. (Original work published 1986)

Clarenbach, J. (2007, February). All gifted is local: Without federal guidance, no two districts deliver gifted education services in the same way. *The School Administrator*. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7230

Clausing-Lee, M. S. (1992). *A qualitative study of patterns in attitudes, values, and behaviors among fathers of gifted and nongifted children in selected preschools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 9229728)

Colangelo, N., & Brower, P. (1987). Labeling gifted youngsters: Long-term impact on families. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 31*, 75-78.

Colangelo, N., & Dettmann, D. F. (1983). A review of research on parents and families of gifted children. *Exceptional Children, 50*, 20-27.

Cornell, D. G. (1989). Child adjustment and parent use of the term "gifted." *Gifted Child Quarterly, 33*, 59-64.

Cornell, D. G., & Grossberg, I. W. (1987). Family environment and personality adjustment in gifted program children. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 31*, 59-64.

Cotton, K., & Wikelund, K. R. (2001). *Parental involvement in education*. Retrieved from http://www.nwrel.org/archive/sirs/3/cu6.html

Csikszentmihalyi, C., Rathunde, K., & Whalen, S. (1996). *Talented teenagers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Dale, P. S., Bates, E., Reznick, J. S., & Morisset, C. (1989). The validity of a parent report instrument of child language at twenty months. *Journal of Child Language, 16*, 239-249.

Damiani, V. B. (1996). The individual family support plan: A tool to assist special populations of gifted learners. *Roeper Review, 18*, 293-297.

Davis, J. (2007). *An exploration of the impact of family on the achievement of African American gifted learners originating from low-income environments* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 3287895)

Dwairy, M. (2004). Parenting styles and mental health of Arab gifted adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 48*, 275-286.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting motivation. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040-1048.

Elliot, A. J. (2005). A conceptual history of the achievement goal construct. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 52-73). New York, NY: Guilford.

Ford, D. Y., Wright, L. B., Grantham, T. C., & Harris, J. J., III. (1998). Achievement levels, outcomes, and orientations of Black students in single and two-parent families. *Urban Education, 33*, 360-384.

Foster, J. F. (2000). *A case study approach to understanding the gifted experience: Children's and parent's perceptions of labeling placement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 8853747)

Foxworth, M. D. (1986). *Family environment as perceived by parents of gifted children in a Southern culture* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 8705062)

Freeman, J. (1994). Gifted school performance and creativity. *Roeper Review, 17*, 15-19.

Freeman, J. (2000). Families: The essential context for gifts and talents. In K. Heller, F. Monks, R. Sternberg, & R. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (2nd ed., pp. 573-585). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Gallagher, J., Weiss, P., Oglesby, K., & Thomas, T. (1983, August). *The status of gifted/talented education: United States surveys of needs, practices, and policies*. Camarillo, CA: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office.

Galloway, B., & Porath, M. (1997). Parent and teacher views of gifted children's social abilities. *Roeper Review, 20*, 118-121.

Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London, England: Macmillan. Retrieved from http://www.galton.org/books/hereditary-genius/text/pdf/galton-1869-genius-v3.pdf

Gelbrich, J. A., & Hare, E. K. (1989). The effects of single parenthood on school achievement in a gifted population. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 33*, 115-117. doi:10.177/001698628903300304

Goertzel, V., & Goertzel, M. (1962). *Cradles of eminence*. New York, NY: Little, Brown.

Golden, D. (2003, December 29). Initiative to leave no child behind leaves out gifted: Educators divert resources from classes for smartest to focus on basic literacy. *The Wall Street Journal,* p. 1. Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/public/resources/documents/Polk_Gifted.htm

Gullesserian, J. A. (2008). *The association between child characteristics and family functioning and academic achievement and social competence in inner-city gifted children* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 3332509)

Hackney, H. (1981). The gifted child, the family, and the school. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 25*, 51-54.

Hébert, T. P., Pagnani, A. R., & Hammond, D. R. (2009). An examination of parental influence on high achieving gifted males. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 33*, 241-274.

Hill, N. E., Castellino, D. R., Lansford, J. E., Nowlin, P., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (2004). Parent academic involvement as related to school behavior, achievement, and aspirations: Demographic variations across adolescence. *Child Development, 75*, 1491-1509.

Hishinuma, E. (2000). Parent attitudes on the importance and success of integrated self-contained services for students who are gifted, learning disabled, and gifted/learning disabled. *Roeper Review, 22*, 241-250.

Hopper, T. K. (2003). *Parents, perceptions, passions, pathways, and patters: Exploratory case studies of home education in the development of intellectually gifted individuals* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 3076301)

Huff, R. E., Houskamp, B. M., Watkins, A. V., Stanton, M., & Tavegia, B. (2005). The experiences of gifted African American children: A phenomenological study. *Roeper Review, 27*, 215-221.

Jarosewich, T., & Stocking, V. B. (2003). Talent search: Student and parent perceptions of out-of-level testing. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 14*, 137-150.

Jeynes, W. (2010). *Parental involvement and academic success*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Karnes, F. A., & D'Ilio, V. R. (1988). Comparison of gifted children and their parents' perception of the home environment. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 32*, 277-279.

Karnes, F. A., & D'Ilio, V. R. (1989). Student leaders' and their parents' perception of the home environment. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 33*, 165-168.

Karnes, F. A., & Marquardt, R. G. (2000). *Gifted children and legal issues: An update*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.

Karnes, M. B., & Shwedel, A. (1987). Differences in attitudes and practices between fathers of young gifted and fathers of young non-gifted children: A pilot study. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 31*, 79-82.

Karnes, M. B., Shwedel, A. M., & Steinberg, D. (1984). Styles of parenting among parents of young gifted children. *Roeper Review, 6*, 232-235.

Keirouz, K. S. (1990). Concerns of parents of gifted children: A research review. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 34*, 56-63.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Landau, E., & Weissler, K. (1993). Parental environments in families with gifted and nongifted children. *Journal of Psychology, 127*, 129-142.

Lee, S.-Y., Matthews, M. S., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2008). A national picture of talent search and talent search educational programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 52*, 55-69.

Lee, S.-Y., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2006). Comparisons between talent search students qualifying via scores on standardized tests and via parent nomination. *Roeper Review, 28*, 157-166.

Li, R. I. (1995). *A study of parent–child relations among gifted Chinese children* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 9606662)

Louis, B., & Lewis, M. (1992). Parental beliefs about giftedness in young children and their relation to actual ability level. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*, 27-31.

Ma, X. (1999). Dropping out of advanced mathematics: The effects of parental involvement. *Teachers College Record, 101*(1), 60-81.

Makel, M. C. (2009). Student and parent attitudes before and after the gifted identification process. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 33*, 126-143.

Matthews, F. N., & Burns, J. M. (1992). A parent evaluation of a public preschool gifted program. *Roeper Review, 15*, 69-72.

Matthews, M. S. (2006). Gifted students dropping out: Recent findings from a Southeastern state. *Roeper Review, 28*, 216-223.

Matthews, M. S., & Farmer, J. L. (2008). Factors affecting the Algebra I achievement of academically talented learners. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 19*, 472-501.

Matthews, M. S., Gentry, M., McCoach, D. B., Worrell, F. C., Matthews, D., & Dixon, F. (2008). Evaluating the state of a field: Effect size reporting in gifted education. *Journal of Experimental Education, 77*, 55-68. doi:10.3200/JXE.3277.3201.3255-3268

Matthews, M. S., & McBee, M. T. (2007). School factors and the underachievement of gifted students in a talent search summer program. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 51*, 167-181.

Matthews, M. S., & Shaunessy, E. (2010). Putting standards into practice: Evaluating the utility of the NAGC Pre-K-Grade 12 Gifted Program Standards. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 54, 159-167.* doi: 10.1177/0016986209356708

McBee, M. T. (2006). A descriptive analysis of referral sources for gifted identification screening by race and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 17*, 103-111.

McBee, M. T. (2010). Examining the probability of identification for gifted programs for students in Georgia elementary schools: A multilevel path analysis study. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 54*, 283-297.

McDowell, J. A. (1992). *Interactional styles of preschool gifted and nongifted children with their children* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 9232442)

Moos, R. H. (1979). *The Family Environment Scale*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. R. (2009). Parenting gifted and talented children: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*, 163-173.

Morrissey, A., & Brown, P. M. (2009). Mother and toddler activity in the zone of proximal development for pretend play as a predictor of higher child IQ. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*, 106-120.

Neihart, M., Reis, S. M., Robinson, N. M., & Moon, S. M. (Eds.). (2002). *The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know?* Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Noble, K. D., Childers, S. A., & Vaughan, R. C. (2008). A place to be celebrated and understood: The impact of early university entrance from parents' points of view. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 52*, 256-268.

Olszewski, P., Kulieke, M., & Buescher, T. (1987). The influence on the family environment on the development of talent: A literature review. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 11*, 6-28.

Patchett, R. F., & Gauthier, Y. (1991). Parent and teacher perceptions of giftedness and a program for the gifted. *BC Journal of Special Education, 15*, 25-38.

Penney, S., & Wilgosh, L. (2000). Fostering parent teacher relationships when children are gifted. *Gifted Education International, 14*, 217-229.

Pletan, M. D., Robinson, N. M., Berninger, V. W., & Abbott, R. D. (1995). Parents' observations of kindergartners who are advanced in mathematical reasoning. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19*, 30-44.

Purcell, J. H. (1993). The effects of the elimination of gifted and talented programs on participating students and their parents. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 37*, 177-187.

Reichenberg, A., & Landau, E. (2009). Families of gifted children. In L. V. Shavinina (Ed.), *International handbook on giftedness* [*Part Two*] (pp. 873-883). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Rimm, S., & Lowe, B. (1988). Family environments of underachieving gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 32*, 353-359.

Robinson, N. M. (2000). Giftedness in very young children: How seriously should it be taken? In R. C. Friedman & B. M. Shore (Eds.), *Talents unfolding: Cognition and development* (pp. 7-26). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Robinson, N. M., Lanzi, R. G., Weinberg, R. A., Ramey, S. L., & Ramey, C. T. (2002). Family factors associated with high academic competence in former head start children at third grade. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 46*, 278-290.

Robinson, N. M., Weinberg, R. A., Redden, D., Ramey, S. L., & Ramey, C. T. (1998). Family factors associated with high academic competence among former head start children. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 42*, 148-156.

Rotigel, J. V. (2003). Understanding the young gifted children: Guidelines for parents, families, and educators. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 30*, 209-214.

Sankar-DeLeeuw, N. (2007). Case studies of gifted kindergarten children part II: The parents and teachers. *Roeper Review, 29*, 93-99.

Scott, M. S., Perou, R., Urbano, R., Hogan, A., & Gold, S. (1992). The identification of giftedness: A comparison of White, Hispanic, and Black families. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*, 131-139.

Shichtman, D. (1999). *Concerns and problems of parents of academically successful gifted children* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 9939553)

Shumow, L. (1997). Daily experiences and adjustment of gifted low-income urban children at home and school. *Roeper Review, 20*, 35-38.

Smith, E. J. (2007, February). Weaving the gifted into the full fabric: It's possible to accommodate the learning needs of all students without a discrete program for those on the high end. *The School Administrator*. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7208

Snowden, P. L., & Christian, L. G. (1999). Parenting the young gifted child: Supportive behaviors. *Roeper Review, 21*, 215-221.

Solow, R. (2001). Parents' conceptions of giftedness. *Roeper Review, 24*, 14-22.

Strom, R., Johnson, A., & Strom, S. (1990). Home and school support for gifted children. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 37*, 245-254.

Subotnik, R. F., & Arnold, K. D. (Eds.). (1994). *Beyond Terman: Contemporary longitudinal studies of giftedness and talent*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Terman, L. M. (Ed.). (1926). *Genetic studies of genius: Vol. 1. Mental and physical traits of a thousand gifted children* (2nd ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2008). *High-achieving students in the era of NCLB*. Washington, DC: Author.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (1989). The role of the family in the success of disadvantaged gifted learners. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 13*, 22-36.

Webb, J. T., Gore, J. L., Amend, E. R., & DeVries, A. R. (2007). *A parent's guide to gifted children*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.

Windecker-Nelson, E., Melson, G. F., & Moon, S. M. (1997). Intellectually gifted preschoolers' perceived competence: Relations to maternal attitudes, concerns, and support. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 41*, 133-144.

Wingert, H. D. (1997). *The label "gifted": Parent beliefs, transmission of beliefs and impact on the child* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 9624365)

Wu, E. H. (2007). *Cultural perspectives on talent development and parenting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses database. (AAT No. 3289604)

Wu, E. H. (2008). Parental influence on children's talent development: A case study with three Chinese American families. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 32*, 100-129.

Yang, W. (E.). (2007). Gifted or not, parental perceptions are the same: A study of Chinese American parental perceptions of their children's academic achievement and home environments. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 1*, 217-234.

Bios

Jennifer L. Jolly, is an associate professor of elementary and gifted education and program director of the gifted education program at Louisiana State University. She is editor-in-chief of *Parenting for High Potentia*l and director of Live! Learn!

Louisiana, a program for gifted and talented students. Her research interests include the history of gifted education and parenting gifted and advanced learners.

Michael S. Matthews, is an associate professor of gifted education and graduate coordinator for the Academically & Intellectually Gifted program at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. He is co-editor of the *Journal of Advanced Academics;* treasurer of the SIG-Research on Giftedness, Creativity, & Talent of the American Educational Research Association; and vice president of the North Carolina Association for the Gifted & Talented. His research interests include gifted education policy; gifted education in science and mathematics; the assessment and identification of learners from diverse backgrounds; underachievement; and the role of parents and families in the education of gifted and high-ability learners.