

Information for the Submission

1. Title of the submission: Gifted Students Who Drop Out—Who and Why: A Meta-Analytical Review of the Literature
2. Name of the author: Esra Ayse Kaskaloglu
3. Affiliation of the author: PhD Program in Arizona State University
4. Address of the author: 1234 E. Spence Ave. Apt # 101 Tempe, AZ 85281
5. E-mail address of the author: ekaskal@yahoo.com
6. Abstract of paper: The purpose of this study was to obtain comprehensive information about gifted high school dropouts and to examine factors that are related to gifted students' dropout behavior as well as the factors of their underachievement. After a thorough examination of original studies in addition to literature reviews, this meta-analysis answered three questions regarding to (1) reasons for leaving school, (2) roles of gender and race, and (3) factors affecting underachievement.

First, there was evidence of failing school, disliking school, getting a job, or being pregnant, although there were many other related reasons. Second, it is indicated that gender and race/ethnicity had an affect on their decision. For instance, male dropouts were more likely than female dropouts to report leaving because of school expulsion or suspension. In addition, dropout rates for Hispanics remained higher than those for White and Black students. Finally, study results confirmed that many gifted underachievers were suffering because they were either not provided with a gifted program or did not have enough challenge at school. There was also evidence of poor student-teacher and student-peer relationships, boredom or disinterestedness in school, parental instability or other parental problems, divorces or

separations of the family and having a single parent, lack of motivation, lack of organizational and study skills, immaturity, and social, behavioral, and emotional problems.

A total of 16 studies were coded with 21 independent samples which yielded 1025 identified subjects. The total number of identified male subjects was 355, and the total number of female subjects was 225, while the sex of 445 subjects was not specified. The studies were found through an exhaustive search of published literature and relevant dissertations. Data were collected from each of the studies in a systematic method with the help of a set of coding forms and a code book that provided rules for coding study features.

Since there are only a limited number of studies regarding gifted dropouts, the results from this investigation suggest the need for further studies. It is also suggested that the further studies be designed to gain more information about the nature of gifted dropouts regarding how their backgrounds, including gender, race/ethnicity and dropout patterns, differ from each other. Finally, it is recommended that follow-up studies be conducted with the students to follow their progress.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain comprehensive information about gifted high school dropouts. After a thorough examination of original studies in addition to literature reviews, this meta-analysis answered three questions regarding to (1) reasons for leaving school, (2) roles of gender and race, and (3) factors affecting underachievement. There was evidence of failing school, disliking school, getting a job, or being pregnant, although there were many other related reasons. Gender and race/ethnicity also had an affect on their decision. Many gifted underachievers were suffering because they were either not provided with a gifted program or did not have enough challenge at school. The results from this investigation suggest further studies both be designed to gain more information about the nature of gifted dropouts regarding how their backgrounds, including gender, race/ethnicity and dropout patterns, differ from each other and be conducted with the students to follow their progress.

Gifted Students Who Drop Out—Who and Why

Esra Kaskaloglu

Arizona State University

The past half-century has seen the goal of a secondary education for all American youth gain rather wide acceptance says Livingston (1958). Substantial progress has been made in achieving this goal as evidenced by statistics that reveal the increasing proportion of youth who enter and graduate from the high schools of the nation. These same statistics also show that the goal is far short of fulfillment. Considerable effort will continue to be needed if further progress is to be made (Livingston).

There is growing interest today in the dropout problem of high schools , not only on the part of educational leaders, but also on the part of many community leaders throughout the country. Many educators say that the problem of determining ways by which pupils might be encouraged to complete high school is one of the most important issues in education.

In most of the studies the consideration of the dropout problem in the high school today is based upon the assumption that all children ought to finish high school. There is little evidence either to justify or reject the validity of this position. Trends in youth employment show that employers prefer high school graduates over those who have not completed their high school course. The majority of youth leaders feel that every child who is at all capable of doing so should complete a high school education. The viewpoint of retaining each pupil capable of graduating from the secondary school until that student has graduated has gradually been accepted. At the

same time thousands of sixteen and seventeen year old youngsters are leaving school before graduating. Numerous secondary and high school administrators are attempting to solve this problem by attempting to find out the "why" so they may better meet the needs of the school dropout (Dresher, 1954).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain comprehensive information about gifted high school dropouts and to examine factors that are related to gifted students' dropout behavior. Considering that one of the important factors is underachievement, this study further examined the factors of underachievement.

This meta-analysis is the writer's attempt to synthesize the research that has examined gifted dropouts, demographics, and underachievement. The subjects of the research were studies, which are published or unpublished, related to the subject areas of gifted students.

Statement of the Problem

The academically gifted dropout is considered a contemporary social problem, because their abilities and potential are not realized and thus constitute a social waste (Sadowski, 1987). Several studies focusing on the IQ's of high school dropouts showed varying percentages. A consensus showed that 10% or more had an IQ sufficient enough to be classified as a high ability student. The literature on preventing gifted high school students from dropping out is limited, as it is the literature on the factors which influence gifted students to remain in school. Durr (1964) did find, however, that material motivations do contribute to the continuing education of gifted students. Conversely, society's aim of having all students complete high school may not apply to

gifted students who may not see the value of certain educational experiences which will not directly aid in their future success (Sadowski).

Research Questions

This study is intended to answer three research questions, on which study was based.

- A. What are the demographics of gifted dropouts from high school and reasons they pose for dropping out of school?
- B. Do gender and race play a role in gifted students' decisions to drop out of high school?
- C. What are the factors affecting to their underachievement?

Limitations

Generalization of the data is limited to the extent that studies used in the synthesis in a manner that guaranteed representation of the general gifted population. None of the studies employed on representative sampling technique. Some of the studies were based on either student or teacher surveys which depends upon the honesty and accuracy of the subjects' response. In addition, there were a number of studies where some missing data points on the specific variables, especially on the gifted dropout site. These studies that did not report sufficient data about the samples and the findings limited this synthesis, as well.

Many studies have focused on potential dropouts and offered suggestions to reduce the number of actual dropouts. Several studies have examined the problems associated with high-ability dropouts, yet few have explored the problems associated with gifted high school dropouts as an aid in recognizing this undeniably important group of students and to lessen the number that drop out of high school each year.

Review of the Literature

Gifted High School Dropouts

The academically gifted dropout is considered a contemporary social problem, because their abilities and potential are not realized and thus constitute a social waste. The available data indicates that at least half and perhaps as many as three-fourths of all dropouts have the necessary ability to graduate from high school (Voss et al., 1966, 1966; Layton, 1952; McCreary & Kitch, 1953; & U.S. Department of Labor, 1960). Involuntary dropouts, who have adequate ability, compromise a relatively small percentage of these dropouts. This implies that many dropouts are intellectually capable, but the evidence is by no means clear.

Studies on the academically capable student rarely focus on the dropping out issue. Studies by Voss et al. (1966), French (1968, 1969), Warner (1964), and several others have addressed this group.

Warner (1964), in a summary of the literature concerning dropouts, reported that about 11 percent have IQ's of 110 and above; only 25 percent of the total population have IQ's in that range. Based on this figure, each year more than 80,000 youths within the top 25 percent of the nation's population intellectually, have the scholastic potential for higher education, and have the occupational potential for a job requiring relatively high-level intellectual power, leave school before graduation.

Van Dyke and Hoyte (1958) reported on the dropout problem in a 20 percent stratified sample in Iowa using a total of 73 high schools. Out of the total of 1652 students, 165, nearly 10 percent, had IQ's of 120 or above. Of the 165 high ability

students, 29 of them were dropouts. Nearly 18 percent of the high ability students dropped out.

In a study by French (1968), of Pennsylvania youth, it is found that more than 1300 high ability youth dropout. Nearly 500 dropouts, or 28 percent, had IQ's of 120 or above and 80, or 4.5 percent of the dropouts, had IQ's of 130 or more, those acknowledged as being gifted.

Factors Related to Gifted Dropouts

Many research studies have specified that family factors are significantly related to the decision of students to drop out. Studies found that the dropout's family was less solid, less influenced by a father, less likely to interact in leisure activities, and less able to communicate than the persister's family (Noth & O'Neill, 1981; Sadowski, 1987). Research studies also indicated that loss of a family member due to death or divorce and other family problems influence a student's decision to drop out (Martin, 1981; Massey & Crosby, 1982; Rumberger, 1981). In addition, the level of education and the occupation of dropouts' parents were significant factors in several studies (Martin; Noth & O'Neill; Watson, 1976).

Focusing on gifted dropouts, Robertson (1991) emphasized school-related factors, such as schools' failure to address the needs of gifted students and their learning styles. She indicated that schools may not present curricula that address the appropriate learning styles of gifted students.

Sadowski (1987) found the following characteristics in his case study of gifted school dropouts: (1) There was evidence of instability in the home environment; (2) drug and alcohol consumption were a part of the dropouts' environment; (3) gifted dropouts exhibited a lack of

interest and motivation in high school; (4) there was evidence of negative and rebellious attitude towards school and authority; (5) there was evidence of an incomplete or inappropriate gifted curriculum in high school; (6) gifted dropouts developed poor peer relationships and exhibited poor social adjustment; and (7) there was evidence of lack of counseling in high school and inadequate communication between the school and the home.

Underachievement

Early researchers (Raph, Goldberg, & Passow, 1966) and some recent authors (Davis & Rimm, 1989) have defined underachievement in terms of a discrepancy between a child's school performance and some ability index such as an IQ score. These definitions, although seemingly succinct, provide little insight to parents and teachers who wish to address this problem with individual students. A better way to define underachievement is to consider the various components.

Whitmore (1980) provides a checklist to identify gifted underachievers. If, after observation, a student exhibits 10 or more of the listed traits, it is suggested that more tests be done to determine whether the student is gifted and underachieving. Of the 20 traits listed, Whitmore cites seven that are most significant: (1) Poor test performance, (2) achievement at or below grade-level expectations in one or all of the basic skill areas: reading, language arts, or mathematics, (3) daily work frequently incomplete or poorly done, (4) superior comprehension and retention of concepts when interested, (5) vast gap between qualitative level of oral and written work, (6) wide range of interests and possibly special expertise in an area of investigation and research, and (7) low self-esteem in tendencies to withdraw or be aggressive in the classroom.

Delisle and Berger (1990) stated that some students, particularly those who are highly capable and participate in a variety of activities, appear to be high achievers when learning in a highly structured academic environment, but are at risk of underachieving if they cannot establish priorities, focus on a selected number of activities, or set long-term goals. On the other hand, some students appear to be underachievers but are not uncomfortable or discouraged. They may be quite discontent in middle or secondary school (in part because of the organization and structure), but happy and successful when learning in an environment with a different structural organization. They may handle independence quite well. They also added that underachievement is made up of a complex web of behaviors, but it can be reversed by parents and educators who consider the many strengths and talents possessed by the students who may wear this label.

Method

Sample

The studies to be included in this meta-analysis were reported in published articles, books, dissertations that have been submitted to the Dissertation Abstracts International, and governmental reports related to high school dropout rates as measured by National Center for Education Statistics. In order to be included in this population, a research report had to contain some outcome measures that reflect either the reasons of gifted students' dropouts for leaving high school or the demographics regarding their dropouts. Additionally, sources that contain the information regarding the factors affecting these students' underachievement were included.

Equipment

A code book and coding forms were used to systematically collect information from each of the data sources. Since designing data coding forms is essential to describe studies, five data coding forms with several sections were created. The five coding forms contained identification, quality of the study, reasons and demographics of gifted dropouts, factors related to gifted dropouts, and factors affecting underachievement.

Procedure

The subjects of this investigation were obtained via an exhaustive search of the literature for studies concerning drop out reasons and demographics, factors affecting their decisions to drop out of high school, and their underachievement. The stages to search data sources were to search for articles by reviewing a variety of journals related to gifted high school dropouts' reasons, demographics, and dynamics as well as the factors related to their underachievement, and to scan references provided by those articles in order to locate other articles, government reports, books, and dissertations related to the subject, and to examine data sources from the Internet. Additionally, every source's reference section was reviewed as they were gathered.

Using these steps stated above, 58 data sources were found, which consist of articles, reports, and dissertations. After a thorough examination of each abstract, 21 articles, reports, and dissertations were selected for further review. The remainder were excluded from further investigation because of three possible reasons: they were completely irrelevant to this research; they did not have enough data; or they reported no data. 16 of the 21 studies were found to have relevant data to include in the meta-analytical study. These 16 studies yielded 21 independent samples due to multi-sample studies. These 16 studies were then

coded in terms of study characteristics and dropout dynamics for statistical analysis of the data.

Data Analysis and Results

According to the most common findings from the studies, reasons for gifted dropouts were gathered under four categories. Table 12 provides information about the frequent reasons why gifted drop out from high school. (1) "Personal reasons" includes desire of traveling, drug / alcohol problems, socially immaturity, behavior problems, reasons connected with citizenship for minority students, having friends who dropped out of high school, health, medical, or physical problems, and having other problems. Moreover, one of the studies details evidence that both working alone and living in a fantasy world might be expectations for gifted dropouts; (2) "Home related reasons" includes the need of the student at home, family instability or instability of home environment, desire to have a family; either planned to get married or got married, pregnancy or child-rearing, and parent loss; (3) "Socioeconomic reasons" includes economic pressures, need or desire to work or get a job, need to support a family, and not being able to work and go to school simultaneously; (4a) "School related reasons, academic achievement", includes failure, low achievement scores or grades and grade retardation, administrative request; either suspended or expelled from school, being not able to keep up with schoolwork, inappropriate curricula for gifted students, lack of counseling in high school and inadequate communication between the school and the home, and between the student and the school, and lack of ability to complete the high school; and (4b) "School related reasons, school behavior", includes feeling alienated or rejection, feeling of unsafe at school, dislike school, poor or negative peer or teacher relationships and poor social adjustment, lack of interest and motivation, lack of

Table 12

Frequent Reasons of Gifted Dropouts According to the Studies

REASONS

Personal Reasons ^a

- Desire of traveling
- Drug / alcohol problems
- Socially immature
- Behavior problems
- Reasons connected with citizenship (for minority students)
- Having friends who dropped out of high school
- Health, medical, or physical problems
- Had another problem

Home Related Reasons

- Needed at home
- Family instability or instability at home environment
- Desire to have a family; either planned to get married or got married
- Pregnancy or child-rearing
- Parent loss

Socioeconomic Reasons

- Economic pressures, need or desire to work or got a job
- Need to support the family
- Couldn't work and go to school at the same time

Table 12 (continued)

REASONS

School Related Reasons

Academic Achievement

Failure

Low achievement scores or grades and / or grade retardation

Administrative request; either suspended and / or expelled from school

Couldn't keep up with schoolwork

Inappropriate curricula for gifted students

Lack of counseling in high school and inadequate communication between the school and the home, and between the student and the school

Lack of ability to complete the high school

School Related Reasons

School Behavior

Feeling alienated or rejection

Feeling of unsafe at school

Dislike school

Poor or negative peer and / or teacher relationships and poor social adjustment

Lack of interest and motivation

Lack of attendance and truancy

Changed and didn't like the new school

^a One of the studies also details evidence that both working alone and living in a fantasy world might be the effects of gifted dropouts.

attendance and truancy, and transferred and did not like the new school.

Table 13 provides information about the frequency of the factors related to gifted dropouts. Statistics about these factors were given in odds ratios and t-test scores. The odds ratio for Caucasian samples was 0.28, African American samples was 0.52, Hispanic samples 0.53, Native American samples 1, and Migrant samples who were Asians and Pacific Islanders 0.22. The variables in this table are taken from one study, due to the reason that the entire sample of two studies was Caucasians, one study sampled African Americans, and the remainder except one, which stated that the gifted dropout rates were 40% for Caucasians, 53.4% for African Americans, and 6.6% for Migrants (Asians and Pacific Islanders), did not state any specific data related to their samples' race and ethnicity. According to one of the studies, Hispanic and Native American students were more likely to drop out of high school, while Caucasian gifted students were less likely to drop out.

According to the most common findings from the studies, factors affecting gifted underachievement can be collected under three categories. Table 14 provides information about the frequency of the factors affecting gifted underachievement. (1) "Sociopsychological and personal factors" includes social and behavior problems (66.6%), emotional problems or immaturity (50%), low self-esteem (33.3%), low social self concepts (8.3%), poor racial identity (16.6%), health or medical problems (33.3%), developmental delays (16.6%), specific or general learning disabilities (16.6%), cultural differences (8.3%), lack of organizational / study skills

Table 13

Frequency of the Factors Related to Gifted Dropouts

RACE / ETHNICITY	Odds ratio	t-test
Caucasian	0.28	- 2.01*
African American	0.52	- 0.09
Hispanic	0.53	- 0.85
Native American	1.00	N/A
Migrant ^a	0.22	- 1.81

Note. The variables in this table are taken from one study, due to the reason that the entire sample of two studies was Caucasians, one study was African Americans, and the remainder except one, which stated that the gifted dropout rates were 40% for Caucasians, 53.4 % for African Americans, and 6.6% for Migrants (Asians and Pacific Islanders), did not state any specific data related to their samples' race and ethnicity. According to one of the studies, Hispanic and Native American students were more likely to drop out of high school, while Caucasian gifted students were less likely to drop out.

^a Asian / Pacific Islanders.

* $p < 0.05$.

Table 14

Frequency of the Factors Affecting Gifted Underachievement

FACTORS	Frequency %
Sociopsychological and Personal Factors	
Social and behavior problems	66.6
Emotional problems or immaturity	50.0
Low self-esteem	33.3
Low social self concepts	8.3
Poor racial identity	16.6
Health or medical problems	33.3
Developmental delays	16.6
Specific ^a or general learning disabilities	16.6
Cultural differences	8.3
Lack of organizational / study skills	50.0
Gender differences	25.0
Perfectionism	16.6
Expectations (of self)	25.0
Personal competencies	16.6
Like to stay home with mother	16.6
Negative environmental influences	8.3
Fear of powerlessness or success syndrome	8.3

Table 14 (continued)

FACTORS	Frequency %
Family-Home Related Factors	
Stressful home environment	33.3
Low parental educational level	33.3
Family instability or parental problems ^b	50.0
Divorces or separations of parents	50.0
Parent loss or having single parent	33.3
Parenting skills and style	25.0
Low or unrealistic parental expectations	41.6
Poor parent – child relationship	16.6
Poor home – school communication	16.6
Low socioeconomic status	25.0
Desire or need to work	8.3
Sibling rivalry or negative sibling relationships	16.6
Adopted children in family	16.6
School Related Factors	
Lack of motivation	50.0
Negative attitude toward school, teacher or program, or disinterested in school	66.6
Learning style preferences are inconsistent with teaching styles	8.3
The lack of an appropriate curriculum	16.6
Poor student-teacher relationship	66.6

Table 14 (continued)

FACTORS	Frequency %
School Related Factors	
Poor peer relationship	66.6
Low expectations	33.3
Gifted program lacks or poor academic quality or not enough challenge provided by teacher	58.3
Lack racial and cultural diversity	8.3
Failure in training the personnel and teacher in gifted education	8.3
Little attention to multicultural education	8.3
Underrepresentation of minority students in gifted programs and services	8.3
Feeling alienated from teachers	16.6
Feeling alienated from classmates	16.6
Unfriendly or hostile classroom environment or feeling insecure at school	16.6
Specific or general academic skill deficits	8.3

^a Brain damage, cerebral dysfunction, neurological impairment. ^b Disagreements between parents over methods of raising the child, transference of problems of parents to the child, fears of the parents regarding the children's health and safety, over anxiety or protectiveness on the part of the parent, parental attitude toward the child related their academic achievement, family value system of education and work, the role of the parents as encourager and monitor for student progress, parents' uninterested attitude toward school, parental pressure, intolerant parental authority.

(50%), gender differences (25%), perfectionism (16.6%), expectations of self (25%), personal competencies (16.6%), preference to stay home with mother (16.6%), negative environmental influences (8.3%), and fear of powerlessness or success syndrome (98.3%); (2) "Family-home related" factors includes stressful home environment (33.3%), low parental educational level (33.3%), family instability or parental problems (50%), divorces or separations of parents (50%), parent loss or having single parent (33.3%), parenting skills and style (25%), low or unrealistic parental expectations (41.6%), poor parent – child relationship (16.6%), poor home – school communication (16.6%), low socioeconomic status (25%), desire or need to work (8.3%), sibling rivalry or negative sibling relationships (16.6%), and being an adopted children in family (16.6%); (3) "School related factors" includes lack of motivation (50%), negative attitude toward school, teacher or program, or disinterested in school (66.6%), learning style preferences are inconsistent with teaching styles (8.3%), the lack of an appropriate curriculum (16.6%), poor student-teacher relationship (66.6%), poor peer relationship (66.6%), low expectations (33.3%), gifted program lacks or poor academic quality or not enough challenge provided by teacher (58.3%), lack racial and cultural diversity (8.3%), failure in training the personnel and teacher in gifted education (8.3%), little attention to multicultural education (8.3%), underrepresentation of minority students in gifted programs and services (8.3%), feeling alienated from teachers (16.6%), feeling alienated from classmates (16.6%), unfriendly or hostile classroom environment or feeling insecure at school (16.6%), and specific or general academic skill deficits (8.3%).

Specific learning disabilities included brain damage, cerebral dysfunction, and neurological impairment, where parental problems included disagreements between parents over methods of raising the child, transference of problems of parents to the child, fears of the parents regarding the children's health and safety, over anxiety or protectiveness on the part of the

parent, parental attitude toward the child related their academic achievement, family value system of education and work, the role of the parents as encourager and monitor for student progress, parents' uninterested attitude toward school, parental pressure, and intolerant parental authority.

Discussion

This meta-analysis synthesized the results of 16 studies that examined gifted dropouts from high school. It also searched for data to describe subjects of the original studies, and rated the studies in terms of their quality based on nine quality determinants.

Sixteen studies reported 21 independent samples. The total number of identified subjects was 1025.

Several important factors emerged from this integration of research results from studies designed to evaluate the gifted student dropout from high school, the factors that affect their decision on dropping out, and the factors affecting to their underachievement.

Results and Conclusions

A number of characteristics of gifted dropouts were found in this study. First, the findings with respect to reasons for leaving school, there was evidence of failing school, disliking school, getting a job, or becoming pregnant, although there were many other related reasons. Especially, school related reasons such as disliking school or failing school were common reasons among both male and female groups. This finding was similar to the previous study from NCES, which included all ability groups. According to the NCES report (1994b), the

reasons for leaving school reported by dropouts were more often school related than job related or family related.

Second, the finding with respect to effects of gender and race, there was evidence of male dropouts were more likely to report leaving because of school expulsion or suspension than female dropouts. In addition, there was evidence of gifted students' educational aspirations were related to their dropping out of school. Also, reasons for male dropouts were more related to economic issues, while reasons for gifted female dropouts were more related to personal issues, although both males and females were likely to offer school related reasons. This report also indicated that there was an evidence of dropout rates varied by racial and ethnical background. The findings according to this research revealed that there was evidence of Hispanic and Native American students were more likely to drop out of high school, while Caucasian gifted students were less likely to drop out than other ethnic groups.

Finally, the finding with respect to the factors affecting underachievement, study results confirmed that many gifted underachievers were suffering from lack of the gifted program or having not enough challenge at school, poor student-teacher and student-peer relationship, bored or disinterested in school, parental instability or other parental problems, divorces or separations of the family and having a single parent, lack of motivation, lack of organizational and study skills, social, behavioral, and emotional problems or immaturity.

Suggestions

These studies focused on exploring general characteristics of gifted dropouts and examining personal and educational factors related to their dropout decision; however, the process of dropping out is longitudinal, and these factors interact with each other. Therefore, Renzulli and Park (2000) suggested that further research should examine not only important

factors, but also their causal relationship and interactions using a longitudinal path analysis technique. Similarly, Tinto (1975) and Sadowski (1987) suggested that future studies should be conducted again using cases from a variety of different ethnic groups and school districts in order to determine if similar influences and experiences resulted in gifted students dropping out of school. Also, follow-up studies should be conducted with the cases to follow their progress, as well as the future studies should look at the longitudinal process of dropout as reflected in longitudinal follow-up data rather than cross-sectional data.

Renzulli and Park (2000) also suggested that further study should develop instruments or behavior check lists that identify the potential gifted dropouts. These can provide a more practical guideline for teachers and school counselors. Recent research on dropouts has simply replicated the descriptive nature of earlier studies with more recent data. Such efforts are necessary and useful as a first step said Rumberger (1987), but to move beyond them will require overcoming the limitations of these earlier studies. Therefore, current and future research efforts need to move beyond these earlier efforts while building on them. That is, new research efforts should focus on developing multivariate, longitudinal, and comprehensive models of the causes and consequences of dropping out. Additional research effort is also needed in conducting systematic evaluations of dropout prevention and recovery programs (Rumberger).

Information lacks regarding the relationship between race and dropout issue (Tinto, 1975). Although it is clear that race is an independent predictor of dropout, it is still unclear in which ways this aggregate relationship occurs. It is not definitely known about the process of interaction that lead individuals of different racial backgrounds to drop out from higher education. It is suggested for future research to take these unknowns into the consideration by Tinto

(1975). In the light of all future references, it is unlikely that the dropout problem to disappear, however, concerted and cooperative efforts by educators, policymakers, and educational researchers can improve the understanding of the problem and help reduce its incidence (Rumberger, 1987).

References

- 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*, 5-15.
- Barrett, H. O. (1957). An intensive study of 32 gifted children. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI*, 192-194.
- Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (1989). *Education of the gifted and talented (2nd ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Davis, H. B. (1983). Self concept profiles of gifted underachievers. The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*(4), 893. (University Microfilms International No. 8413056)
- Delisle, J., & Berger, S. L. (1990). *Underachieving gifted students*. ERIC Digests in full text. Retrieved on February 11, 2002 from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed321483.html.
- Delisle, J. (1994). The top ten statements that should never again be made by advocates of gifted children. *Gifted Child Today Magazine, 17*(2), 34-35, 42.
- Dowdall, C. B., & Colangelo, N. (1982). Underachieving gifted students: review and implications. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 24*, 51-55.

- Dresher, R. H. (1954). Factors in voluntary drop-outs. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 287-289.
- Durr, W. (1964). *The gifted students*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emerick, L. J. (1992). Academic underachievement among gifted: Students' perceptions of factors that reverse the pattern. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 36, 140-146.
- Ford, D. Y., & Thomas, A. (1997). *Underachievement among gifted minority students: Problems and promises*. ERIC Digests in full text. Retrieved on February 11, 2002 from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed409660.html.
- French, J. (1968). The high intelligent dropout. *Accent on Talent*, 2, 3.
- French, J. (1969). Characteristics of high school dropouts. *National Association of Secondary Schools Principals Bulletin*, 53, 77.
- Gowan, J. C. (1955). The underachieving gifted child—a problem for everyone. *Exceptional Children*, 21, 247-249, 271.
- Gowan, J. C. (1957). Dynamics of the underachievement of gifted students. *Exceptional Children*, 24, 98-100.
- Layton, W. (1952). *Special services for the drop-out and the potential drop-out*. Publication No. 408, National Child Labor Committee.
- Livingston, A. H. (1958). High-school graduates and dropouts: A new look at a persistent problem. *The School Review*, 195-203.
- Lobosco, A. (1992). *Individual, school, and community correlates of high school graduation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Chicago.
- Mansfield, R. S., Busse, T.V., & Krepelka, E. J. (1978). The effectiveness of creativity training. *Review of Educational Research*, 48, 517-536.

- Martin, D. L., Jr. (1981). *Identifying potential dropouts: A research report*. Frankfort, KY; Kentucky State department of education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED216304)
- Massey, S. R., & Crosby, J. (1982). *Study of George Valley high school dropout program*. Scarborough, ME: New England Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED220768)
- McCall, R. B., Evahn, C., & Kratzer, L. (1992). *High school underachievers*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCreary, W., & Kitch, D. (1953). Now hear youth. *Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, XXII*, 27-44. National Center for Education Statistics.
- (1994). *National education longitudinal study: 1988 / 94: Data Files 1 and Electronic Codebook System (NELS 88)*. Washington, DC: the US Department of Education's Publications Center.
- Noth, N., & O'Neill, B. (1981). *Dropout identification: A preliminary study of the Pasco School District*. (ERIC Document reproduction Service No. ED215013)
- Passow, H. A., & Goldberg, M. (1958). Study of underachieving gifted. *Educational Leadership, XVI*, 121-125.
- Raph, J. B., Goldberg, M. L., & Passow, A. H. (1966). *Bright underachievers: Studies of scholastic underachievement among intellectually superior high school students*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Park, S. (2000). Gifted Dropouts: The who and the why. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 44*, 138-143.

- Rimm, S., & Lowe, B. (1988). Family environments of underachieving gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 32*, 353-359.
- Robertson, E. (1991). Neglected dropouts: The gifted and talented. *Equity and Excellence, 25*(1), 62-74.
- Roth, R. M., & Meyersburg, A. (1963). The non-achievement syndrome. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXIV*, 535-540.
- Rumberger, R. W. (1981). *Why kids dropout of schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the America Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Rumberger, R. W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 101-121.
- Sadowski, A. J. (1987). A case study of the experiences of and influences upon gifted high school dropouts. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*(4), 893. (University Microfilms International No. AAC87-16185)
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1985). *Statistical abstract of the United States, 1986* (196th ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1993). *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Department of Education. (1996). *High school dropout rates*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved on February 11, 2002 from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/OR/ConsumerGuides/dropout.html>.

- U. S. Department of Labor. (1960). *School and early employment experience of youth: A report on seven communities, 1952-57*. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1277. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Office of Education. (1972). *Education of the gifted and talented*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- VanDyke, L., & Hoyte, K. (1958). University of Iowa. Iowa State Department of Public Instruction.
- 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.
- Voss, H. L., Wendling, A., & Elliot, D. S. (1966). Some types of high school dropouts. *Journal of Educational Research*, 59, 363-368.
- Warner, O. R. (1964). The scholastic ability of school dropouts. *Selected Report and Statistics on School Dropouts*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Watson, C. (1976). *Focus on dropouts*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Whitmore, J. R. (1980). *Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Whitmore, J. R. (1985). *Underachieving gifted students*. ERIC Digests in full text. Retrieved on February 11, 2002 from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed262526.html.