Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Learning and Development
ISSN 2164-4063
2020, Vol. 10, No. 1

The Status of Teaching Gifted Students in King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence

Dr. Yahya Al-Dhaimat (Corresponding author)

Department of Special Education

Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Ma'an, Jordan

E-mail: dhamity@gmail.com

Dr. Raed Omar Salah

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Ma'an, Jordan

Dr. khaled Asheq Abutayeh

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Ma'an, Jordan

Received: November 17, 2019 Accepted: January 7, 2020 Published: February 5, 2020

doi:10.5296/ijld.v10i1.16135 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v10i1.16135

Abstract

The present study aimed to identify the reality of teaching gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence in southern Jordan. The study sample consisted of (98) primary, middle and high school teachers. The results of the study indicated that the level of teaching related to (teaching strategies, physical environment, classroom environment, teacher-specific competencies, and assessment techniques) was high and that the level of teaching of gifted students related to the teaching aids was average. The results of the study also showed that there were no statistically significant differences due to gender, age, academic qualification and specialization variables. Moreover, there were statistically significant differences in the level of teaching attributed to the years of experience variable in favor of those who have less than 5 years of experience. In addition, they showed that there were statistically significant differences in level of teaching among teachers of 20 years of experience and above in relation

to the domain of assessment methods. This is attributed to the cumulative experience of teachers as a result of years of experience and the diversity of evaluation methods. As to the gender variable, the results showed no differences in the total dimensions except for the physical environment and the qualifications of the teacher. Thus, this indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the gender variable amongthe teachers of gifted students in favor of female teachers. Furthermore, the researchers recommended that all teachers of gifted students should be trained through holding training courses and workshops to enhance the knowledge and enrichment content of teachers. They also recommended that there is a need to continuously develop the physical environment surrounding gifted students in the schools for excellence in southern Jordan.

Keywords: status of teaching, gifted students, King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence.

1. Introduction

Developed countries have recognized those gifted students are one of the pillars of their developmentrepertoire as they have enhanced the status of these countries to occupy prestigious global positions among countries in all fields. Therefore, developed countries devoted their efforts to care for them by revealing their talents and organizing educational programs consistent with their abilities and development, as well as studying their attributes, needs, problems and ways of upbringing. Moreover, the developed countries paid great attention to the methods of their educational, psychological, social and professional care.

The school environment, which is rich in learning resources and opportunities to discover the students' preparations and interests, is regarded the infrastructure of the gifted student, school program that aims at developing thinking and creativity; how to discover a student who is willing to excel in computer or music without a computer or musical instruments? (Jurwan, 2002).

A successful school is a school that has the competencies that qualify it to be effective, which makes it credible and trusted by the community. Nevertheless, there are schools that do not perform their mission optimally because of internal factors specific to the schools or to external factors. Therefore, many educational systems have called to improve the effectiveness of school as a criterion for school success or failure (Orloske, 1984; Sammons, 1996).

Effectiveness in education refers to the progress and intellectual, educational and social development, and the degree of achieving the desired goal in the educational process (Bacchus et al., 1991). An effective school has teachers with high expectations for their students' success, the ability to use appropriate teaching strategies, and develop positive relationships between teachers and parents (Feldman, 1984). In other words, the effectiveness in educational institutions can not only be a matter of outcomes of achievement, but also includes judgments about the effectiveness of achieving the intended goals in the educational process.

The programs of outstanding and gifted students need clear thinking in terms of preparation, qualified teachers to work with this group, and material and moral support, as providing these resources leads to students obtaining high quality education (O'Donovan, 2007).

Some believe that gifted students are smart enough that they can work their way effortlessly and without any help, but it has been shown that the gifted who are denied specially designed educational opportunities fail to maximize their potential (Scheerens *et al*., 2003).

The education and care of gifted students need a suitable school environment starting from the good choice of the place, then equipping it with all required equipment. Therefore, the classrooms must be large, well-ventilated and lit, equipped with furniture and equipment, and the corner for the projectors, cameras, computers, television, video and other equipment (Alsrur, 1998).

The process of evaluating gifted programs has proven to be a powerful tool that serves several objectives. Evaluation can be a powerful incentive for development because it helps in the future to provide better programs for students and provides recommendations for growth and expansion (Smntney, 2003).

Educational institutions will not be able to pursue developments and interest in scientific research unless there is an appropriate innovative environment (Aqbor, 2008; Fkhrw,2005) indicated that the school environment suffers from deficiencies in some aspects and that quick action should be taken to fill these shortcomings and gaps. There is an urgent need to improve the environment of the school even if it requires a change in educational policies and plans with the need to work to encourage students' talents.

The increased interest of educators in evaluating the curriculum offered to them in order to provide decision-makers. This evaluation usually helps in improving the understanding of program performance by providing data for all aspects of performance and explaining the reasons for the observed performance or failure to achieve the objectives or the overall impact of the programs (Hill, 2008).

In order for the learning process to make optimal use of computer technology, a number of factors must be considered; these include the technology infrastructure and teachers. The teachers' use of technology is influenced by several factors that can be categorized into external environmental factors and teachers' personal attributes. The school which has enough technological basis may not succeed to provide technology-supported education if teachers do not want to do so and do not adopt positive attitudes towards the use of technology in education (Kahveci et al., 2011).

Osborn (1996) pointed out to the need of gifted children for challenging education and the importance of providing them with appropriate curricula that consider their higher mental abilities. Education goals and activities should include techniques related to the talented ones such as critical and creative thinking, creative writing, and independent research projects. These activities should prevail the classroom throughout the school day, so the classroom environment should be prepared for this purpose.

Therefore, the American Association of Gifted Students (ASTA) standards were established in 1998, with the aim of defining the procedures that departments and educational institutions must adhere to on how to provide educational services to gifted students. At present, this set is considered the official standards for the education of gifted students in the United States. These

standards are periodically amended by the Standards Committee to ensure that they are up to date with the latest developments in the educational field (Matthews &Shaunessy, 2010). These standards include: identifying and discovering gifted students, designing educational programs, curriculum design, choice of teaching strategies, management and organization of educational programs, meeting the social and emotional needs of students, professional development of educators, and evaluation of programs (Aljughaiman, 2011).

Teachers of gifted students should be trained and prepared to identify specific rules that are consistent with the talent area in which their program is designed to be served; these rules should be specific and include attributes associated with them.Such training will eventually improve the programs of gifted students (Siegle et al., 2010).

Most educators point to the importance of the existence of a philosophy for curriculum, and the curriculum of the gifted is also based on a philosophy close to the goals of the community and the aspirations of its gifted members. Pasca, Van Tassel and Tamra (2007) cited a set of philosophical approaches to what gifted curricula can be: curriculum as a process of developing thinking processes, a technical process, a process of character building, social reconstruction, and a process of functionally making education as a process of professional habilitation.

Many specialists and researchers in the field, the expansion of the publishing movement, the use of experimental research methods, and other factors have necessarily led to the provision of different models of application. Therefore, it is found that the school services for the gifted students start from the provision of additional activities and courses such as personal arrangements and initiatives that benefit students, whether gifted or not, and the use of advanced methods of acceleration, enrichment and assembly (Hertzberg& Holly, 2009).

Therefore, taking these considerations into account, gifted students' education programs can contribute to the achievement of the continuing professional development of a teacher by developing the competencies necessary to perform his/her work with this group of students (Subotnik&Rickoff, 2010). Gifted children need educational services based on their unique psychological and educational needs and to be given the opportunity to experience independence, self-direction, and self-discipline in their learning process (Berman et al., 2012).

Several studies pointed to the need for teachers of gifted students to practice modern teaching methods with their gifted students. They also indicated to the urgent need to develop teaching methods for gifted students. For instance, a study by Ramsey and ALgozzme (2005) showed that there is a difference between teachers in America, including talented teachers, in their mastery of effective teaching methods. The study recommended that there should be intensive training programs to raise their efficiency in effective teaching methods. Another example is the study of Johnsen and Van-Baska (2007) which recommended that there is a need to develop national standards which teachers of gifted students must have, most notably of which are the use appropriate teaching strategies, enhancing student performance and achievement, and providing teacher training programs to achieve this.

Teachers today are encouraged to adopt new teaching practices. At present, the task of the

teacher is to encourage positive qualities of motivation among students and prepare them for their future lives. Gifted students, for instance, must be kept busy throughout the day to avoid getting bored and teachers should use interesting teaching methods that help achieving this goal (Rosicka & Mayerova, 2014).

Lewi *et al*. (2007) found several findings, the most important of which is the integration of services into homogeneous classrooms, although methods and distinctive content are not integrated into the general curriculum. The study aimed to identify the reality of gifted care, and concluded that the content of the current gifted care programs is somewhat relevant to the needs of gifted students, and that the most commonly used method in teaching them is brainstorming, discussion and problem solving followed by collaborative education and critical thinking (Alkasy, 2004).

Studies have confirmed that the use of technology in schools is only partially successful despite the availability of infrastructure for information and communication technology in education. They also showed that there are many factors that influence the effectiveness of computer use in schools (Padmavathi, 2016).

The study of Aimer and Lassie (1998) aimed to identify the views of teachers about the gifted students, their problems and teaching methods suitable for them. The sample of the study consisted of (43) teachers for gifted students, and found that the teaching methods are based on individual participation, school competitions, thinking based on ability and diversity, and their own classrooms. The study revealed some of the difficulties faced by the gifted, the most important of which are: the raising of questions, discussion of the teacher and criticism of others.

The study of Van Tassel (2006) showed that the field of gifted education might be vulnerable to loss of infrastructure at local levels if there is no development of program over the next few years for the areas understudy. The study identified the main areas of program development: curriculum, program design, professional development for teachers, and the involvement of parents in evaluation. It, moreover, emphasized the importance of program evaluation and paying attention to improving the quality of programs for the gifted students.

Easterl (2001) conducted a study aimed at evaluating the education programs of gifted and distinguished students in primary education in Texas. The results showed that the education programs for gifted and distinguished students in the state need to be developed and coordinated with specialized centers for the education of gifted and distinguished in other states. In addition, the results also showed that there is a shortage of teachers specialized in gifted and distinguished education. Moreover, they showed that there are some obstacles that face the implementation of gifted and distinguished education programs in primary education including: the rigidity of the curriculum, the lack of enrichment programs for the gifted students, the need for the multiplicity of standards, and the necessary tools for the detection of gifted and distinguished students.

Another study suggests that the professional competencies of a gifted student's teacher include a high level of skills in: teaching, analytical and critical thinking, problem solving, creativity

and innovation, positive interaction with students, appropriate motivational techniques, conduct student-oriented activities and facilitate independent research within the school (Cheung &Hui, 2011).

The results of the study, conducted by Fatma et al. (2007), indicated that gifted programs are limited in Islamic schools in America, and that the majority of teachers have a weak distinction between gifted and ordinary students. They are unable to differentiate between the application of curriculum and teaching strategies with gifted and ordinary students. The study found that 74% of teachers in American Islamic schools for gifted students believe that there are talented students in the class, but they do not adjust their strategies in education to suit the needs of gifted students and that the degree of adjustment of strategies in some is very limited.

The study of Almaharmah (2009) aimed to evaluate the programs of King Abdullah II schools for excellence in the light of international standards for the education of gifted students. The results of the study pointed out that the policies, criteria and procedures used in the identification of gifted students, the enrichment methods used, and the conditions for the selection of teachers were identical to a low degree with international standards. Furthermore, the study showed that teachers did not undergo enough training courses.

Leavitt and Geake (2009) study found that teachers who received the professional training and development program felt able to make a difference in the curriculum for students identified as gifted. The study indicated that factors such as "motivation, personality, environmental opportunities, and educational and technical support" are strongly related to gifted education programs to meet the multiple educational development needs of those children, which go beyond simple academic and intellectual needs (Schaeffer, 2015).

Kaplan (2003) also conducted a study aimed at paying attention to the teaching methods that must be mastered by the teacher, and not only limited to the content of knowledge. Among the modern methods that the study focused on is the Socratic dialogues, research skills, and problem-solving creative ways by William Gordon and others, where diversity in the use of teaching methods is important.

Mills' (2003) study aims to identify the attributes of teachers for gifted students. The study dealt with a range of cognitive, scientific and personal competencies, and concluded to focus on the personal and cognitive qualities that the study considered to have an impact in the education of gifted students since the personality of the teacher is reflected on his performance inside the classroom.

The study of Bain, Bourgeois and Pappas (2003) tackled the conditions of gifted people in the southern United States and the importance of incorporating programs for the training of gifted teachers. The following are the theoretical bases for caring for the gifted: goals and theories, higher thinking areas in Bloom's taxonomy, creative thinking skills, employing technological means and computers with the gifted, and the mechanism of using enrichment programs. Some of the surveys in this study indicated that enrichment programs are one of the most important services that a teacher can provide to the gifted at school, and that the teacher needs an intensive training on their design and implementation.

1.1 Problem and Questions of the Study

In the past years, the world has witnessed remarkable progress in the development of knowledge, technology and science, which has had the greatest impact in prompting many societies to introduce many tangible changes in their policies and teaching methods in order to keep pace with this scientific and technological progress. The researchers believe that investing in human minds is one of the most important types of investment, especially in the field of talent, because of its positive effects that benefit society in a profound way and make it among the advanced societies. The gifted are a group with special abilities and are therefore in need of modern curriculum teaching methods, as the current methods do not meet their needs, preferences and desires, especially their desire for online and distance education.

The researchers also believe, within the scope of their work and interest in gifted care programs, in the need to assess the reality of schools for the gifted and the extent to which they keep abreast of recent developments in teaching methods and evaluation, as well as the availability of a suitable physical environment to embrace this group of students. Jordan started to open specialized schools for talented people in all governorates without pre-qualification for teachers and preparation for special school environment for these students> For this reason, it was necessary to evaluate this reality scientifically through the teachers of these schools, and to know the general policies, criteria, and procedures used by gifted teachers, the enrichment curricula, and conditions for selecting teachers in these schools.

Therefore, the study attempts to identify the true reality of the school environment in full detail from the teachers' point of view.

The study questions are as follows:

1. What is the reality of teaching gifted students in King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence in Southern Jordan?

2. Are there any statistically significant differences in the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers in King Abdullah II schools for excellence in southern Jordan to the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to variables of (age, gender, educational qualification, specialization in bachelor, and years of experience).

2. Methods

The study followed the descriptive survey methodology because of its relevance for the purposes of the present study. In order to achieve the study objectives, the researchers designed a questionnaire to evaluate the reality of teaching the gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence after reviewing the literature review. The questionnaire consisted of (83) items distributed on different sub-domains. The specific areas of the questionnaire were determined in the light of the objective for which it was designed and according to the study questions. These areas are: physical environment, teaching methods, teaching aids used, classroom environment, specific competencies of the teacher and the evaluation methods.

2.1 Population and Sample of the Study

The study population consisted of (127) male and female teachers who are teaching different subjects such as math's, sciences, history and languages of gifted students at King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence in southern Jordan. The sample of the study consisted of (98) male and female teachers.

2.2 The Study Tool

In order to determine the dimensions and items, the study tool was designed in its initial form, where the study tool was sent to ten arbitrators with specialization in the field of special education and psychological measurement. After making a set of proposed amendments, the final version of the questionnaire consisted of eighty-three items that measure six dimensions.

This study aimed to assess the reality of teaching gifted students from the perspective of teachers in the South of Jordan, and in the light of the understanding of the researchers and after reviewing the relevant previous studies. In order to derive the domains and items expressing the trends, the study tool was designed in its initial form. The study tool was presented to ten reviewers with specialization in the field of special education and psychological measurement. After a set of proposed amendments, the questionnaire includes eighty-three items within six domains (Almaharmah, 2009 ,Al kasy,2004 , National Association for Gifted children,2010)

2.3 Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

To verify the validity and reliability of the study tool, the researchers used the following methods:

Validity of the structural consistency of the domains of study:

Table (1) shows the correlation coefficients between the rate of each domain of study with the overall average of the questionnaire items, which shows that the correlation coefficients are functionally significant at the level ($a \leq 0.05$).

The researchers used the method of Cronbach Alpha to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. It was shown that the reliability coefficients for all domains of the questionnaire were 0.892, which was high.

Table 1. Correlations Coefficient among variables

Domains	Correlations coefficient	Sig.
Physical environment	0.792*	0.000*
Teaching Methods	0.863*	0.000*
Media of education	0.920*	0.000*
Classroom environment	0.608*	0.000*
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	0.807*	0.000*
Assessment Methods	0.884*	0.000*

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

3. Results and Discussion

To answer the first question, the mean and standard deviations were extracted as in Table (2):

Table **2**. The means and slandered deviations for teachers' scores

Domains	**M**	**SD**
Teaching Methods	3.759	0.610
Classroom environment	3.679	0.655
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	3.633	0.570
Physical environment	3.322	0.5966
Assessment Methods	3.300	0.695
Media of education	2.602	0.896
TOTAL	3.382	0.653

The table shows the reality of teaching of the gifted students in the schools of King Abdullah II for excellence according to the domains of study and the order of their means as follows: (teaching methods, classroom environment, specific qualifications of the teacher, physical environment, methods of evaluation, teaching aids used). It is noted that the domain of teaching methods was ranked first in the reality of teaching gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence, with an average of (3.759) followed by the classroom environment with an average of (3.679), the specific qualifications of the teacher with an average of (6.633), the physical environment with an average of (3.322), the assessment methods with an average of (3.300), and the teaching aids used with an average of (2.602), respectively.

The researchers attribute these results in their sequence to the importance given by the Ministry of Education to developing the teaching process for gifted students to suit their desires and interests. It has conducted several training programs in the Kingdom to raise the efficiency of the gifted students' teacher, especially in the field of modern teaching methods for the gifted.In addition to training them on the modern and important strategies such as the strategy of brainstorming and the development of critical and creative thinking.

But regarding the specific competencies of the teacher, the development of pre-service and in-service programs to prepare and train teachers of gifted students and providing them with the necessary competencies according to the standards of the American Association for the Gifted Education could be the reason for the high reality of teaching gifted students in this domain.

As to the classroom environment, the Ministry of Education adopts a safe and supportive environment that plays an important role in raising the educational level of gifted studentsand

their motivation for education through the diversification of strategies and methods of modern teaching, which necessarily need modern and innovative means. This led to the rise of the reality of teaching of gifted students in the field of teaching aids. The development of the focus—given by the educational process—to the most important results, namely, the outcomes of the educational process and the final level of performance of the students, to the high level of the reality of teaching of the gifted students in the domain of assessment methods.

While the physical environment is attributed to the great responsibility of the Ministry to develop the physical environment for the education of gifted students through the establishment of private schools and academies to educate the gifted and distinguished students in accordance with international standards. The mediation of the reality of the teaching of gifted students in the field of the physical environment in the Kingdom of Jordan could be attributed to the weakness of effective financial support and the presence or specific priorities in relation to the reality of the teaching of gifted students related to the physical environment and the modernity of their welfare programs.

Are there any statistically significant differences in the reality of teaching gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence in the southern region due to the variables of (age, gender, educational qualification, bachelor's specialization, and years of experience)? To answer this question, the following were calculated:

First: The differences between the mean responses of the study sample on the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers to the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to the age variable as shown in Table (3).

Table 3. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Teachers' Age level

Age		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical environment	Between Groups	1.963	2	.981	2.862	.062
	Within Groups	32.570	95	.343		
	Total	34.533	97			
Teaching Methods	Between Groups	.509	2	.254	.678	.510
	Within Groups	35.627	95	.375		
	Total	36.136	97			
Media of education	Between Groups	.009	2	.004	.005	.995
	Within Groups	78.034	95	.821		
	Total	78.042	97			

Classroom environment	Between Groups	2.962	2	1.481	3.636	.030
	Within Groups	38.687	95	.407		
	Total	41.649	97			
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	Between Groups	.336	2	.168	.511	.601
	Within Groups	31.224	95	.329		
	Total	31.560	97			
Assessment Methods	Between Groups	.762	2	.381	.785	.459
	Within Groups	46.096	95	.485		
	Total	46.857	97			

The One-Way ANOVAtest was used to test the differences between the mean responses on the level of gifted students' teachers' knowledge of the reality of gifted teaching in King Abdullah II schools for excellence attributed to age variable.

The results indicate that there are no differences between the mean responses on the level of gifted students' teachers' knowledge of the reality of teaching gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence attributed to the age variable at the significance level of ($a \leq 0.0$) except for the classroom environment as there are statistically significant differences.

The researchers attribute the lack of differences between the average responses in the study population in King Abdullah II schools for excellence to the great development in knowledge in the teaching methods used to develop gifted students that occurred in previous years, and this was also a reason for the trend of differences for the age group from 20 to 30, in the domain of the environment classroom where this age group often has the motivation to teach and learn about modern teaching strategies, the positive outlook of the classroom and the lack of psychological burning of the modern teaching profession.

Second: Differences between the mean of the responses of the study sample on the level of knowledge of teachers of gifted students to the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to the gender variable.

Means and standard deviations for the level of knowledge of the reality of gifted students were calculated according to the gender variable, as shown in Table (4).

Table 4. T-test analysis of variables and gender

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
Physical environment	Female	60	3.4071	.62689	.066
	Male	38	3.1880	.52579	
Teaching Methods	Female	60	3.7515	.68968	.085
	Male	38	3.7727	.46679	
Media of education	Female	60	2.7750	.91301	.013
	Male	38	2.3289	.80927	
Classroom environment	Female	60	3.4818	.72810	.043
	Male	38	3.7344	.49008	
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	female	60	3.6667	.64128	.043
	Male	38	3.5806	.43880	
Assessment Methods	female	60	3.1861	.75436	.041
	Male	38	3.4803	.55190	

The T-test was used to test the differences between the mean responses of respondents about the level of gifted students' teachers' knowledge of the reality of gifted students attributed to the gender variable.

The results in Table (4) indicate that there are no differences in the total domains except the domain of the physical environment and the competencies of the teacher. This indicates to the presence of statistically significant differences in the gender variable for the teachers of gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence at the level of significance of ($a \leq 0.0$) and that the differences are in favor of female teachers.

The researchers attribute this to the differences in the reality of teaching gifted students between male and female teachers attributed to differences in motivation, love of work and the desire to give.

Third: Differences between the mean of the responses of the study sample on the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers to the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to the variable of educational qualification.

Means and standard deviations of the level of knowledge of the reality of gifted students were calculated according to the educational qualification variable, as shown in Table (5).

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Teachers' Education level

Education		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical environment	Between Groups	2.084	2	1.042	3.050	.052
	Within Groups	32.450	95	.342		
	Total	34.533	97			
Teaching Methods	Between Groups	1.233	2	.616	1.677	.192
	Within Groups	34.904	95	.367		
	Total	36.136	97			
Media of education	Between Groups	.872	2	.436	.537	.586
	Within Groups	77.170	95	.812		
	Total	78.042	97			
Classroom environment	Between Groups	1.257	2	.629	1.478	.233
	Within Groups	40.392	95	.425		
	Total	41.649	97			
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	Between Groups	.767	2	.383	1.183	.311
	Within Groups	30.793	95	.324		
	Total	31.560	97			
Assessment Methods	Between Groups	.400	2	.200	.409	.666
	Within Groups	46.458	95	.489		
	Total	46.857	97			

The One-Way ANOVE test was used to test the differences between the mean responses of the respondents about the level of gifted teachers' knowledge of the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to the qualification variable.

The results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between the qualification variables (Bachelor, Higher Diploma, Master and higher) for the teachers of gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence at the level of significance of (a≤ 0.05). The researchers attribute these findings to the importance of gifted student teachers' knowledge of the reality of gifted teaching, as bachelor's or master's degree holders are likely to have undergone many specialized training courses in the teaching methods of gifted students.

Fourth: Differences between the mean responses of the study sample on the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers to the reality of teaching gifted students attributed to the variable of specialization in the bachelor. The means and standard deviations of the level of knowledge of the reality of gifted students were calculated according to the variable of specialization in the bachelor level, as shown in Table (6).

Table 6. T-test analyses of variables and Study specialization

Study specialization		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig
Physical environment	Scientific	39	3.4524	.59634	.079
	Literary	59	3.2361	.58606	
Teaching Methods	Scientific	39	3.7552	.68608	.095
	Literary	59	3.7627	.56091	
Media of education	Scientific	39	2.6378	1.02429	.075
	Literary	59	2.5784	.81039	
Classroom environment	Scientific	39	3.6678	.65124	.282
	Literary	59	3.5216	.65693	
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	Scientific	39	3.5865	.67003	
	Literary	59	3.6642	.49756	.512
Assessment Methods	Scientific	39	3.3440	.67975	
	Literary	59	3.2712	.70924	.614

The T-test was used to test the differences between the mean responses of the respondents about the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers to the impact of teaching gifted students attributed to the variable of specialization in the bachelor (scientific stream – humanities stream).

The results indicate that there is no difference between the means of the responses of the

respondents about the level of knowledge of the teachers of gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence to the reality of gifted teaching attributed to the variable of specialization in the bachelor.

The researchers attribute the previous results to the lack of statistically significant differences in the responses of teachers of gifted students in King Abdullah II schools for excellence attributed to the variable of specialization in the bachelor in favor of the training plans prepared for the preparation of gifted student teachers based on the standards of competencies of gifted students' teachers prepared by the Ministry of Education, which relies on a training plan whose ultimate outcome is to prepare the teacher appropriately to carry out the tasks and duties of teaching gifted and distinguished students. Moreover, these training plans for teachers of gifted students adopt the same principles and the training procedures regardless of the specialization (scientific stream – humanities stream). Both graduates from these colleges will work with talented students each according to his specialization (scientific - humanities), and this is probably the holders of bachelor's degree at the college of humanities or scientific colleges have undergone many training courses on the methods of teaching gifted students.

Fifth: Differences between the mean of the responses of the study sample on the level of knowledge of gifted students' teachers to the reality of the teaching of gifted students attributed to the variable of the years of experience.

The means and standard deviations of the level of knowledge of the reality of gifted students were calculated according to the variable of the years of experience, as shown in Table (7).

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Teachers' yearsof experience

Yearsof experience		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical environment	Between Groups	3.831	4	.958	2.901	.026
	Within Groups	30.702	93	.330		
	Total	34.533	97			
Teaching Methods	Between Groups	1.722	4	.430	1.163	.332
	Within Groups	34.414	93	.370		
	Total	36.136	97			
Media of education	Between Groups	5.152	4	1.288	1.643	.170
	Within Groups	72.890	93	.784		

	Total	78.042	97			
Classroom environment	Between Groups	5.339	4	1.335	3.418	.012
	Within Groups	36.310	93	.390		
	Total	41.649	97			
Qualitative qualifications of the teacher	Between Groups	2.076	4	.519	1.637	.171
	Within Groups	29.483	93	.317		
	Total	31.560	97			
Assessment Methods	Between Groups	4.928	4	1.232	2.733	.034
	Within Groups	41.929	93	.451		
	Total	46.857	97			

The One-Way ANOVA test was used to test the differences between the mean responses on the level of gifted teachers' knowledge of the reality of their teaching attributed to the variable of years of experience.

The results in Table (8) indicate that there are statistically significant differences in the level of gifted student teachers' knowledge of the reality of gifted students attributed to variable of the years of experience (less than 5 years, more than 5 years, and less than 10years, more than 10 years) at the significance level of 0.0 in King Abdullah II Schools for Excellence.

The researchers attribute these results to the novelty of the specialization of gifted education, the motivation they have is higher than those who have more years of experience, and that the information they have is up to date through pre-service and in-service training programs. The differences were in favor of those with less than 5 years of experience. The results of the study also indicated that there are statistically significant differences among teachers of 20 years of experience and more. This is due to the cumulative experience of teachers as a result of years of experience and the diversity of evaluation methods.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The study indicated that the level of teaching related to (teaching strategies, physical environment, classroom environment, teacher-specific competencies, and assessment techniques) was high and that the level of teaching of gifted students related to the teaching aids was average. The study showed that there were no statistically significant differences due to gender, age, academic qualification and specialization variables. Moreover, there were statistically significant differences in the level of teaching attributed to the years of experience

variable in favor of those who have less than 5 years of experience. In addition, they showed that there were statistically significant differences in level of teaching among teachers of 20 years of experience and above in relation to the domain of assessment methods. This is attributed to the cumulative experience of teachers as a result of years of experience and the diversity of evaluation methods. As to the gender variable, the results showed no differences in the total dimensions except for the physical environment and the qualifications of the teacher.

The study has the following recommendation.

- All teachers of gifted students should be trained through holding training courses and workshops to enhance the knowledge and enrichment content of teachers.
- There is a need to continuously develop the physical environment surrounding gifted students in the schools for excellence in southern Jordan.

References

Aljughaiman, A. M. (2011). Evaluation of math and science summer enrichment programs in Saudi Arabia. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 20*(2), 1-20.

Almaharmah, L. (2009). *Evaluation of King Abdullah II Schools of Excellence Programs in the Light of Global Standards for Gifted Education*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Faculty of Educational Studies, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies.

Aimer, D., & Lassie, B. (1998). *Teacher opinion about the nature of giftedness*, Eric Identifier 429373.

Alsrur, N. H. (1998). *Introduction to the education of outstanding and talented*. Dar Al-Fikr for printing, Publishing and Distribution, Jordan.

Al kasy, A. (2004). *The Reality of Gifted Students in Gifted Care Centers in Some Educational Areas*, Unpublished Master Thesis, College of Education, Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.

Aqbor. (2008). Emmanuel creativity and innovation: the leadership dynamics. *Journal of strategic leadership*, Reyent University.

Bain, S., Bourgeois, S., & Pappas, D. (2003). Linking theoretical models to actual practices: A survey of teachers in gifted education. *Roeper Review, 25*(4), 166-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190309554224

Berman, K., Schultz, R., & Weber, C. (2012). A lack of awareness and emphasis in preservice teacher training: Preconceived beliefs about the gifted and talented. *Gifted Child Today, 35*(1), 18-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217511428307

Scheerens, J. , Glas, C., & Thomas, S. M. (2003). *Educational Evaluation, Assessment and Monitoring: A Systematic Approach*. Swets & Zeitlinger: United Kingdom.

Cheung, H., & Hui, S. (2011). Competencies and characteristics for teaching gifted students: A comparative study of Beijing and Hong Kong teachers. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 55*(2),

139-148. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986210397832

Easterl, K. S. (2001). *The state of elementary gifted and talented education in the state of Texas* (Ph.D. Thesis, Sam Houston State University, USA).

Frost, P. (2005). The CTY summer school model: evolvement, adaptation and extrapolation at the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth (England), *High Ability Studies, 16*(1), 137-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598130500115379

Fkhrw, A. (2005). The needs of gifted students in the different levels of education from the school environment. *A paper presented to the Fourth Scientific Conference for the Care of the Gifted and Outstanding*, Amman, Jordan.

Hertzberg-D, H. (2009). Myth 7: Differentiation in the Regular Classroom Is Equivalent to Gifted Programs and Is Sufficient - Classroom Teachers Have the Time، the Skill، and the Will to Differentiate Adequately. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, (53), (251-253).

Hill, A. (2008), *AK-12 gifted program evaluation and the evaluator district-university gifted program evaluation model*. PH Thesis. Saint Louis University, AAT,33324169.

Jurwan, F. (2002). M*ethods for the detection and care of talented people*. Dar Al Fikr, Amman.

Kaplan, S. (2003). Is there a gifted-child pedagogy? *Roeper Review, 25*(4), 165. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190309554223

Kahveci, A., Sahin, N., & Genc, S. (2011). Computer perceptions of secondary school teachers and impacting demographics: A Turkish perspective. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 10*(1), 71-80.

Lewi, J., Crosier, P., & Hall, C. (2007). Impact of Two Elementary School Principals' Leadership on Gifted Education in Their Buildings. *Gifted Education Today, 30*(2), 56-62. https://doi.org/10.4219/gct-2007-35

Leavitt, M., & Geake, J (2009). Giftedness perceptions and practices of teachers in Lithuania. *Gifted and Talented International, 24*(2), 139-148.

Millls, C. J. (2003). Characteristics of effective teachers of gifted students: Teacher background and personality styles of student. *Gifted Child Quarterly. 47*(4), 272 . https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620304700404

National Association for Gifted children (2010). Characteristics of Gifted children. Retrieved form http://www.nagc.org/resources publications/resources/my-child-gifted/common-characteristics-gifted-individuals/traits.

Nicole, S., & Frank, C. (2008). Academically Talented Students' Attitudes toward Service in the Community. *Gifted Child quarterly, 52*(2), 170-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986208316038

Osborn, J. (1996). Special educational needs of gifted and talented children. *Youth Mental Health Update, 8* (4), 7.

Pasca, J., van tassel, & stampa, T. (2007) The comprehensive approach for gifted students translated by: Hussein or riach on. Amman, Dar Al Fikr.

Ramsey, R., & Algozzme, B. (2005). Teacher Competency Testing: What are Special Education Teachers Expected to Know?. *Exceptional Children, 57*(4), 339-351

Rosicka, Z., & Mayerova, S. (2014). Motivation to study and work with talented students, *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 114*, 234-238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.691

Padmavathi, M. (2016). A study of student- teachers' readiness to use computers in teaching: An empirical study. *Manager's Journal on School Educational Technology, 11*(3), 29-39. https://doi.org/10.26634/jsch.11.3.4788

Siegle, D.; Moore, M.; Mann, R., & Wilson, H., (2010). Factors that influence in-service and preservice teachers' nominations of students for gifted and talented programs. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 33*(3), 337-360. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235321003300303

Smntney, J. (2003). *Designing and developing programs for gifted students, thousand oaks*, ca.corwinpress,inc.

Subotnik, R., & Rickoff, R. (2010). Should eminence based on outstanding innovation be the goal of gifted education and talent development? Implications for policy and research. *Learning and Individual Differences, 20*(4), 358-364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2009.12.005

Van Tassel, B. (2006). A Content Analysis of Evaluation Findings across 20 Gifted Programs. *Gifted child Quarterly, 50*(3), 199-215. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620605000302

Wood, S., Portman, T., Cigrand, D., & Colangelo, N. (2010). School counselors' perceptions and experience with acceleration as a program option for gifted and talented students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 54*(3), 168-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986210367940

Copyright Disclaimer