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Abstract

This mixed methods study examined why gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans and why parents desire gifted education for their children. At a time when accelerated learning is at odds with equity ideals, parents from the communities comprising the Asian umbrella have mobilized to fight to keep these academic opportunities for their children. These parents have been labeled as ‘white adjacent’ in order to shut them down as ‘racists’ when they speak out. The large number of Asian students in accelerated education has led to the accusation of them being ‘resource hoarders’. Even gifted education scholars have used the term ‘overrepresentation’ which perpetuates harm against the community. This study takes issue with the label ‘Asian’ as being overbroad, describing too large a group of dissimilar people, cultures, languages, and beliefs. Instead, the research focusses on the largest subgroup within New York City, Chinese Americans, who have a long history of oppression in this country. Two instruments, the Asian Values Scale (AVS) and the Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ), were combined with demographic questions in a single, online survey for the quantitative strand with an optional qualitative strand consisting of open-ended questions at the end. Results indicated gifted education is deeply rooted in Confucian principles as parents who desire gifted education for their children scored within the high range on the AVS. Moreover, these parents scored very high for the needs of Achievement and Autonomy on the NAQ. Parents expressed a strong belief that gifted education opens up future opportunities for their children which will allow them to achieve the American Dream.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

*Heaven gives long life to the just and the intelligent.*
- Confucius

Gifted education is a polarizing issue within New York City (NYC). On one end of the spectrum, civil rights advocates are pushing for the ban of such programs (Veiga, 2018; *Integrate NYC v. State*, 2021) because the field is not equitably represented by all populations, particularly among Black and Latino children (Ford, 2015; Peters, 2022). On the other end, parents of accelerated learners are fighting to keep these opportunities which are viewed as the great equalizer for overcoming economic and cultural disparities (Cross, 2013). This has become a politically charged issue. Left-leaning politicians continue to demonize gifted education as propping up white supremacy values (Algar, 2019), while researchers agree with parents that gifted children have unique learning needs that are not addressed in a regular classroom (Dixson et al., 2020; Reis & Renzulli, 2010). Right-leaning politicians have embraced parents’ call to save gifted education while demonizing Critical Race Theory (CRT) as the great divider (Amin, 2022; Kamp, 2022; Ray & Gibbons, 2021), even though research indicates that culturally responsive and sustaining education (CR-SE) is crucial to close gaps for Black and Latino children (Muñiz, 2019).

The Chinese American community in NYC is a central figure in this fight, but the sparse research on this population focuses on the so-called ‘overrepresentation’ of their children in gifted programs without considering why they are motivated to expend considerable time and resources to ensure their children have this opportunity (Kitano & DiJiosia, 2002). The Chinese characters for ‘gifted education’ – 天才班 – can be translated as ‘heavenly classes for children’ (Zhang, 2017). This is very much steeped in Confucian ideals of rearing children to be intelligent
and just adults. Many Chinese American parents strive to prepare their children to enter into accelerated learning programs, yet the future of gifted education is uncertain in NYC. This mixed methods study explores why Chinese Americans desire gifted education for their children, and whether as a long-oppressed minority group their children are entitled to opportunities for gifted programs under the CR-SE policies of the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE).

**Background**

**Current Landscape**

NYC has one of the largest gifted programs in the nation yet is also the most segregated school system in America (Gould, 2021). Black and Latino (the DOE categorizes this latter group as ‘Hispanic’) students comprise roughly 70% of the school population, yet more than 70% of the seats in G&T programs are held by white and Asian students (Lu & Weinberg, 2016, p. 37). A brief timeline of events in gifted education in NYC over the past decade tells the story. Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg gained control over the NYC school system in 2002 (Goodnough, 2002). One of his concerns was that families with means were gaming the gifted education system, so he changed the admissions process to a single test that would be administered at the child’s zoned school (Neily, 2021). Although this policy was meant to target underrepresentation of minority and low-income children, it actually widened the racial gaps (Algar, 2019).

The next mayor, Bill de Blasio, brought in a schools chancellor, Richard Carranza, to implement policies to ensure equity. A rift developed between the two when Carranza believed gifted and other accelerated education programs were at odds with equity standards (Chapman, 2018). A lawsuit was filed\(^1\) accusing the city of racial discrimination and seeking to dismantle

---

all accelerated learning programs – and gifted education in particular – within the NYCDOE. Chinese American parents who rallied against these efforts were ridiculed, shouted down, and labeled ‘white adjacent’ – a label which has enabled their opponents to accuse them of being ‘racist’ against Black and Latino children (Algar, 2019; Eckart & Rule, 2021). Carranza announced that the city would eliminate gifted education and specialized high schools, but this caused such a furious reaction from parents that the mayor decided to back off from the plan; Carranza quit mid-year. At the end of his second and final term, de Blasio switched course to announce that upon his departure there would be no more gifted programs for incoming students (Price & Caina Calvan, 2021).

Gifted education, along with public safety, became seminal issues for the 2021 mayoral race. Eric Adams, a former police officer who expressed support for a more equitable gifted program, was elected as mayor. This election was significant because many Chinese Americans crossed party lines to vote for Republican candidates who expressed support for gifted education as well as for safety in the Chinese community when the Democratic candidate failed to do this (Chan, 2022; Campanile & Li, 2022; Raleigh, 2022). The political mobilization and rigorous activism of this group came as a surprise to many who long viewed Chinese Americans as the ‘model minority’ who are complacent to authority (Barkan, 2022; Xiaoqing et al, 2021; Xu, 2021). Even though Mayor Adams has expanded gifted education by more than one thousand seats, parents have become dissatisfied with his idea of equitable programs because there is no longer an admission test, and criteria for a seat is too subjective (Barron, 2022).²

² Since Adams’ tenor as mayor, a total of 2500 gifted education seats are now available and roughly 8% of these are Asian students (Fadulu, 2022).
This study comes in the middle of these above-mentioned events and explores why gifted education is culturally relevant to the Chinese American community. Parent perspectives will be examined to understand why they prefer gifted education for their children. Finally, this study will explore whether the NYCDOE’s CR-SE policy creates a legal entitlement to gifted education for accelerated learners from the Chinese American community.

**Historical Context**

Researchers attribute the academic success of Chinese American students to their unique cultural traits and traditional values, based on Confucian ideals, which promote the importance of education (Yao, 1985; Zhang & Carrasquillo, 1995). Confucianism encourages scholarly pursuits, improvement through self-discipline, and connecting the family unity to the harmony of society (Zhang & Carrasquillo, 1995). Confucianism also emphasizes hard work, endurance, modesty, and respect for elders (Zhang & Carrasquillo, 1995). Chinese American parents hold traditional values of respect for education, reverence for the teacher, the importance of hard work, delaying gratification through self-discipline, and responsibility for the well-being of the family (Siu, 1996). Thus, Confucian values such as respect for education and teachers, coupled with control over selfish wants and desire to please the family, has been postulated to be the most significant contributing factor to Chinese Americans’ school success (Siu, 1992).

Confucius (551 B.C. – 479 B.C.) was a philosopher, political figure, and scholar who founded the Ru School of Chinese thought that is now referred to as Confucianism. This is the official state philosophy of China and has been a part of the people’s daily life there for more than 2,000 years (Yang & Zhou, 2008). Confucian ideology infused a high value on education throughout China’s history. During the Spring and Autumn Period (770 B.C. – 476 B.C.), China developed an elaborate system of competitive examinations to select outstanding candidates for
government positions. This revolutionized society by devising a civil service system that allowed upward mobility depending upon ability (Zhao, 2009).

Later, the Han Dynasty (206 B.C. – 220 A.D.) expanded this idea by establishing a Child Examination System, known as *Tong Zi Ke* in Chinese, to select the best candidates for administrative positions until the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty (Yang & Zhou, 2008). *Gaokao* is the modern-day version of meritorious selection, and education is considered to be the road to fame and material success. Anyone could become an official through education no matter how lowly their family’s station (Siu, 1992). Even though the Mao regime attempted to erase ancient traditions, the People's Republic of China founded the world's first standardized educational examination, the ‘*Gaokao Examination Policy’*, that was adopted in 1952 (Muthanna & Sang, 2015). This national college entrance exam is a "high-stakes test" that "tests students' mastery of the subjects taught in high school" (Bai, Chi, & Qian, 2014, p. 634). This one test determines a person’s future and social standing.

This idea of rule by merit instead of circumstance of birth permeates modern China’s civil service system and is deeply rooted in the teachings of Confucius (Aufrecht & Bun, 1995). Quoting his teacher, Lao Tzu, Confucius taught:

> The Master stated: At fifteen, my mind was bent on learning. At thirty, I stood firm. At forty, I had no doubts. At fifty, I knew the mandates of Heaven. At sixty, my ear was receptive to truth. At seventy, I could follow my heart's desires without sin. (Lau, 2000)

This quote exemplifies the importance of learning for children and implies that it will lead to a righteous path. The reference to “mandates of Heaven” recalls the Mandate of Heaven originating with the Zhou Dynasty (1046 – 256 B.C.) to legitimize overthrowing the Shang kings to replace them with citizens more capable of ruling (Zhao, 2009). The Mandate of Heaven
posits that commoners may rule as emperors if they are intelligent and just, and this has been used throughout China’s history to justify usurpation of power.

The Gaokao system in China is similar to the American practice of testing into the accelerated learning programs in public schools in New York City. Up until recently, there was a Gifted & Talented test given to children in Pre-K up to 2nd grade, and the top high schools are still vetted through the Specialized High School Aptitude Test (SHSAT).\(^3\) Just as the Gaokao system screens for the most academically advanced students to attend the best colleges regardless of social standing, the accelerated learning programs in NYC open doors of opportunities for students from the lower socioeconomic classes (Baldwin, 2007). In fact, many students in gifted programs qualify for free lunch, and a large proportion of these are from the Chinese American community (Neily, 2021). Educational opportunities are believed by this community to be the key to upward mobility (Xu, 2021).

**Statement of the Problem**

Chinese American accelerated students are viewed as the ‘model minority’ who are taking away opportunities from other races. Gifted education is at risk of being eliminated in NYC because the disproportionate amount of white and Asian students in accelerated learning programs has led to charges of segregation, racism, and resource hoarding. There is a perception of a high percentage of Chinese students in gifted programs, specialized high schools, and even Ivy League colleges and universities, which has heightened racial tensions. Harvard, for example, is embroiled in a lawsuit currently being appealed before the Supreme Court by an Asian student group contesting the racial quotas and ‘personality scores’ used by the institution.

---

\(^3\) The Hect-Calandra Act (1971) is a state law mandating the SHSAT as the sole criteria for admission to specialized high schools. The mayor has no power to repeal or circumvent this law.
to limit Asian admissions.⁴ Some NYC public school parents and civil rights advocates are calling for an end to all accelerated learning programs, including gifted education, because there are ‘too many’ whites and Asians, and not enough Black and Latino children in them. Even scholars in the gifted education field continue to examine the question of ‘overrepresentation’ in gifted programs, which perpetuates the notion that Asians are taking up space that should be reserved for other minoritized groups.

The Harmful Notion of ‘Overrepresentation’ & ‘Asian’ as Misnomer

Instead of examining the cultural aspects of why Asian students are successful at attaining seats in gifted and accelerated programs, gifted education research of this population perpetuates the socio-political notion that Asians are ‘overrepresented’, and this has led to the charge that they are ‘resource hoarders’ (Nomani, 2022). Cultural capital is a term coined by Pierre Bourdieu (1979) and refers to the aspect of a group that “provides access to scarce rewards” (Lareau & Weinenger, 2003, p. 567). There is a gap in the research addressing the issue of cultural capital which facilitates children from the non-dominant groups, including ‘Asians’, in attaining academic success.

Moreover, the term ‘Asian’ is problematic as it identifies a swath of diverse cultures, languages, and people. Yet, the NYCDOE uses this term as one of its five racial categories: White, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Other. Within the Asian category, the largest population is of Chinese descent. In fact, the second most common non-English home language is Mandarin, right after Spanish (New York City Department of Education 2018-19 Demographic Report).

---

⁴ Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, 142 S. Ct. 895 (U.S. 2022); also see Xu, 2021 for an in-depth discussion of the case. This case was decided in favor of the Petitioner during the editing phase of this dissertation.
This paper will narrow the Asian designation by focusing on Chinese American students for three reasons. First, that population is the largest under the NYCDOE’s Asian category. Second, scholars in several disciplines have suggested that Chinese Americans have been historically oppressed. Third, Chinese Americans continue to be under attack in NYC. Not only are they being victimized by anti-Asian discrimination (Chiang, 2020; Eckart & Rule, 2021; Hong, 2019; Kelly-Voicu, 2020), but they are also being physically attacked (Durkin, 2022; Eckart & Rule, 2021; Fonrouge, 2022; Hong & Bromwich, 2021).

Thus, Chinese Americans have a critical and pressing need to have this issue resolved. Instead of perpetuating the harmful notion that this group is ‘overrepresented’ and ‘hoarding resources’ from children of other minority groups, a shift in the field is crucial to recognize their cultural capital contributing to both their academic success and to the ‘gorgeous mosaic’ of NYC.\(^5\) Further, the designation of the ‘Asian’ label lumps multiple dissimilar cultures together while erasing distinct needs of each. Chinese American students are entitled to be seen, celebrated, and validated for their unique culture and to have their culturally based educational needs met as guaranteed under the CR-SE Framework (Table 1.1).

**Perpetuating the Myth of the ‘Model Minority’**

The Chinese American community has struggled with the myth of the model minority, which presents them as being successful, self-reliant, and complacent (Xu, 2021). Those who fail to meet the pre-conceived image of being academically gifted and professionally successful are rendered invisible while those who seem to possess those qualities are rendered ‘hypervisible’, leading to them being ‘fetishized’ (Wong & McCullough, 2021, p. 92). In the 2020 Democratic

\(^5\) NYC’s first Black mayor, David Dinkins, described the city as a ‘gorgeous mosaic’ rather than a ‘melting pot’ (Dinkins, 2013).
presidential primary race, candidate Andrew Yang, from New York, played off this myth tongue-in-cheek. Most of his campaign materials referenced math in a nod to the perception that Asians are all good at it (Figure 1.1). Yet Yang’s embrace of the model minority myth may have cost him Asian votes, especially when he lost the primary in his run for NYC Mayor in 2021. He commenced the race as a front-runner, but by primary night he was the first to concede (Rubinstein, 2021). Advocates from the community called him out on social media for perpetuating the harms that flow from the model minority myth and sounded the alarm for its use to destroy meritocracy (Xu, 2021).

**Figure 1.1**

*Andrew Yang’s 2020 Presidential Campaign Button*

According to the NYCDOE CR-SE Framework (Table 1.1), race, culture, language, and ability should be valued from all students. Teachers should have high expectations for every student, whose lives and identities should connect to their education. Schools must be aware of past and present forms of bias and oppression, while building partnerships with families and communities. Despite the inclusive language of the Framework, one of the most seminal CR-SE scholars, Geneva Gay, reports, “Asian Americans are underrepresented in all aspects of research, theory and practice about culturally responsive teaching” (Gay, 2018, p. xxv). The myth of the ‘model minority’ has caused researchers and practitioners alike to disregard the needs of students.
who are deemed to be academically advanced and self-reliant. This dissertation aims to fill this gap by identifying the culturally based education needs of the Chinese American community in NYC to determine whether the desire for gifted education is so deeply rooted in their culture that it should be accommodated under the Framework (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1

**NYCDOE CR-SE Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR-SE requires schools and districts to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See and value the background, views, and needs of all students. This includes experiences related to race, culture, language, or ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be aware of past and present forms of bias and oppression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and stop practices that boost historically advantaged groups at the expense of marginalized students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use teaching methods that are challenging, but honor students’ diversity. Students’ lives and identities should connect to their education. They should become critical thinkers and feel the agency to end inequality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ staff with high expectations for all students. They must be able to examine their own personal beliefs around identity, while giving professional learning and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build strong connections with students. Understand their lives, backgrounds, and identities. Build partnerships with families and communities. These bonds can be a source of knowledge and help shape school priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create emotional safe spaces and foster trust among students. In a conflict, use restorative practices to reconcile both sides. Nurture students’ identities and give them a sense of ownership and belonging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Research Questions**

The research questions addressed in the study include:

RQ1: Why is gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese Americans?

RQ2: Why do Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children?
Significance of the Study

This study will fill several important gaps as well as break new ground. Critically Responsive and Sustaining Education (CR-SE) has yet to address the needs of Asian American students. Asians have been left out of culturally responsive gifted studies. The field of Critical Asian studies (AsianCrit) has ignored the nuanced racial realities of Chinese Americans and instead presents a myopic lens of Asians through a white/black dichotomy. Finally, Organizational Management Theory (OMT), a field that examines workplace motivations and behaviors, has recently been applied to study students’ motivation in higher education, but has never been utilized to study the needs and motivations behind parents’ desire to obtain gifted education for their children.

Importance to the Field of CR-SE

Most of the research on Culturally Relevant pedagogy has addressed Black and Latino, but not Asian American students. Global studies also incorporate Indigenous children. In the US, researchers examine how to make education more aligned to the cultures of Black and Latino children in urban schools. Globally, culturally relevant pedagogy focuses on decolonizing education for Indigenous minorities. However, there were no studies found in a search of databases including ProQuest, PSYCHINFO, JSTOR, Digital Commons LIU, and Google Scholar that focused on culturally relevant pedagogy as applied to Asian American students. Investigative reporter Kenny Xu, who has written for national publications such as City Journal, The Federalist, The Daily Signal, and The Washington Examiner, refers to this phenomenon in his book as Asians being an ‘inconvenient minority’ because they do not fit the sociopolitical narrative (Xu, 2021). Even Gloria Ladson-Billings, the architect of the CR-SE framework adopted by the NYCDOE, has criticized the framework as a “top down” effort “fall[ing] short of
the original and subsequent iteration designs of the theory” (Ladson-Billings, 2021, p. 352). She stresses that “all students [are entitled] to receive the benefit of culturally relevant, sustaining, revitalizing, reality pedagogies” (p. 353), but to date the benefits have been aimed solely towards Black and Brown students. The needs of Asian students, including Chinese Americans, have been ignored. This study aims to broaden the CR-SE discussion to incorporate the right of Chinese American students to culturally responsive education as well.

**Importance to the Field of Culturally Responsive Gifted Education**

There are only a handful of studies exploring culturally relevant gifted education, and the few gifted studies on Asian Americans tend to focus on so-called ‘overrepresentation’. There are almost none focused on the needs of Chinese American students specifically. Most studies on Asian students do not disaggregate their data for Chinese Americans. Even the publicly available educational data sets lump everyone who descended from the Asian continent together as ‘Asian’. Yang and Zhou (2008) stress that “there is a dire need for future research on Chinese American children's high academic achievement in school” (p. 99). Gifted education research focuses on equity and access for Black, Latino, and Indigenous children. None address whether gifted education is so aligned to the cultural values of Chinese Americans that it could be fairly said to be culturally relevant to that group. This dissertation will assert for the first time that gifted education is *per se* culturally responsive to the needs of Chinese American accelerated learners. It is hypothesized that the desire for parents of this community to seek out gifted education for their children is steeped in Confucian ideals, such as hard work combined with natural talent will lead to success. It is further hypothesized this deeply rooted value makes gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese American families.
Importance to the Field of Asian Critical Theory

AsianCrit studies narrowly focus on the adverse effects of white supremacy on the Asian community and encourages alignment with the struggles of the Black community without encompassing the very nuanced racial realities of Chinese Americans in urban areas such as New York City today. Chinese Americans have been labeled as being ‘white adjacent’ and having ‘white privilege’ to justify taking away their children’s accelerated learning opportunities. Attaching whiteness to this group allows others to call them out as ‘racists’ when they fight to keep gifted education (Eckart & Rule, 2021; Kelly-Voicu, 2020; Nomani, 2022; Xu, 2021). This study pushes the boundaries in the AsianCrit field by decentering it from the lens of ‘white supremacy’ and refocusing it on the lived experiences of a distinct group that comprises the ‘Asian’ umbrella, Chinese Americans.

Importance to the Field of Organization Management Theory

Finally, this study presents several novel approaches in the field of Organizational Management Theory (OMT). The role of race is certainly crucial to understand the issues and controversies surrounding gifted education in NYC. However, there is something deeper that motivates us all as humans to make choices and pursue goals. These shared motivations unite us and aid in understanding each other cross culturally. OMT posits that the efficiency and effectiveness of the workplace can be improved when the leadership aligns the organization’s goals with the needs and motivations of the works (Drucker, 2001). This will be the first study to apply this field to gifted education as well as the educational perspectives of Chinese American parents to examine why they seek out gifted education for their children.

There are two branches of OMT that lend themselves well to this task: Needs Theory posits that human behaviors are motivated by one of four needs: Achievement, Affiliation,
Autonomy, and Dominance (Geiger, 1995), while *Expectancy Theory* asserts that behaviors are motivated by a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes (Vroom, 1964). These theories are widely applied to occupational psychology to understand what motivates workers, but this will be the first time applying them to gifted education and parent motivation.

The Confucian ideals of filial piety and success according to ability align well with the needs for affiliation and achievement. *Needs Theory* will be applied for the first time to investigate the relationship between adherence to these traditional values and the degree to which respondents need to affiliate with others or feel motivated to achieve. Additionally, the Confucian ideal that hard work will lead to achievement aligns with *Expectancy Theory*. Parents who prepare their children to qualify for and attend gifted education programs expect this will lead to opportunities for upward mobility and societal acceptance.

**Theoretical Rationale and Framework**

The theoretical framework provides the lens through which the data are collected, analyzed, interpreted, and intertwined with the researcher’s positionality to guide a qualitative approach (Creswell & Poth, 2016; Saldaña & Omasta, 2018). The theoretical rationale of this study is based on three complementary perspectives: (1) Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Education; (2) Asian Critical Theory (AsianCrit); and (3) Organizational Management (Needs and Expectancy Theories). These perspectives provide the foundational theoretical framework that is also steeped in legal, sociopolitical, and historical analyses through a post-critical paradigm.

The first two perspectives are rooted in Critical Race Theory (CRT), which debuted in the law school curriculum at Howard University under Professor Derrick Bell in the early 1970s
(Tate, 1997). CRT acknowledges the power, privileges, and inequities inherent in society’s structures, including the school system. Bell (1988) posits CRT’s basic tenets aid in understanding social justice, educational inequities, social consciousness, and hegemony in educational settings. Harper et al. (2009) adds that the fight against racial injustices necessarily involves the fight against sexism, homophobia, economic exploitation, and other forms of oppression or injustice because the silencing of disenfranchised populations enforces the status quo of all inequities. Other scholars have viewed CRT in the context of educational systems. Bell (1988), Delgado (2002), Harris (1993), Ladson-Billings (1995), Ladson-Billings & Tate (1995), Matsuda (1987), and Williams (1987) explore how race, power and privilege oppress and marginalize many student groups in addition to Black children. Richards et al. (2004) assert CRT as pedagogy should facilitate and support the achievement of all students in a culturally supported, learner-centered context, where teachers identify, nurture, and utilize the cultural capital students bring to the classroom. It is this view of CRT that this present study seeks to amplify.

**Culturally Responsive & Sustaining Education**

Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Education (CR-SE) is a new framework steeped in CRT principals. It builds upon Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, a term coined by Gloria Ladson-Billings over three decades ago to describe the focus on advancing student learning through developing cultural competence and fostering critical consciousness of teachers who work with Black children in elementary schools in high-needs areas (Ladson-Billings, 1989). Over time, the pedagogy expanded to secondary schools and moved beyond literacy to STEAM content (Ladson-Billings, 2021). By 2012, Django Paris shifted the research towards pedagogy that was culturally sustaining, and not just relevant (Paris, 2012), and then with H.
Samy Alim added a social justice lens to encourage students from marginalized communities to fight for their linguistic and cultural sovereignty (Paris & Alim, 2017). Chris Emdin (2011) developed the work by incorporating youth empowerment, and with Edmund Adjapong created a hip-hop pedagogy to increase student engagement in the sciences (Adjapong & Emdin, 2015).

The new CR-SE definition offered by the NYS Framework includes an education “grounded in a cultural view of learning and human development in which multiple expressions of diversity (e.g., race, social class, gender, language, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, ability) are recognized as assets for teaching and learning” (NYSED, 2019). It is this view of ‘multiple expressions of diversity’ that frames this study.

**Asian Critical Theory & Asian Perspectives**

Asian Critical Theory, or AsianCrit (Iftikar & Museus, 2018; Museus & Iftikar, 2013) emerged from Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a lens to understand the racialized and oppressed experiences of Asian Americans (Chang, 1993; Museus & Iftikar, 2013). The AsianCrit Framework developed by Museus and Iftikar (2013) consists of seven tenets found in the CRT Framework incorporating Asian American racial realities made applicable to education (Iftikar & Museus, 2018). These tenets include: 1. *Asianization*, which is the reality that racism and nativism are pervasive aspects of American Society (p.22); 2. *Transactional contexts*, highlighting the importance of historical and contemporary experiences both here and in the country of origin (p. 23); 3. *Re)constructive history*, recovering silenced voices and reframing the stories from their point of view (p. 24); 4. *Strategic (anti)essentialism*, based on the assumption that race is a social construct shaped by economic, and sociopolitical forces (p. 25); 5. *Intersectionality*, which is the notion that racism interacts with other systems of oppression to form social identities and shape experiences (p. 26); 6. *Story, theory, and praxis*, underscore that...
these are intertwined in the analysis of experiences and advocacy (p. 27); and 7. Commitment to social justice, advocates for the end of all forms of oppression (p. 27).

Other studies on Asian perspectives outside of the AsianCrit paradigm are sparse, but there are several that examine parents’ influence over their children’s education; comparisons of Caucasian and Chinese American families’ study habits; and very limited research on Asian students’ experiences in gifted education. These studies indicate there might be a “curriculum of the home” that helps children excel academically (Yang & Zhou, 2008, p. 92).

**Organizational Management Theory**

Organizational Management Theory (OMT) derives from the discipline of psychology to explain behavior in the context of the workplace and utilizes scientific methods to improve the performance of workers by increasing productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness through motivation (Kitana, 2016). OMT has been applied to study students’ motivation in higher education, but not to the study of gifted education.

Needs and Expectancy theories lend themselves well to explain why Chinese American parents choose gifted education for their children. According to Needs Theory, the motivation to act is influenced by one or more of the following four needs: Achievement; Affiliation; Autonomy; and Dominance (Geiger, 1995). The need for achievement is characterized by the motivation to succeed and to be recognized for success. The need for affiliation is characterized by the desire to belong to a group. The need for autonomy is characterized by the desire to work alone and be free from micromanagement. The need for dominance is characterized by the desire to lead others (Geiger, 1995). Finally, Expectancy Theory postulates that the motivation to act is a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes (Vroom, 1964).
Definitions and Key Terms

The following are key terminologies used within this study:

_Culturally Responsive Education_: a cultural view of learning and human development in which multiple forms of diversity (e.g., race, social class, gender, language, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, ability) are recognized, understood, and regarded as indispensable sources of knowledge for rigorous teaching and learning (NYC DOE website).

_Expectancy Theory_: Under organizational management theory, the motivation to act is a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes (Vroom, 1964).

_Giftedness_: Under New York Education Law, gifted students are defined as “pupils who show evidence of high performances capability and exceptional potential in areas such as general intellectual ability, special academic aptitude and outstanding ability in visual and performing arts” (_Gifted and Talented_, N.Y. ST. EDUC. DEP’T, [http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/gt/define.html](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/gt/define.html)).

_Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)_: A qualitative approach to inquiry that examines the lived experiences of individuals who share a common phenomenon (Creswell, & Poth, 2016). The purpose of this type of study is to understand the nature of this experience from the viewpoint of the participants.

_Meritocracy_: the belief that society should be governed by those with talent, ability, and a strong work ethic regardless of socioeconomic background or social connections (Xu, 2021).

_Mixed Methods Research_: The collection and analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data to answer the research questions and hypotheses; integration of the two forms of data and their results; organization of these procedures into specific research designs that provide the
logic and procedures for conducting the study; and framing these procedures within theory and philosophy (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, p. 5).

*Needs Theory:* Under organizational management theory, the motivation to act is influenced by one of four needs: Achievement, Affiliation; Autonomy and Dominance (Geiger, 1995).

*Organizational Management Theory:* the scientific methods seeking to improve the productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness of workers along with their performance (Kitana, 2016).

*Purposeful Sampling:* Intentionally selecting or recruiting participants who have experienced the central phenomenon, or the key concept being explored in the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

*Qualitative Research:* A method of coding frequency of words used, or recurrent themes garnered through interviews and observations. (Marczyk et al., 2005).

*Quantitative Research:* Finding relationships and correlations through statistical analyses of the data gathered (Marczyk et al., 2005).

**Organization of Study**

Chapter 1 provides a contextual and conceptual understanding of the problem and importance surrounding the issue of the cultural relevance of gifted education to the Chinese American community, particularly parents of accelerated learners. The various disciplines, paradigms, and theoretical frameworks are explored to ground the problem in the scholarship.

Chapter 2 presents the literature review on culturally responsive and sustaining education, Chinese American perspectives on education from an AsianCrit viewpoint, and OMT as it pertains to Needs and Expectancy theories. Boundaries of the scholarship in these areas will be
pushed to encompass the need for more studies on the cultural relevance of gifted education for Chinese Americans.

Chapter 3 focuses on the design of the study. It details the mixed methods convergent design used in the research to provide a quantitative and qualitative analysis of how and why gifted education is culturally relevant to the Chinese American community. This chapter also features the research questions used to provide a clearer understanding of the participants’ experiences of choosing gifted education for their children and how to interpret the data collected. Moreover, a more in-depth discussion of the research methodology is provided to show the researcher’s means of data collection and analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of this study based on parents’ perspectives on gifted education that are desegregated from the researcher’s assumptions. It provides answers to the research questions and relevant data will be analyzed.

Finally, Chapter 5 provides discussion and conclusions of the findings and their implications for the Chinese American community, public office holders, and policymakers. It also addresses recommendations for further research in these areas.

Chapter Synthesis

Chapter 1 reviewed the context of the problem and the significance of the study. Currently, New York City is deeply divided on the issue of gifted education. On the one hand, the DOE is the most segregated in the country and there is a disproportionate amount of white and Asian students in accelerated programs. On the other hand, the cultural needs of Asian students are being ignored as they are viewed as the ‘model minority.’ This dissertation will examine the cultural relevance of gifted education for the Chinese American community. The next Chapter will explore the scholarship that supports the theories of this paper.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the research related to the cultural relevance of gifted education to Chinese Americans, as well as the motivating factors influencing parents to choose gifted education for their accelerated students. This was accomplished through reviewing an array of scholarship from the following disciplines: (1) Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Education (CR-SE); (2) AsianCrit/Asian Perspective Studies and (3) Organizational Management: Needs and Expectancy Theories.

Figure 2.1

Map of the Literature Review
As illustrated in Figure 2.1, the disciplines are boxed and connected to the circled research questions they address. The Asian studies are divided into two categories: AsianCrit and Asian Perspective studies. These are presented separately in the figure because each goes to a distinct research question. Both CR-SE and AsianCrit are steeped in Critical Race Theory (CRT), but this study diverges from a strict black/white dichotomy to refocus AsianCrit on the more subtle ways race and racism affect the Chinese American community.

These perspectives shown in Figure 2.1 provide the foundational theoretical framework for approaching the two research questions. The NYCDOE’s CR-SE Framework (see Table 1.1) derives from Culturally Responsive pedagogy, which is steeped in CRT. Garces-Bascal and Elboweris (2022) made a recent call to apply Culturally Responsive pedagogy to gifted education, but their focus is to decenter whiteness from the curriculum. There are no studies linking either Culturally Responsive Pedagogy or CR-SE to the Chinese American community, or even to the broader Asian community. AsianCrit is steeped in CRT but has not been linked to CR-SE either. Other Asian perspective studies stemming from the disciplines of psychology and sociology touch upon how parents prepare their children for educational success, but not why. Finally, Needs and Expectancy theories from the discipline of Organizational Management may be seemingly disjointed from the other disciplines, but together these best explain the complex phenomena under investigation.

**Culturally Relevant Sustaining Education (CR-SE)**

CR-SE scholars such as Lisa Delpit (1988), Gloria Ladson-Billings (1992, 1995), H. Richard Milner, IV (2007) and Chezare Warren (2018) provide a working definition of culturally relevant education as recognizing the importance of including students’ cultural backgrounds, interests, and lived experiences in all aspects of teaching and learning within the classroom and
across the school. The term “culturally relevant pedagogy” originates with Ladson-Billings (1989) and is steeped upon Paolo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1973). The goal of culturally relevant and sustaining education is to raise awareness to what educators’ responsibilities must be “to emancipate, empower, and transform the learning experiences of culturally diverse students” (Yen, 2020, p. 3).

The Department of Education’s (DOE) CR-SE Framework (Table 1.1) emanates from this pedagogy and provides the policy defining it within the school system. The organization defines Culturally Responsive and Sustaining Education (CR-SE) as:

a cultural view of learning and human development in which multiple forms of diversity (e.g., race, social class, gender, language, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, ability) are recognized, understood, and regarded as indispensable sources of knowledge for rigorous teaching and learning. Culturally responsive-sustaining education uses educational strategies that leverage the various aspects of students’ identities, including the rich cultural, racial, historical, linguistic characteristics of students to provide mirrors that reflect the greatness of who their people are and windows into the world that allow students to connect across cultures. (NYCDOE website)

These values have been codified in the DOE’s CR-SE Framework (Table 1.1) which operationalizes the pedagogical values into statements of clear expectations.

AsianCrit/Asian Perspectives Studies

Research on Asian students in gifted programs has unfortunately focused on the issue of ‘overrepresentation’ (Ford, Harris, Tyson, & Trotman, 2002; Ford, 2003; Kitano & DiJiosia, 2002). Yoon and Gentry (2009) take issue with the term ‘overrepresentation’ as well as the too-
broad label of ‘Asian’, but the stated purpose of their study was to analyze data sets “to describe the issue of overrepresentation of Asian American students in gifted education programs in the United States” (p. 121). Another issue noted is that they describe the myth of the model minority as a “misperception” (p. 122) yet give credence to it by citing studies that uphold it. For instance, they cite a study (Lee, 1994) finding that Asian students struggle to keep up with the myth of the model minority by keeping their problems secret and being reluctant to talk to others, while some high-achieving Asian American students suffered from a fear of failure and could not accept poor grades.

Yoon and Gentry (2009) mentioned one study (Kitano & DiJiosia, 2002) analyzing disaggregated data sets where it was found that East Asians and not Southern Asians were ‘overrepresented’ in gifted programs, especially Chinese Americans. Kitano and DiJiosia’s (2002) data is consistent with the most recent tally of the Asian and Pacific Islander (API) disaggregated data from 2019 by the Mayor’s Office of Immigrant Affairs, where Chinese Americans comprised almost 50% of the entire API population with Asian Indians at 18%. All other groups were at single digit percentages. Yoon and Gentry (2009) critiqued Kitano and DiJiosia’s (2002) study because they failed to probe the correlates between the students’ race and ethnicity with other factors such as socioeconomic status, home environments, and cultural

---

6 ‘East Asians’ are people who come from China, Korea, Japan, Taiwan, or Mongolia, whereas ‘South Asians’ are from Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, or Maldives (Khoo, 2017). However, as Kho (2017) points out, there are also ‘Southeast Asians’, who are people coming from countries that are south of China, as well as east of India. This includes eleven countries: Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, Laos, Indonesia, Brunei, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia and Timor-Leste.

7 https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/immigrants/downloads/pdf/Fact-Sheet-NYCs-API-Immigrant-Population.pdf However, this may not be consistent with the present day NYCDOE’s gifted population, but since there are no official disaggregated data sets for the ‘Asian’ category, it is difficult to know for sure.
values which might affect students’ achievement. In NYC, data from 2017 indicated 24% of Asians lived in poverty, compared to 22% of Hispanics, 20% of Blacks, and 13% of Whites (Kelly-Voicu, 2020).

There are a few studies on what Chinese American parents do in the home that differs from European Americans; but it is the gap in study of cultural values from this community and its relation to education that informs this present research. Kao and Hébert (2006) addressed the “paucity of research concerning gifted Asian American students” (p. 89). Their qualitative study is very limited as there were only two participants. However, their comprehensive literature review on Asian American students revealed their seeming success belied the difficulties faced, such as racialized taunts and bullying, economic struggles, transcultural conflicts, deficiencies in written and spoken English, and underlying mental health issues that could not be addressed due to cultural stigma and ‘saving face’ to prevent shame to the family.

Other studies have focused on the harm emanating from the myth of the model minority (Siu, 1992, 1996; Siu & Feldman, 1995; Tsai, 1992; Yen, 2020; Wong & McCullough, 2021). Chinese Americans and some other Asian groups are seen as intelligent and especially proficient in math. Because of these perceived gifts, Asian students have been excluded from the benefits of CR-SE, which are targeted towards Black and Latino students instead (Yen, 2020; Xu, 2021). One problem noted in the literature is the myth of the model minority has caused educators to ignore the needs of children from Asian groups (Yen, 2020; Wong & McCullough, 2021).

**Chinese American Perspectives**

While American students focus on the individual and enjoy free expression, Chinese students, even second generation, adhere to Confucian filial piety and “careful expression of feelings” (Kao & Hébert, 2006, p. 92). This concept of ‘face’ is more fully explained by Qi
(2016) as the social and moral standing an individual holds in society. Equally important is to help preserve others’ standing, especially in the face of adversity, and preventing a *faux pas* from reflecting badly on the family unit. A person’s self-esteem is intricately woven with their social standing.

Closely related to the concept of ‘face’ is the social system of *guanxi*. Aufrecht and Bun (1995) found three factors most reflective of traditional Chinese culture: “Confucianism; civil service examinations and scholar rulers; and the Chinese brand of personalism known as *guanxi*” (p. 176). *Guanxi* is a sophisticated system of favors among social networks (Aufrecht & Bun, 1995). It is similar to the American notion of ‘pay it forward’ except by paying it forward under the *guanxi* system, the individual expects to receive the same or even greater favor in return sometime in the future when needed (Aufrecht & Bun, 1995).

Chinese American students often feel anxiety and confusion navigating the tension between American and Chinese norms (Yagi & Oh, 1995), yet the concept of ‘face’ precludes them from seeking counseling or guidance (Qi, 2016). These hidden feelings intensify during adolescence due to the complicated developmental stages of identity formation and group affiliation (Kao & Hébert, 2006). Gifted Chinese youth should be considered as a “double minority” because they are further challenged to meet parents’ high expectations to consistently achieve academic excellence while navigating cultural conflict (Kao & Hébert, 2006, p. 113).

Research on Chinese American parents is even more sparse than that for Asian gifted students and focuses on mothers rather than fathers or both parents. One study in China may explain why this is so as teens rated their mothers higher than fathers in providing warmth as well as pressure to excel in academics (Quach et al., 2015). A joint study conducted in the U.S. and Hong Kong (Ng et al., 2017) found that low-income Asian American mothers consistently
gave their children messages based on Confucian values of effort and achievement, even more than Hong Kong mothers, and postulate that this is a “strategic adaptation to obstacles arising from their immigrant status, beyond the influence of cultural values” (Ng et al., 2017, p. 979).

This ‘heightened effort’ is confirmed in studies showing Asian American adolescents spend more time on schoolwork than do their Caucasian, African, and Latino peers (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010; Brookings Institute, 2017); are most dissatisfied with scores below 90% (Chen & Stevenson, 1995); and Chinese American preschoolers (as compared to Caucasian) placed more value on school and showed greater awareness of parental expectations (Li et al, 2010).

Some studies have examined Chinese American mothers’ perspectives. Louie (2001) found that all Chinese immigrant mothers in his study had high educational expectations for their children. They expect both their daughters and sons to complete college, at the minimum. Yao (1985) also found that all the Chinese immigrant mothers in that study reported that they expected their children to make an average grade of "A" and would never be willing to accept a "C". They were more demanding and had higher expectations for their children than American parents. Schneider and Lee (1990) posit the Asian cultural tradition places a high value on education for self-improvement, self-esteem, and family honor, and Asian families tend to overcome occupational discrimination by investing in education.

A few more studies have looked to the home environment to ascertain the success of Chinese American students. Parents' behaviors and activities at home, which might be called "the curriculum of the home," predict academic success more than the socioeconomic status of families alone (Yang & Zhou, 2008, p. 92). Families who provide books, workbooks, periodicals, an internet connected device and a quiet place to study, as well as engage in
discussions about school performance, use math and science at home, read together, review homework, enjoy hobbies, and play games together had more successful students (Yang & Zhou, 2008; Yao, 1985; and Zhang & Carasquillo, 1995). High achieving Chinese American students live in homes where there was a regular family routine and priority given to schoolwork (Yang & Zhou, 2008).

There was just one study found that investigated both the Chinese American mothers and the fathers’ perspectives on their children’s education (Ng & Wei, 2020). Both parents conveyed high expectations for academic effort throughout the children’s entire schooling. While European American parents tend to use praise and highlight achievement, Chinese American parents tend to use criticism and highlight failures. Yet Chinese parents provide more academic support in the home and through outside resources. Even parents from lower socioeconomic backgrounds convey more messages of effort and achievement to mitigate the lack of funds for additional resources. This push towards continuous self-improvement and high achievement is steeped in Confucianism and is tied to a practical belief as well. Parents strongly believe that “academic achievement as the surest path to upward mobility” (Ng & Wei, 2020, p. 64).

Organizational Management Theory

The theory of organizational management can provide insights into why Chinese American parents are motivated to choose gifted programs for their children. Kurt Lewin is the ‘father’ of modern-day OMT, which arose from the Industrial Revolution (Papanek, 1973). Lewin devised the concepts of field theory, action research, the study of group dynamics, and aspects of sensitivity training techniques to study motivation in the workplace (Papanek, 1973). Drucker expanded the theory to empower leadership to leverage workers’ motivations and expectations to meet organizational goals (Drucker, 2001). Recent studies have applied the
theory to study motivation in academia. Chen et al. (2006) examined factors that motivate business faculty to conduct research and found faculty members who are not tenured tend to be motivated by extrinsic rewards, while tenured faculty tend to be intrinsically motivated. Estes and Polnick (2012) discovered research output significantly decreases once faculty are tenured as compared to pre-tenured faculty.

A comprehensive review of the literature failed to find any study applying OMT to gifted education (GE). However, Burns and Martin (2019) did explore motivational issues in GE. They found perfectionism to be the strongest motivator for gifted students. No GE study has focused solely on the motivations of the Chinese American community, but one study in China delved into the minds of parents of high-achieving students and found that an expectation of a rigid framework of success based on social and cultural norms was consistently conveyed to the children (Ng & Wei, 2020). Yang and Mindrila (2020) applied expectancy theory to measure attitudes of highly educated people towards culturally relevant education, but this present study will be the first to apply Needs and Expectancy theories to parent perspectives about gifted education.

Needs Theory

To understand motivation even further, intrinsic individual needs of students and their parents can be analyzed through Needs Theory. Murray (1938) postulated behavior motivation results from the relative strengths of various needs at a given point in time. Steers and Braunstein (1976) designed the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) to assess four needs in the workplace: achievement; affiliation; autonomy; and dominance. Heckert et al. (2000) noted inconsistencies in the internal measures of the MNQ and fixed these with a new Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ) which was administered to university students instead of workers. The
adaptable of the NAQ to students’ motivation to get good grades should also transfer to parents’ motivation to get their children into gifted programs.

**Expectancy Theory**

According to Vroom (1964), Expectancy Theory posits that the motivation to act is a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes. Valence is the value placed towards potential rewards of the behavioral outcomes. Yang and Mindrila (2020) applied Expectancy Theory to study perspectives about multicultural education. Their participants with a master’s or doctoral degree had significantly higher expectancy beliefs about the value of multicultural education than those with only a bachelor’s degree. Expectancy Theory is similarly applicable to Asian perspective studies because Chinese parents’ belief that their children’s hard work in school will lead to success in life may be tied to the degree of Asian values they possess.

The Valence Model from Expectancy Theory provides a formula for determining motivation towards goals. According to Vroom (1964), expectancy theory posits motivation to act is a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes. *Valence* is the value placed towards potential rewards of the behavioral outcomes. Geiger and Cooper (1995) applied the Valence Model of Expectancy Theory to an academic setting and found the attractiveness of earning an A predicted actual academic success.

While Expectancy Theory describes conscious decisions based on perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs to act in order to increase pleasure and avoid pain (Vroom, 1964), Needs Theory involves subconscious motivations to attain intrinsic awards (Geiger & Cooper, 1995). In their study, Geiger and Cooper (1995) compared Expectancy Theory to Needs Theory to see which
would provide a more accurate predictor for GPA. The MNQ was administered to participants to assess their needs’ levels. The students scored highest in Achievement and Affiliation, which is consistent with prior Needs Theory studies of college students. However, it was the Valence measures and not the Needs scores that most accurately predicted GPA.

Yang and Mindrila (2020) were the first to apply Expectancy Theory to measure attitudes towards culturally relevant education, but they utilized a more modernized version blended with traditional psychological theories of motivation. This new theory is Expectancy-Value (EV) Theory, where expectancies and values such as “perceptions of competence, perceptions of the difficulty of different tasks, and individuals’ goals and self-schema” are assumed to directly influence performance, persistence, and task choice (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002, p. 118). Eccles further developed four components of task-value: attainment value; interest value; utility value; and cost (p. 119). *Attainment value* involves the personal importance of doing well on a task. *Interest value* is the enjoyment attained from doing the task. *Utility value* refers to the usefulness of the task to reach the short and long-term goals. *Cost* is the negative aspects of engaging in a task, including anxiety, fear, efforts needed to succeed, and lost opportunities to perform other tasks or activities (Burak, 2014).

Yang and Mindrila (2020) found that prior studies in the field of EV show higher expectancy of success and task values tend to result in more motivation, persistence, resilience, and success. In their research, Yang and Mindrila discovered highly educated participants (Master’s or Doctor’s level) were more likely to have positive attitudes towards culturally relevant education than those who were less educated because they were most likely exposed to the benefits of diversity and inclusion. The respondents had reason to believe culturally relevant education is beneficial and leads to a more diverse and inclusive society which benefits us all.
The Expectancy-Value Scale (EVS) was devised to measure expectancy beliefs and task values (attainment, interest, utility, and cost), but cannot be replicated here as it is “domain specific” (p. 70). Thus, this research serves as a pilot study to identify task values with which to build a quantitative instrument to measure Chinese American parents’ expectancy values.

**Chapter Synthesis**

This chapter explored the three major disciplines that comprise the theoretical framework of this study, as well as the novel areas that will be explored. CR-SE and AsianCrit are steeped in CRT, which has become a racially divisive political issue. Organizational Management Theory (OMT) instead examines behavior and motivation in a larger human context. However, it is important to study this phenomenon in the context of the participants’ lived experiences.

This study presents the opportunity to broaden the parameters of CR-SE by making the framework applicable to Chinese American students. The field of AsianCrit can be reconfigured to acknowledge the very nuanced racial realities of Chinese Americans living in urban areas such as NYC. Asian Perspective studies should shift from perpetuating harmful myths and embrace the cultural capital that help students become successful. Needs Theory and Expectancy Theory from the field of OMT are ripe for expansion into the gifted education studies arena as well as Asian parent perspectives. Chapter 3 next outlines the research design implemented to address the research questions.
CHAPTER 3  
RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

“To see things in the seed, that is genius.”  
-Lao Tzu

The purpose of this chapter is to review the design of the study and the methods used to answer the research questions. This study examines why gifted education is culturally relevant for Chinese Americans and why parents choose it for their children. Research was conducted using a convergent parallel mixed methods design to gain an in-depth understanding of the reasons why parents choose gifted education for their children, and whether these reasons may establish the cultural relevancy of gifted education to the Chinese American community. The quantitative data reflect reasons that are aligned to culture as well as general human motivational needs, while the qualitative data give voice to this historically marginalized community to explore their unique and under researched perspectives. In this chapter, the philosophical assumptions of mixed methods research, the participants, research design, procedures, instruments, data analyses, and validity techniques are described.

Mixed Methods Methodology

Mixed methods is gaining in popularity in the study of gifted education. Since 1985, gifted education researchers have begun to integrate qualitative methods (Coleman et al., 2007). The primary utilization of mono-methods when designing gifted studies has drawbacks. Quantitative research designs alone do not provide the gifted education researcher opportunities to explain ‘why’ or ‘how’ in terms of interpreting research findings, whereas qualitative research designs alone tend to use small, nonrandom samples, thereby limiting the generalization of research findings. Implementing both quantitative and qualitative techniques minimize these issues (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Moreover, a mixed research approach can be utilized by
researchers who embrace one or more paradigms (Creswell et al, 2003). While pragmatism was the driving worldview embraced for this study, there was a concurrent aim to deconstruct the fields of CRT and AsianCrit in order to recenter the focus away from the black/white dichotomy and onto more nuanced racial interconnections based on the lived experiences from discrete communities under the ‘Asian’ umbrella. A post-critical lens aided in this undertaking.

**Research Questions**

Two research questions were addressed in this study. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected to respond to these questions. The two questions that were examined include:

RQ1: Why is gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese Americans?

RQ2: Why do Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children?

**Research Design**

This study used a mixed methods convergent research design in which qualitative and quantitative data were collected, analyzed, combined and/or compared, and interpreted (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Combining both qualitative and quantitative data serves to validate each other while providing a more complete picture of the research problem. A convergent parallel design (QUANT + QUAL) was used where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected, compared, analyzed, and interpreted.

As illustrated in Figure 3.1, all survey respondents completed the quantitative portion first, which began with 11 demographic questions, followed by two instruments: the Asian Values Scale (AVS) and the Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ). All of the quantitative questions were in English with accompanying Chinese translations. Participants were then given the option to continue with the qualitative portion which was English only and consisted of 11
open-ended questions which were appropriate for the qualitative method of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA).

**Figure 3.1**

*Diagram of the Convergent Mixed Methods Design Process*

Statistical tests were performed on the quantitative data utilizing the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) system, version: 29.0.0.0 (241). These results were then integrated with the qualitative data, and the findings were compared and combined. Next, the results from the merger were interpreted to determine how the data converged, diverged, related, or combined to provide a clearer understanding of the research questions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

There were several strengths to using the convergent parallel design. The design was efficient because both qualitative and quantitative data were collected simultaneously during just one single phase of the research by using a survey. Another strength was that the research questions were addressed through the voice of participants’ qualitative responses using open-
ended questioning and analysis of statistical trends through close-ended survey questions. A third strength was that the qualitative subjective views of participants honored their voice, while the quantitative component added a holistic understanding and generalizability to the research findings.

The rationale for using this approach to guide the research was twofold. First, the quantitative phase allowed for the generalizability of the findings and provided statistical results that explored the relative frequency of cultural attitudes and needs. Second, the qualitative component provided an in-depth and invaluable understanding of the participants’ views about gifted education, based on their lived experiences as parents. Thus, this mixed methods approach was beneficial for this study to provide a more thorough understanding of the research questions than either method alone.

**Participants & Sampling**

According to official NYC demographic data, there are just over 400,000 Chinese Americans living in the city comprising roughly 49% of the Asian population and the only other group with double digits is Asian Indian at 18%. The latest demographic data from the DOE show a total Asian population of 16.6% out of just over one million students, but the numbers are not disaggregated into distinct groups. If the school population is comparable to the city population, an estimated 80,000 Chinese American students are in NYC schools. A total of 2500 gifted education seats are available and roughly 8% of these are Asian students. Again, if the school population is comparable to the city population, there are about 200 Asian students in

---

10 https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/14/nyregion/nyc-gifted-talented.html
gifted education and about 98 of these are from the Chinese American community. Recruitment for this study was targeted to these estimated 98 Chinese American families as well as other parents who desired gifted education for their preschoolers.

**Sampling Procedures**

Upon receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for human subjects (Appendix A), participants were recruited beginning on March 7, 2022 and ending on December 31, 2022 (Appendix B). Since the NYCDOE does not disaggregate data from the Asian student populations, it was not feasible to go through that agency to recruit participants. Instead, parent groups advocating for gifted education were contacted to distribute recruiting materials as well as tutoring centers and Pre-Ks serving Chinese American students in Flushing. The researcher also approached parents in parks with a well-known martial arts grandmaster fluent in Mandarin to recruit participants in Chinatown, Manhattan and Flushing, Queens. A purposive sample population was sought for the study based on the criteria of identifying as a member of the NYC Chinese American community and status as a parent, grandparent, or caregiver of a child aged Pre-K to 8th grade who desired to keep gifted education opportunities available in the NYCDOE.

The Geneva Workshop Sample Size Formula (Ali, 2014) works well to choose a sample size where a purposeful or convenience sample is used for a subpopulation (Figure 3.2). The subpopulation studied is calculated in proportion to the percentage of the general population. Comparing the number of Chinese students in the NYCDOE gifted programs to all other students in grades Pre-K through eighth yielded a participant number of only 30 participants needed under this calculation. Since 34 respondents complete the entire survey, this number slightly exceeds the minimum participants needed pursuant to the Geneva model.
Figure 3.2

Geneva Workshop Sample Size Formula

\[ n = \frac{z^2(pq)}{e^2} \]

where
- \( n \) = the sample size
- \( z \) = standard error associated with the chosen level of confidence (1.96)
- \( p \) = estimated percent in the population
- \( q = 100 - p \)
- \( e \) = acceptable sample error


Participant Demographics

There were eleven demographics questions at the start of the survey (Appendix C). Only the data from the 34 participants who completed the two instruments are used for the quantitative strand of this study, and some of the most relevant results are summarized in Table 3.1. Of these 34 participants, 23 were mothers, six fathers, and five more were other primary caretakers of a child aged Pre-K through 8th grade. They ranged in age from 21 to 65, with the average age being 40.

Income levels (not shown in table) were divided according to the IRS tax brackets and ranged from under $10,000 to over $419,000 per year. The average income was $95,941 with a median of $82,000. There was a strong statistical significance of the correlation between
educational level and income at the 0.01 level (one-tailed), and both of these significantly
correlated with the Need for Achievement at the 0.05 level (one-tailed).

**Table 3.1**

*Overview of Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Country</th>
<th>Immigration Status</th>
<th>Years in NYC</th>
<th>Household Composition</th>
<th>Educational Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China = 19</td>
<td>US Citizen = 25</td>
<td>&lt;1 = 5</td>
<td>Single parent = 3</td>
<td>&lt;HS = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US = 13</td>
<td>Green card = 5</td>
<td>&lt;10 = 3</td>
<td>Couple/child = 9</td>
<td>HS = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other = 2</td>
<td>Visa = 1</td>
<td>&gt;10 = 14</td>
<td>2 children = 12</td>
<td>Trade = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of status = 3</td>
<td>&gt;20 = 5</td>
<td>3+ children = 3</td>
<td>AA = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30 = 3</td>
<td>Multigenerational = 7</td>
<td>BA = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40 = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA = 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic portion also inquired about their experiences with the *Gaokao* test (not shown in table), which is China’s higher education entrance exam determining whether a candidate goes to college and where they may go. Most respondents in this study, 23, did not take the *Gaokao* test or have any of their immediate family take it. Seven respondents took the test and of these, two had other family members who also took it. Three respondents who did not take the test had family that did.

The last question in the demographic portion of the survey asked the respondents to provide their zip code. Participation in this question was made optional as it was slightly more intrusive, and it was anticipated some respondents may not be comfortable identifying their
neighborhood. Indeed, six of the participants opted out of the question. Most of the respondents, however, 28, provided their zip codes (Table 3.2).

As noted in Table 3.2, a total of 13 participants were from Queens, eight from Brooklyn, six from Manhattan and one from the Bronx. Of the 20 different neighborhoods represented, four are comprised of a large enclave of Chinese residents (Chinatown, Manhattan; Flushing, Queens; Rego Park/Forest Hills, Queens; and Sunset Park, Brooklyn).

Table 3.2

Participants’ Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinatown</th>
<th>Not Chinatown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MC*</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl*</td>
<td>Bk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/F</td>
<td>Bx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
MC = Manhattan Chinatown; Fl = Flushing; SP = Sunset Park; R/F = Rego Park/Forest Hills
Q = Queens; Bk = Brooklyn; M = Manhattan; Bx = the Bronx.
* Researcher actively recruited here in person.

There are a total of nine neighborhoods designated as “Chinatowns” in NYC (De Silva, 2022). The largest three ¹¹ are represented in this sample (plus the smaller populated Rego Park/Forest Hills) but five other neighborhoods with large Chinese American populations were not: Elmhurst, Queens; Little Neck, Queens; Bensonhurst, Brooklyn; Homecrest, Brooklyn; and the East Village, Manhattan. The researcher actively recruited in person within the two largest Chinatowns.

Recruitment & Data Collection

Upon IRB approval (Appendix A), Campus Labs, an assessment tool for higher education institutions, was employed to create the survey. Campus Labs provides an ethical means of data

¹¹ Manhattan, Flushing, and Sunset Park are the largest Chinatowns, in that order.
collection by protecting participants’ confidentiality and responses. Campus Labs launched the survey March 1, 2022, on their site at baseline.campuslabs.com. The survey period closed on December 31, 2022. Participants were recruited initially through social media postings of the IRB approved Recruitment Flier on Twitter and Facebook (Appendix B). Asian parent and community advocates helped repost the survey link and recruitment flier on social media, especially leaders and members of Parent Leaders for Accelerated Curriculum & Education (PLACE NYC).

A total of 740 respondents logged into the Campus Labs survey system, generating a unique ID number. Of these, 65 completed the demographics section, 34 completed the two instruments, and six more partially completed the instruments. For the optional open-ended questions that followed, 10 completed these, and one more partially completed the questions. The two instruments provided the data for the quantitative strand, while the optional, open-ended questions provided data for the qualitative strand.

Providing the survey link and QR code on the flier allowed participants to employ self-pacing on their cell phone or other device. Each respondent generated a unique ID number and no personally identifying information is included in the results. The raw data were exported as an Excel file and saved on a computer, using encrypted password-protected documents to which only the researcher had access. The data were initially cleaned by eliminating the 675 respondents who did not complete the demographic questions, and further cleaned by only entering the data of those completing both instruments into the SPSS system. This left a total of 34 participants.

Ethical concerns were minimized by storing data in the Campus Labs system, which is encrypted and provides industry standard protections. Since a random number was assigned to
each participant, confidentiality was preserved. Trustworthiness of the data was enhanced by not making the survey link widely available. The recruitment flier was only sent out to the target community.

Quantitative Methodology

In this convergent parallel mixed methods design, the quantitative strand of the research occurred concurrently with the qualitative strand and explored why gifted education is important to Chinese American parents. Participants filled out a survey that was available through Campus Labs after reading and clicking their approval on the consent form approved by the Institutional Review Board (Appendix A). This form informed participants of the purpose of the study and reminded them that their participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw from the study any time they chose. Participants were assured that no identifying information would be stored. Only after electronically signing the informed consent form, participants could access the rest of the survey. A total of 34 respondents completed both instruments.

Instruments

The instruments were implemented to measure Asian values and motivating needs. The Appendix contains the final version of the demographic questions as well as the two instruments (see Appendices C-E). The survey was a continuous questionnaire consisting of 11 demographics questions, a 24-item AVS scale, and a 20-item NAQ scale. The demographic questions contained bubble responses of the range of choices, while the two instruments utilized a 5-point Likert response scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

The Asian Values Scale (AVS)

The Asian Values Scale (AVS) (Kim et al., 1999) (Appendix D) is a 24-item instrument measuring adherence to traditional Eastern cultural values in an effort to make psychological counseling services more culturally relevant to the Asian population. The AVS is appropriate to
use in this study because it measures whether the participants hold traditional cultural beliefs, such as filial piety, *guanxi*, and saving face (Kim et al., 1999). *Filial piety* is the concept of affiliation where respect and loyalty are given to parents, elders, siblings, kith and kin, and community members (Kao & Hébert, 2006). *Guanxi* is similar to the western notion of ‘pay it forward’ but involves a more intricate social credit scoring system. Favors are not exchanged on a *quid pro quo* basis, but rather good deeds are banked within an affiliated group (Aufrecht & Bun, 1995). *Saving face* is the concept of not dishonoring self or family. In a disagreement, it is important to give the opponent an opportunity to bow out gracefully while maintaining honor and dignity (Qi, 2016). All of these values are deeply rooted in the teachings of Confucius (Lau, 2000).

Example items from the AVS include (a) "One should be discouraged from talking about one's accomplishments," (b) "The worst thing one can do is to bring disgrace to one's family reputation," (c) "One should consider the needs of others before considering one's own needs," (d) "One should be humble and modest," and (e) "One need not be able to resolve psychological problems on one's own" (reverse worded) (Kim et al., 1999; Appendix D). It is hypothesized that parents who desire gifted education opportunities for their children hold fast to traditional beliefs, and it is those beliefs which make gifted education culturally responsive to the community.

**The Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ)**

The Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ) (Heckert, et al., 2000) (Appendix E) is a 20-item instrument modified from the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) (Steers & Braunstein, 1976) for implementation with a college student sample. Each of the four motive subscales is made up of five items, two of which are reverse coded. The MNQ was designed to
assess four basic needs following the need theory of Murray (1938). Murray's theory postulated that motivated behavior results from the relative strengths or salience of various needs at a given point in time. The purpose of utilizing a manifest needs questionnaire is to assess needs by measuring the behaviors individuals perform in order to satiate these needs (Steers & Braunstein, 1976). Murray’s four needs that were quantified in the MNQ include: the needs for achievement (nAch), affiliation (nAff), autonomy (nAut), and dominance (nDom). The need for achievement is the desire to excel and involves attempting to improve on past performance. The need for affiliation is the desire to interact socially and to be accepted by others. The need for autonomy is the desire for self-direction rather than direction by others. The need for dominance, sometimes called the need for power, is the desire to influence and direct others (Steers & Braunstein, 1976). Heckert, et al. (2000) recalibrated the scale as the NAQ so that it could be applied to an academic setting.

The NAQ is appropriate to use for this study because it measures motivational needs of parents who seek gifted education opportunities for their children. Example items include (a) “I try to perform my best at work,” (b) “I spend a lot of time talking to other people,” (c) “I would like a career where I have very little supervision,” and (d) “I would enjoy being in charge of a project” (Heckert et al., 2000; Appendix E). It is hypothesized that Chinese American parents who seek gifted education opportunities for their children are motivated primarily by needs for Achievement and Affiliation. These two needs align with Confucian values of meritocracy and filial piety, so it is expected that the higher the AVS scores, the higher the scores in these two needs on the NAQ scale.
Translation Services

Two-level translations were provided to ensure the accuracy of the survey questions. Since Chinese is a pictogram language conveying ideas rather than words, there are no exact word-for-word translations available into English. Instead, two translators were employed to check English-to-Chinese and Chinese-to-English to make sure the ideas remained constant between the survey questions. Translation services of the recruitment flier, consent form, demographics and instruments were provided by a native Mandarin speaker and professional translator. A second translator, who is a native Cantonese speaker also fluent in Mandarin and English, then checked the first translations by reading through the materials and manually filling out the demographics and instruments in hardcopy form. The translations of the Recruitment Flier and survey questions can be found in the Appendices.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative analysis was first conducted manually. The AVS and NAQ results were scored manually and entered in tables (Appendix G). A Likert Scale was utilized (Table 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses were coded with numbers (Table 3.3), and these were added together and divided by five in order to obtain a raw score (Joshi et al., 2015). The scores were color coded from very low to very high to aid in seeing patterns in the data. For the AVS data, any score over 3.5 indicates the respondent adheres to traditional Asian values. Conversely, any score under 2.5
indicates the respondent rejects traditional Asian values. For the NAQ data, any score over 3.5 indicates the respondent is motivated by that particular need. Conversely, any score under 2.5 indicates the respondent is not motivated by that need.

AVS and NAQ scores were entered into the SPSS system, version: 29.0.0.0 (241), along with the coded demographic data, to run a Pearson r test. The purpose of this test was to analyze correlations between the degree the respondents hold traditional Asian values and the strength of their manifest needs, and the relationship of these scores to their demographic data. It was hypothesized that parents who desire gifted education opportunities for their children would score highly for AVS values, and a high AVS score would correlate to high Affiliation and Achievement scores in the NAQ.

The second step involved analysis from a one-sample t test using the SPSS system to determine whether the respondents’ AVS and Needs scores were significantly differently from the original subjects’ scores in the studies validating the instruments. The subjects used to validate the AVS were from a general Asian population receiving counseling services (Kim et al., 1999), and those used to validate the NAQ were from a general college student population (Heckert et al., 2000). It was hypothesized that Chinese American parents desiring gifted education for their children would score higher in Asian values than a more general Asian population. It was also hypothesized that these parents would score higher on the needs of Achievement and Affiliation, and lower on the needs of Autonomy and Dominance than members of a general college population.

Finally, this present study is the first to apply the valence model of expectancy theory to the motivations of parents from the Chinese American community who choose gifted education opportunities for their accelerated learners. As far as it is known, there has only been one study
quantifying expectancy values (EV), but the instrument used there could not be replicated outside that study (Yang & Mindrila, 2020). Since this is the first study applying EV to parent perspectives, there is no other instrument available that can provide quantitative measurement of prospective expectancy beliefs and task values. It is hoped that the qualitative strand of this pilot study yields these values so that an instrument can be developed in future studies.

**Qualitative Methodology**

The same participants that were used to respond to the quantitative instruments were given the option to continue with the qualitative strand of the survey. About one third of the participants opted to continue. Out of the 34 respondents that completed both instruments in the quantitative strand, 11 chose to continue with the optional portion with 10 completing all questions. Research ethics were strictly followed, including informing participants at the beginning of the survey that their participation was voluntary, that they had the choice to withdraw their participation from the study without penalty at any time, and by giving them the opportunity to finish the study without answering the short answer questions. In addition, each participant was asked to read and electronically sign the consent form outlining their rights as a participant and agree that they understood these rights (see Appendix B). The survey responses were recorded in the Campus Lab online platform, and the answers to open-ended questions were transcribed and analyzed.

**Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)**

The qualitative method utilized was Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), a phenomenological approach used to describe “the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon” (Creswell, 2013, p. 76). IPA is an interpretative process on the part of both researcher and participant (Smith et al., 2009) and is
used in this study to understand why Chinese American parents desire gifted education opportunities for their children. IPA is analyzed and interpreted through an inductive process. Data were managed through coding, identifying common themes to place into categories, and determining relationships among these themes (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Huberman & Miles, 1994, Saldaña, 2022).

The IPA process for this study involved asking 11 open ended questions (Appendix F) at the end of the quantitative strand of the study. The questions asked about the qualities of the child aged Pre-K through 8th grade that the parent felt made them gifted; qualities of gifted education; benefits from gifted programs; alternatives parents would undertake if there were no more gifted programs; and messages to policy makers. After completing the demographic questions and two instruments, respondents had the option to continue with the short answer interview questions or end the study.

Out of the 34 respondents who completed all quantitative sections, only 11 opted to complete the IPA. This is most likely due to several factors. First, translation was not done for the open-ended questions. Chinese calligraphy uses pictograms based upon ideas rather than exact words. Since the researcher is not fluent in Chinese, participants’ voice might have been lost in translation. Only respondents proficient in reading and writing English could participate in this portion of the survey. Second, since the open-ended questions required responses to be typed in, this takes considerably more effort than clicking on a bubbled answer. Respondents may have been tired from completing the demographic questions and two instruments and did not want to exert more energy into an optional component. Third, since the survey platform did not use cookies to identify participants to maintain confidentiality, their responses could not be saved to come back to later. The entire survey had to be completed in one sitting and this may have been
too much for the participants who chose not to continue with the interview portion. Finally, an incentive to continue with the interview questions may have increased participation, but this was not possible due to lack of funding.

**Determining the Coding, Themes, & Relationships**

One essential part of the analysis includes classifying and interpreting qualitative data through the coding process which involved aggregating participant responses into categories and then assigning a label (Saldaña & Omasta, 2017). This coding process presented multiple opportunities to read and re-read the semi-structured interview responses. The final read before coding involved reviewing the research proposal, specifically looking at theory, critical lens, the literature review, and research questions. Codes and categories were developed by clustering and chunking the responses multiple times so that broader themes, interpretations, and representations could emerge from the data.

Codes were mostly repeated words used by the participants, but some were descriptive of the participants' words in a passage or section of the transcript. When the coded transcript was analyzed in an online, opensource Word Cloud, the responses were shown in a color-coded graphic representing high, medium, and low frequency, with word size depicting the frequency within each of those categories. While a theme may have contained a code word, themes were intended to link ideas or concepts established after analyzing the codes and examining contextual similarities and differences among responses.

Finally, relationships were examined to determine the task values so that a quantitative instrument could be developed in the future. For example, Expectancy Theory posits that the motivation to act is a combination of the perceived attractiveness of future outcomes and the likelihood actions will lead to these outcomes (Vroom, 1964), but provides no means to quantify
the results. The emerging Expectancy-Value (EV) Theory stemming from Expectancy Theory advances the idea that success results from the individual’s alignment with four task values, combined with a high expectancy that these will lead to obtaining the end goal (Yang & Mindrila, 2020). Yang and Mindrilla (2020) are the first to quantify the four task values, but their instrument cannot be replicated here due to it being domain specific (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4

**EV Values of Instrument Items from Yang & Mandrilla (2020)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectancy Value</th>
<th>Instrument Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>I think it is useful to learn about human diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>I enjoy learning about human diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>It is important to me personally to be proficient in cross-cultural communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>I have difficulty understanding people from different cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Diversity issues are important to me personally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>I am really keen to learn a lot in multicultural issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>I am never good at communicating with people from different cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>The amount of time I spend on learning about human diversity keeps me from doing other things I would like to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to EV Theory, there are four components of task value: attainment value; interest value; utility value; and cost (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002, p. 119). **Attainment value** involves the personal importance of doing well on a task. **Interest value** is the enjoyment attained from doing the task. **Utility value** refers to the usefulness of the task to reach the short and long-
term goals. *Cost* is the negative aspects of engaging in a task, including anxiety, fear, efforts needed to succeed, and lost opportunities to perform other tasks or activities (Burak, 2014).

Table 3.4 depicts the instrument used in the first study quantifying EV Theory and cannot be replicated here as the task value instrument used was domain specific, referring to the values associated with multicultural studies (Yang & Mindrilla, 2020). Instead, one of the aims of this present pilot study is to articulate the values associated with pursuing gifted education from respondents’ own words (Table 3.5).

**Table 3.5**

*EV Values of Proposed Instrument Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectancy Value</th>
<th>Proposed Instrument Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Attainment       | • I am proud that my child has been identified as gifted, talented, advanced, or intelligent.  
                  | • Gifted education will give my child a better future/the American Dream.  
                  | • Gifted education will help my child do well on standardized tests.  
                  | • Gifted education will provide advanced learning.  |
| Interest         | • My child works hard to do well in school.  
                  | • My child perseveres in school assignments.  
                  | • My child is happy or displays a positive attitude towards school.  
                  | • My child performs better when challenged.  |
| Utility          | • I want my child to learn in advance.  
                  | • I want my child’s education to be customized to fit their needs.  
                  | • I want my child to be challenged and pushed to do well.  
                  | • I want my child to get into the best university possible.  
                  | • I want my child to be with peers who take education seriously.  
                  | • I want my child’s interests and abilities to be developed at school.  |
| Cost             | • I do not want to take my child out of our zoned area to attend school.  
                  | • I have to pay extra for tutoring and talent development.  
                  | • My child spends too much time prepping for tests.  
                  | • I spend too much time helping my child succeed in school.  
                  | • I will pay for private school if gifted programs are abolished.  
                  | • I will move out of NYC if gifted programs are abolished.  
                  | • My children will pick up bad habits if mixed with kids who do not take education as seriously.  |
The Expectancy Values quantified by Yang and Mindrila (2020) involve the costs and benefits of such things as communicating with people from different cultures and participating in a diverse environment. This study probes values associated with parents who desire gifted education for their children (Table 3.5). Preliminary results of this study diverge with Yang and Mindrila’s focus on academic attitudes as Chinese American parents seem less interested in diversity and strongly prefer homogeneous grouping to spur competition and prevent exposure to other children with poor academic habits. This should be developed in future studies so that perspectives of Asian parents of gifted children can be quantified.

In order to expand EV to the field of gifted education to examine parent perspectives, a domain specific instrument must be developed by identifying the four task values. The relationships between the responses, codes, and themes of the responses were closely examined to determine these values. First, a coding of the raw responses was done to place a, A, I, U or C where these values could be found in the data. Then a table was created to sort the responses from each of the 11 participants into the four respective values (Table 3.5). The emerging data were then shaped by the individual narratives (Appendix I), and these were further distilled to create an overarching narrative.

Crafting the Narrative

The most important part of the research is crafting the narrative in order to give voice to the participants’ lived experiences. Researchers must avoid the pitfall of the “voyeuristic search for a good story” by connecting to theoretical perspectives that aids in understanding the participants’ lived experiences (Jones et al., 2014, p. 85). Saldaña and Omasta (2018) posit that the researcher must make these connections in the analysis of the data, seeing relationships where none are apparent and linking dissimilarities in a way that connects to overarching themes.
To give voice to the participants’ lived experiences, the data were approached in multiple directions throughout the study. Reading and re-reading, coding, categorizing, and drawing themes from their responses, relating these back to the research questions, and maintaining an empathic gaze throughout the process helped address *bona fide* needs in their community without contributing to the harms already entrenched in the related research fields.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

Qualitative data analysis involves “organizing the data, conducting preliminary read-through of the database, coding and organizing themes, representing the data, and forming an interpretation of them” (Creswell, 2013, p. 179). Moustakas (1994) developed a four-step process of analysis for qualitative data: Horizontalizing; Textual Descriptions; Structural Descriptions; and Integration of the textures and structures.

*Horizontalizing* is the identification and highlighting of all “significant statements, sentences, or quotes” relevant to the topic that “provide an understanding of how the participants experienced the phenomenon” (Creswell, 2013, p. 82; Moustakas, 1994). These highlighted statements produce “meaning or meaning units,” which are listed and clustered into themes (Moustakas, 1994). After cleaning the participants’ responses, a T-chart was created to place the responses to the left and highlight significant statements. These highlighted statements were placed in the column on the right side in a shortened version so that they could be easier to read together with the other highlighted responses.

Next, *textural descriptions* of the participants’ experience were developed from the significant statements and themes. The highlighted statements were grouped and categorized into textual descriptions that are used to write *structural descriptions* describing the context or setting influencing the participants’ experience of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). This process
allowed for the creation of five theme categories (characteristics, benefits, harms, alternatives, and messages) into which each highlighted statement could fit (Appendix H). Responses could all fit into the following: characteristics, which were qualities possessed by gifted children or their gifted programs; benefits derived from participation in a gifted program; harms derived from participating in gifted programs or expected harms if gifted education is abolished; alternatives that could enhance a child’s development or replace gifted education if it should be abolished; and messages to policy makers concerning the parents’ feelings about keeping gifted education.

Finally, the textual and structural descriptions are combined to produce an integration representing the essence of the phenomenon. Creswell (2013) posits the integration should allow the reader to come away from the research understanding what it is like for the people in the study experiencing the phenomenon. This was accomplished by presenting the individual parent narratives (Appendix I) as well as the overall distilled narrative presented in the Findings section of Chapter 4. The final narrative was crafted from an integration of the codes, themes, and individual narratives.

According to Tracy (2019), postcritical researchers use inductive, expansionistic, and iterative processes to loosely construct tentative explanations, compare them with emergent data, revise their claims, go back to the data, and repeat. As a result, “the study may solve a problem, attend to a given controversy, critique an existing school of thought, strengthen a fledgling theory, or construct a new one” (p. 49). The postcritical paradigm works well with the qualitative strand of this study because Chinese American parents have a problem that needs solving, namely keeping gifted programs from being eliminated from the public schools. There is a racially divisive sociopolitical controversy around this issue and existing schools of thought only
add fuel to the flames by claiming ‘Asian overrepresentation’ in gifted education. A postcritical lens viewed the research problem through legal and historical analysis, coupled with the respondents own words.

Tracy (2019) posits qualitative researchers engage in *Bricolage*, which is “a pieced together set of representations that is fitted to the specifics of a complex situation” (p. 46, citing Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 4), and makes an analogy to quilters. By transcribing and coding respondents’ narratives multiple ways, then utilizing computer-aided qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), themes begin to emerge. Interweaving these themes with the respondents’ viewpoints, yielded an overarching narrative from the multiple perspectives. This partial and mismatched data were ‘quilted’ into a meaningful synthesis to address the research questions.

**Mixed Methods Data Validation**

Validation of data occurs by utilizing triangulation, which uses multiple sources, methods, or theories to corroborate the evidence (Creswell, 2013). Multiple sources from the fields of CR-SE, AsianCrit, Asian Perspectives, Organizational Management, history, and law were used to examine the phenomena. The use of a convergent parallel mixed methods design in this study involved the joint analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data to support and answer the research questions.

In a convergent parallel design, results can converge or diverge. Divergence is disconfirming evidence presenting “a perspective that was contrary to the one indicated by the established evidence” (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, p. 217). Reporting any disconfirming evidence where data diverge is a form of data validation that confirms the evidence. There was no disconfirming evidence to report here because this study breaks new ground. To the best of researcher’s knowledge, this is the first study to examine whether gifted education is culturally
responsive to Chinese American accelerated learners as well as why these parents choose gifted education for their children. This is also the first study to apply Needs and Expectancy Theories to gifted education and parent perspectives. Further, this is first study to utilize Expectancy Values Theory to explore the costs and benefits of gifted education to parents.

**Chapter Synthesis**

This chapter describes the selection of participants that were used to conduct this study, as well as the procedures, data collection, data analysis used. The criteria for participation were outlined as were the recruitment strategies and ethical considerations that were afforded to participants. All appropriate measures were taken to protect participant confidentiality such as consent, data storage, and security. The study examines the cultural relevance of gifted education to the Chinese American community in NYC and has important implications for theory, research, and practice by adding to existing epistemologies regarding parent perspectives of gifted education, Needs Theory, Expectancy Theory, and culturally relevant education for communities under the ‘Asian’ umbrella. Moreover, it is an aim of this study to push the boundaries of the AsianCrit and Asian Perspectives fields to be more representative of the needs of the Asian communities and to stop perpetuating harms such as the myths of the model minority and ‘overrepresentation’. Finally, it is hoped that task values (attainment, interest, utility, and cost) can be identified for this community so that an instrument can be developed for further research in Expectancy Theory. The findings of this study are reported in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the findings of the study by revisiting and addressing the research questions. This mixed methods study was designed to explore why Chinese American parents choose gifted education opportunities for their children and whether gifted education might be culturally relevant to that community. The continuation of gifted education in NYC is a hotly contested political issue divided among deep racial lines. There is a black/white dichotomy that ignores the needs of other marginalized groups, such as Chinese Americans. This study presents an opportunity to give voice to this community by exploring the cultural connection to gifted education and understanding why these parents pursue opportunities for their children to engage in accelerated learning.

The following research questions were posed:

RQ1: Why is gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese Americans?

RQ2: Why do Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children?

The quantitative and qualitative data results will be presented in the following section to address these questions.

Quantitative Results

There were two quantifying instruments used to address the research questions. The Asian Value Scales (AVS) was designed to measure the extent participants hold on to traditional Eastern values and beliefs. These values are consistent with the teachings of Confucius. It is hypothesized that Chinese American parents who desire gifted education for their children will have higher AVS scores, because this aligns with the Confucian ideal of meritocracy.

The second instrument, Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ), measures the latent needs that motivate behavior. Since the needs for Achievement and Affiliation are consistent
with Confucian ideals of meritocracy and filial piety, it is hypothesized that parents who pursue gifted education for their kids will have higher scores in these two needs. These two instruments together help establish how aligned the participants are to Confucian ideals and whether these motivate them to pursue gifted education opportunities for their children.

Of the 34 participants completing both quantitative instruments, 23 were mothers, six were fathers and five more were the primary caretakers of children ages Pre-K through 8th grade.

**Table 4.1**

**Demographics for Quantitative Strand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birth Country</th>
<th>Years in NYC</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers = 23</td>
<td>21 – 65</td>
<td>China = 19</td>
<td>6 mos – 42 yrs</td>
<td>&lt;$10k → $419k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers = 6</td>
<td>(μ = 40)</td>
<td>US = 13</td>
<td>(μ = 14.19)</td>
<td>(μ = $95,941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretakers = 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As depicted in Table 4.1, the participants ranged in age from 21 to 65, with the average age being 40 years old. More than half of the participants were born in China, and the rest were born in the US except for two. Participants have lived in NYC from a range of six months to 42 years, with the average stay of 14.19 years. Income levels ranged from under $10,000 to over $419,000 annually, with an average salary of $95,941 per year. While most participants held a Bachelor’s degree (not shown on table), educational levels ranged from not having completed high school to achieving a doctorate level.

**Research Question 1: Why is gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese Americans?**

It was hypothesized that gifted education aligns with Confucian values, such as filial piety, affiliation, and achievement according to hard work and ability (meritocracy). These values are codified in the AVS, so that higher AVS scores ostensibly predict alignment of the desire for gifted education to their culture. Here, the combined average for the AVS scores of
parents and caregivers of gifted children are significantly higher than for the general Asian population. This was true regardless of number of years in the US, but the older the respondent, the stronger the adherence to these values. Moreover, there is a strong correlation between their Asian Values Scale score, and the Need for Affiliation. The more the respondents adhere to Asian Values, the higher their Need for Affiliation.

Analyses for the quantitative strand occurred in two steps. First the Asian Value Scales (AVS) and Needs Assessment Questionnaire (NAQ) results were scored manually and entered in tables (Appendix G). The trends in the data were readily visible by using color coding. A summary of the number of respondents scoring in the raw score ranges are presented in Table 4.1. The score ranges were divided from “very low” to “very high”. There were 10 respondents who scored in the three “high” ranges and only one who scored in the “low” range. Six scored moderately high, three scored high, and one scored very high. There were 23 who scored in the “average” range, which means their scores were consistent with other Asians and not the general population.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument:</th>
<th>AVS</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod High:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Low:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining the Needs scores, 26 respondents scored in the “high” ranges for Achievement and only one score in the “low” range. More than half scored in the “average” range for
Affiliation, less than half scored in the “high” ranges, and only three scored in the “low” ranges. Autonomy had the strongest scores with 25 respondents scoring in the “high” ranges and only two in the “low” range. Dominance was the lowest scoring need with only 16 in the “high” ranges and three in the “low” ranges. While the AVS scores were calibrated to other Asian populations, the NAQ scores were compared to a general population.

The second stage involved running statistical analysis in the SPSS system. The AVS and NAQ scores were entered, along with the coded demographic data, to run a Pearson r test, which analyzes correlations. As seen in Table 4.2, there were several statistically significant correlations with a set alpha level of 0.05 (two-tailed). First, higher Asian Values scores were associated with higher scores for the Affiliation Need. Second, higher Achievement Need scores were associated with higher Autonomy Need. Third, higher Autonomy Need scores were associated with higher Dominance Need. Despite the strong correlation between Need for Affiliation and AVS, this was not the highest scoring need by far. The Needs for Achievement and Autonomy were the two highest scorers, and there was an even stronger correlation between these two needs than AVS and Affiliation.

Table 4.3  

Correlations from SPSS Pearson r Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVS</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Dominance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Values</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Chinese American parents adhere to traditional values. Gifted education aligns with these values,
which are deeply rooted in Confucian ideal of meritocracy, which is the notion that hard work to
develop natural talents which will lead to success. The more the respondents adhere to traditional
Asian values, the higher their need for Affiliation. This need aligns with the Confucian concept
of ‘filial piety’, which is the idea that the individual is not as important as the kinship group.
However, Affiliation was not the highest scored need. Achievement and Autonomy were the
highest scoring needs by far with a strong correlation between them (Table 4.3). Achievement
connects well with Confucian thought, but Autonomy seems more aligned with American values.

**Table 4.4**

*Significance Levels from SPSS t Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>1-sided p</th>
<th>2-sided p</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Values</td>
<td>2.138</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.598102</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>2.332</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.6619</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>9.219</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.7069</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>7.519</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.6842</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.7649</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next test run in the SPSS system was a one-sample t test to determine whether the
respondents’ AVS and Needs scores were significantly differently from the populations used in
the original studies to quantify the Asian Value Scales and NAQ instruments. As seen in Table
4.3, the scores of their AVS scale were compared to a general Asian population, whereas their
NAQ scores were compared to a general college student population. AVS mean scores ($M =
3.21926, SD = 0.598102$) were significantly higher for these respondents ($n=34$) than for other
Asians, $t = 2.138, p < .05, d = .598102, 95\% CI [0.017, 0.711]$. This suggests Chinese American
parents who prefer gifted education for their children adhere to Asian values more strongly than
other Asians.
When examining NAQ scores, as seen in Table 4.3, all four Needs were significantly different than that for the general population of students in higher education. For Affiliation, mean scores \((M = 3.265, SD = 0.6619)\) were significantly higher for these respondents than for the college student population, \(t = 2.332, p < .05, d = .6619, 95\% Cl [0.016, 0.695]\). Achievement mean scores \((M = 4.118, SD = 0.7069)\) were significantly higher for these respondents than for the students, \(t = 9.219, p < .05, d = .598102, 95\% Cl [0.48, 0.747]\). For Autonomy, mean scores \((M = 3.882, SD = 0.6842)\) were significantly higher for these respondents than for the college students, \(t = 7.519, p < .05, d = .598102, 95\% Cl [0.827, 1.741]\). Dominance mean scores \((M = 3.418, SD = 0.7649)\) were significantly higher for these respondents than for the students, \(t = 3.184, p < .05, d = .7649, 95\% Cl [0.182, 0.903]\). Results for all four Needs were significant at both one and two-tailed with Achievement and Autonomy being \(< .001\), which is highly significant. This suggests not only that Chinese American parents who desire gifted education for their children have greater motivating needs than a general population of college students, but that the strongest drive comes from the needs for Achievement and Autonomy.

Gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans because it aligns with traditional Confucian ideals of meritocracy. The parents in this study adhere to Asian Values even more than other Asian communities. The higher the AVS score, the greater the need for Affiliation, but these parents are primarily motivated by needs for Achievement and Autonomy.

While AVS, Affiliation, and Achievement Need scores support the hypothesis, Autonomy does not seem to. A correlation between Autonomy and Dominance Needs is also puzzling. It was anticipated that these two needs would receive the lowest scores because they are at odds with traditional Confucian values and align more with American values. Yet these
respondents scored higher in these needs than the general population. The qualitative data speak to these issues further in this chapter.

**Research Question 2: Why do Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children?**

It was hypothesized that parents who desire gifted education for their children would score high in the two needs most aligned to traditional Confucian values: Achievement and Affiliation. Respondents did score significantly higher in the Need for Achievement, but not Affiliation. Although there was a strong correlation between high AVS score and Need for Affiliation, this did not hold true for all of the respondents. Instead, there was a strong correlation between the Needs for Achievement and Autonomy. While the parents in this study still hold onto traditional Asian values, Achievement and Autonomy are stronger than the need for Affiliation, and these seem to drive the motivation behind parents’ desiring gifted programs for their children.

When analyzing the Needs scores with the demographic data, there were significant correlations between the Achievement Need and educational and income levels. The higher the education and income levels, the higher the Achievement Need score. This seems to indicate that parents who are already successful and well-educated understand that gifted education will open doors of opportunities for their children. There were no other significant correlations between the demographic data and any other need.

The Needs for Autonomy and Dominance are more aligned to American values. While Dominance was the lowest scoring need among respondents, higher Autonomy scores were positively correlated with higher Dominance scores. The qualitative data may provide an explanation for this anomaly. The ‘American Dream’ concept emerged as a strong theme in the qualitative strand of the study. Rather than presenting this notion as an archaic cliché,
respondents connected this ideal to wanting a ‘bright future’ and ‘better opportunities’ for their children. They see gifted education as an individualized and enriched path that meets their children’s unique needs and opens the door to success. Future studies should explore this concept more fully to understand why Chinese immigrate to America in the first place, what their expectations are, and how they perceive they will achieve their goals.

**Qualitative Results**

A qualifying instrument eliciting short answer (Appendix F) and utilizing Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), served to allow participants to explain in their own words what gifted education means to them, how they prepare their children for accelerated learning, and why it is important to keep this opportunity for their children. Of the 34 participants who completed the two quantifying instruments, The AVS and the NAQ, 11 opted-in to participate in the qualitative strand of the research. The demographic composition of these participants is summarized in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5**

*Demographics for Qualitative Strand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birth Country</th>
<th>Years in NYC</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers = 5</td>
<td>21 – 57 (μ = 37.2)</td>
<td>China = 5</td>
<td>6 mos – 46 yrs (μ = 16.45)</td>
<td>&lt;$10k → $173k (μ = $59,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>US = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretakers = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten participants answered all 11 open-ended questions, and one more partially completed these. There were five mothers, three fathers, and three caretakers who agreed to participate in the qualitative strand. They ranged in age from 21 to 57, with average age of 37.2. Five were born in China, four in the US, and two were born in other countries that do not have a Chinese majority. Nine are US citizens, one has a Green Card and one more is undocumented (not shown on table).
Only two have lived in NYC less than a year, and all but one of the others have lived here for at least a decade. The educational levels spanned from trade school to doctorate level, and the incomes ranged from under $10,000 to over $173,000, with the average income being $59,364. The participants who completed the qualitative strand were younger with substantially less income than those participants who only completed the quantitative strand.

**Research Question 1: Why is gifted education culturally relevant to Chinese Americans?**

The quantitative data indicated that gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans because the idea that hard work to develop natural talents leads to success is deeply rooted in the Confucian ideal of meritocracy. Parents from this community hold strongly to traditional Asian values and are motivated by a strong need for achievement. The qualifying data confirmed that parents conceptualize gifted education as the medium where their child’s hard work and natural abilities will be rewarded with success.

**Word Analysis**

The first qualitative analysis was conducted after participants’ open-ended responses from the survey were coded and re-coded. The initial analysis involved the frequency of words found throughout the responses as well as a charted list of words and an analysis of how many times they appeared in the responses. Word Clouds are useful tools to commence a more in-depth qualitative analysis (Heimerl et al., 2014). A Word Cloud was created here to visualize word frequencies derived from the participants’ written responses (Atenstaedt, 2012). Figure 4.1 shows the resulting Word Cloud where frequency of words were divided into high (wine colored), medium (green colored) and low (blue colored), with the more frequent words enlarged in size for each category.
Figure 4.1

Word Cloud

Note: open-sourced online [https://www.freewordcloudgenerator.com/generatewordcloud](https://www.freewordcloudgenerator.com/generatewordcloud) the survey were entered into an opensource Word Cloud creator, providing a vivid graphic.

The most frequent words were “children” and “kids”, followed by “hardworking”, “gifted programs”, “learn better”, “ability” and “better future”. Other notable terms include “inspire”, “creative”, “perseverance”, “opportunity”, “perform”, “chances”, “advantages”, and “extracurricular activities.” This Word Cloud analysis connects gifted education with the Confucian ideal that hard work coupled with natural ability will give the children a better future. Thus, gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans because it is aligned with traditional Asian values.
Research Question 2: Why do Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children?

The Word Cloud analysis connected gifted education to deeply rooted cultural beliefs, but in order to understand why parents are motivated to pursue gifted education opportunities for their children, themes and narratives were analyzed. Parents explained in their own words what gifted education means to them and the advantages they expect their children to derive from it.

Themes

There were five emerging themes that capsulated most of participants’ short answer responses: Characteristics, Advantages, Harms, Alternatives, and Messages. The first theme of Characteristics refers to the qualities that parents and caregivers see in their children that make them gifted. The second, Advantages, refers to the benefits that their children receive, or what they expect to receive, from gifted education programs. The theme of Harms refers to the costs to the children if they no longer have the opportunity to pursue gifted education programs. Fourth, Alternatives refer to what parents would do instead to provide for their children should there be no gifted education opportunities. Finally, the theme of Messages refers to what the participants would like policymakers to know about the importance of gifted education.

As seen in Figure 4.2, parent perspectives were sorted into five categories and the size of these represent the amount of information given in the responses. A corresponding color coordinated chart (Appendix H) shows all the responses in their respective columns. Unsurprisingly, the largest category is Characteristics because respondents had a lot to say about the qualities their children possess that they believe make them gifted. Although not among the least responses, Messages was a bit surprising in that respondents did not have more to say to policymakers about the importance of keeping gifted education.
According to the theme analysis (Appendix H; Figure 4.2), parents overwhelmingly identified their children as “hard working”, “intelligent”, “talented”, and “able to perform better than peers”. They believe gifted programs will allow their children to have a better future by helping them to “learn in advance”, “challenge them”, “enrich their talents”, and “prepare them to enter a better university”. Moreover, they associate gifted education with pursuing the “American Dream” and believe homogenous classes will keep their children from learning bad habits from less motivated peers while promoting a competitive spirit that will inspire them to help each other grow. Some parents expressed anger towards those who are threatening to take gifted education away and feel they are being targeted because they are Asian. They are willing
to fight to keep these opportunities for their children because they feel strongly it affects their future.

Narratives

Individual narratives (Appendix I) presented several common threads to explain why parents desire gifted education for their children. The respondents were most eager to share the qualities they felt made their children gifted and expressed a belief that hard work would lead to success. Many viewed gifted programs as providing their children the means to achieve the American Dream and felt that it was unfair to Asians to take this opportunity away. Some expressed anger at those who advocate for dismantling gifted education and believe children who qualify for it are deserving because of their hard work, rather than their innate talent. They further expressed the view that hard working children should be segregated from those who do not strive for academic success to protect them from acquiring bad habits and to keep them motivated to engage in accelerated learning. The parents tend to see gifted education as the door to future success and are willing to fight to preserve it.

Expectancy-Value (EV) Identifiers

Further research is needed to quantify the values Chinese Americans place on gifted education. There is an emerging branch of Expectancy Theory that works well with perspectives and motivation of gifted education studies. Expectancy-Value (EV) Theory (Yang & Mindrila, 2020) posits four values work in tandem to determine whether the expected gain is worth the effort needed to expend in order to attain the goal. Attainment value involves the personal importance of doing well on a task. Interest value is the enjoyment attained from doing the task. Utility value refers to the usefulness of the task to reach the short and long-term goals. Cost is the
negative aspects of engaging in a task, including anxiety, fear, efforts needed to succeed, and lost opportunities to perform other tasks or activities.

The instrument used in the single study implementing EV Theory cannot be replicated outside the original domain. Thus, an aim in the qualitative strand of this study is to identify EV values for future researchers to develop an appropriate instrument to quantify parent motivations in seeking out gifted education programs for their children. The table with proposed instrument items can be found in Table 3.2.

The respondents’ attainment value involved confirmation that their children were gifted, intelligent, hardworking, advanced, and possessed talent and exceptional qualities, coupled with the belief that their children will do better on standardized tests, become successful, and achieve the American Dream. Interest value included the children working hard to do well in school, persevering in assignments, performing well when challenged, and displaying a happy or positive outlook towards school. Utility value stemmed from having a chance to attend better universities, being with peers who take education seriously, and overall self-improvement through the opportunity to stimulate their children’s own interests and developing their natural talent.

The cost value to pursuing gifted education was minimal, with only one parent deciding to stay with their child’s zoned school instead of a gifted program because it was more convenient. However, there were many costs associated with not having access to gifted education. Parents mentioned the cost of tutoring and enrichment, which many may not have the means to pay. Others were concerned that their children’s educational needs would not be met in a regular program. Some parents were willing to fight to keep gifted education or move out of
NYC in order to find a program for their child. These insights are informative for developing a quantitative EV instrument in future studies.

**Summary of Key Findings**

Gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans. The idea that hard work and development of talent will lead to success is very much steeped in Confucianism. Respondents in this study, Chinese American parents and caregivers who desire gifted education for their children, scored significantly higher on the Asian Values Scale than other Asians in the original study used to validate the instrument. The highest AVS scores were correlated with a corresponding Need for Affiliation from the Needs Assessment Questionnaire, which aligns with the Confucian value of filial piety. However, Affiliation was not the strongest need measured in the NAQ. Achievement and Autonomy were the top scoring needs with a strong correlation between them. There was also a statistically relevant relationship between Autonomy and Dominance. Surprisingly, respondents in this study scored significantly higher in all needs than the university students from a general population used to validate the NAQ.

The use of a mixed method design allowed for qualitative methodology that served to explain this anomaly in the quantitative data, giving insight as to why parents choose gifted education for their children. The NAQ measures four needs that serve to motivate human behavior. Two of them align well with Confucian values: Achievement and Affiliation. The other two align more with American values: Autonomy and Dominance. While those scoring highest in Asian Values also scored high in the need for Affiliation, the majority of the respondents scored highest in the needs for Achievement and Autonomy. This can be explained by the respondents’ own words. Achieving the American Dream was a strong theme that emerged from the qualitative data. Although respondents adhere to Confucian values, they were
willing to adapt to American ideals in order to open the doors to success for their children. Gifted education was seen as the door to achieving the American Dream. Parents are willing to fight to keep gifted education and are mobilizing to consolidate political power. The need for Autonomy may very well indicate parents’ wish to be free to enjoy the constitutional guarantee that their children will be given an equal opportunity to succeed in their dreams and remain free from others meddling in this right.

**Chapter Synthesis**

In this chapter, the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses addressed the two research questions posed. First, the question of why gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans was answered by the quantitative instruments, while the qualitative analysis explained an anomaly. Gifted education aligns with traditional values of meritocracy, achievement and ‘filial piety.’ However, the two strongest needs that motivate the parents are Achievement and Autonomy. Achievement aligns with traditional Asian values, but Autonomy does not. The qualitative data helped explain that while parents adhere to traditional values, they are willing to adapt American values to ensure their children’s success.

Second, the combined data determined why Chinese American parents desire gifted education for their children. Parents recognized that their gifted children possess qualities that differ from their non-gifted peers. They seek out gifted programs to support their children’s unique needs and for enrichment. They believe that gifted programs will prepare them to enter competitive colleges and give them a bright future. Participants adhere to traditional Asian Values but will adapt values that are uniquely American when necessary. While Asian Values and Need for Achievement align well with traditional Confucian values, the Need for Autonomy is distinctly aligned with American values. Parents related their desire for gifted education to the
“American Dream”, having more opportunities, a bright future, enrichment, and individualized learning. The results seem to indicate that while Chinese Americans have deeply held cultural beliefs, they are able to adapt to American cultural values that they believe will help them and their children attain the American dream. The final chapter will discuss the implications of these findings.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH, THEORY & POLICY

The purpose of this study was to examine why gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans and why parents from this community prefer it for their children. This chapter elaborates on the study’s findings and discusses the study's limitations, implications for policymakers, public office holders, researchers, and practitioners, and most importantly, provides a possible solution for the Chinese American community to establish the right to gifted education pursuant to the CR-SE Framework.

Discussion of Findings

This study investigates whether gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans and why parents seek out gifted programs for their children. Gifted education has become such a politicized issue not only in NYC but in other cities across the US that it is now assumed there are “too many” Asian children taking accelerated education seats away from other minoritized groups.12 Since not all communities under the Asian umbrella are similarly situated, the research focuses on the largest group, Chinese Americans.

Gifted education is culturally relevant to Chinese Americans because it aligns with traditional Asian values such as meritocracy, the belief that hard work and development of talent will lead to success. Not only do Chinese American parents who desire gifted education

---

12 In Halifax, Virginia, former Wall Street Journal reporter, Asra Nomani, is leading parents to oppose admission changes that disfavors Asian children in one of the nation’s best high schools, Thomas Jefferson. Anti-Asian animus is so entrenched at that school that students were not even informed that they had won National Merit Scholarships (Nomani, 2023). Lawsuits have been filed against schools in multiple cities seeking to ban gifted and accelerated programs under the guise of racism (Dreilinger, 2020). The attorney who filed the lawsuit against the City of New York, Benjamin Crump, also has cases in several other cities, indicating his plan to take this issue up to the Supreme Court (LeBoeuf, 2022).
opportunities for their children score high in Asian values, they are also highly motivated by the needs for Achievement and Autonomy. High Achievement need scores would appear to corroborate the finding that gifted education is culturally relevant to these parents, but the high scores for the Autonomy need seemingly reject this notion. The qualitative strand of this mixed method study provided some explanation for this anomaly, but additional research is needed in this area.

A person scoring high for Autonomy desires to work alone and be free from micromanagement (Geiger, 1995). The combined high scores in Autonomy and Achievement fit better with the notion of American rugged individualism, where each person has the opportunity to pull themselves up by the bootstraps to achieve their dream (Eppard, et al., 2020). This is inapposite to the concept of ‘filial piety’ where the individual’s needs give way to those of the collective. These results suggest that Chinese American parents in this exploratory study have adapted to these American ideals in order to secure their children’s success. Many parents related how they prepare their children for accelerated learning through individual tutoring and giving extra academic work in the home. In this manner, perhaps children are conditioned to work alone and to engage with academics in a heightened effort to please their parents. Parents also expressed concern that other children may not be as hardworking and that their child may be exposed to bad habits. Some explained a preference for homogenous learning so that equally abled children can spur competition that will challenge everyone to a higher standard of excellence. If parents were more aligned with ‘filial piety’ and Affiliation, it would be expected that there would be a preference for collaborative learning, but that was not the case for these respondents. Collaborative learning is at odds with meritocracy, where achievement is due to individual efforts.
The Confucian notion of meritocracy means that individual talents were cultivated in order to better serve society (Lau, 2000). An Americanized version of meritocracy could mean that the individual cultivation of talents should better serve the self. In other words, the ‘American Dream’ to these parents might be interpreted to mean hard work and self-improvement will lead to that individual’s success. The parents in this study did not express a belief that their children deserved to be in gifted programs solely due to innate abilities, but rather because they worked hard to learn in advance of their peers. Thus, the parents soundly rejected the myth of the ‘model minority’ and instead embraced the view that children’s hard work should be rewarded by placement into a gifted program, as this will lead them to success.

**Right to Gifted Education**

The decolonization of research means moving beyond a voyeuristic and emotionally detached lens to offer solutions for the stated problem (Smith, 2012). Respondents are very much invested in keeping gifted education opportunities for their children and are distressed this is being threatened. The solution may lie within the NYCDOE CR-SE Framework. According to the Framework, all students’ cultures must be valued. Teachers are expected to have high expectations for every student. The lives and identities of all students should connect to their education. Schools must be aware of past and present forms of bias and oppression, while building partnerships with families and communities.

Asians and whites together comprise only 30% of NYCDOE school population, yet they hold 70% of gifted education seats. These disproportionate numbers have been the basis for civil

---

13 Since the Framework is official policy of the DOE, it may create legal rights and responsibilities that can be enforced in a court of law. A current NY state case is using the Framework to claim that gifted education harms Black and Brown children (see *Integrate NYC, Inc., et al. v. State of New York, et al.*, N.Y. Supreme Court (2021)).
rights advocates’ call for dismantling gifted education and desegregating classrooms in the name of equity. However, equity cannot be divorced from excellence, lest a race to the bottom ensue. Removing standards and accelerated programs do nothing to address the deep inequities that caused the segregation in the first place. There is a literacy crisis stemming from the word gap that disproportionately affects Black American males.\textsuperscript{14} Priority should be given to this emergency, but by no means should resources be taken away from other marginalized groups to do so.

While parent advocates oppose disaggregation due to suspicion of being singled out coupled with the perception of strength in numbers, the designation of the Asian label lumps together many dissimilar cultures, languages, and beliefs which artificially inflate student demographic data (Day, 2018; Peng et al., 2022). Further, the Asian label obscures the issues and needs of distinct groups. Chinese Americans have the longest history of oppression in the United States than any other group from Asia (Hong, 2019). In fact, there is a vast record of unfavorable Supreme Court decisions denying Chinese in America their constitutionally guaranteed rights (Chin, 2013). Even Congress passed an Act in 1882\textsuperscript{15} to exclude them from this country due to their differences in culture, language, and beliefs. Though this Act was overturned, restrictive immigration quotas remain to this day (Hong, 2019).

In addition to the discrimination entrenched in American legislative and judicial systems, Chinese Americans today face harassment and physical attacks. The group Stop AAPI Hate reported more than 10,000 attacks against this community nationally from 2020 to 2021 alone due to blame from the COVID outbreak. Although this number includes attacks on other Asian


\textsuperscript{15} 8 U.S.C. 7 - EXCLUSION OF CHINESE.
groups, many were mistaken for Chinese. In NYC, hate crimes against Chinese Americans have skyrocketed and even lead to death over the past two years. Yao Pan Ma died months after being stomped in the head while collecting cans; Michelle Alyssa Go was pushed to her death in front of a subway in an unprovoked attack; Christina Yuna Lee was stalked and fatally stabbed in her apartment; and Zhiwen Yan, a Queens restaurant delivery guy, was shot to death because he didn’t put extra duck sauce in the bag. Asian American leaders unsuccessfully called for Mayor Eric Adams to declare a state of emergency because hate crimes against the community quadrupled in 2021 with many other attacks unreported or downgraded by the NYPD from a classification as a hate crime. Chinese Americans have undoubtedly long been targeted for discrimination, racism, harassment, and attacks, and the problem has been exacerbated post-Covid. It is thus imperative to view this community as a distinct group so that their unique educational needs can be fairly assessed.

Chinese Americans are a historically marginalized group that should benefit from the CR-SE framework too. Past Supreme Court rulings have classified Chinese as a disfavored group.

---

18 https://nypost.com/2022/01/15/woman-pushed-to-her-death-at-times-square-subway-station/
unworthy of Constitutional protections.\textsuperscript{22} Congress legislated an act to exclude them.\textsuperscript{23}

Contemporary news articles of random violent attacks on Asians show that oppression is deeply rooted and ongoing.\textsuperscript{24} Nevertheless, Chinese Americans have tapped into a rich cultural capital to persevere. Placing a high value on education coupled with establishing a curriculum of the home have resulted in the success of getting a greater number of their children into gifted programs. This desire for gifted education is directly connected to their cultural values. Thus, this study advances the notion that gifted education is \textit{per se} culturally responsive and should be preserved to meet the needs of Chinese American accelerated students.

\textbf{Limitations}

There are several limitations to this study affecting generalizability. First, the targeted population was restricted to Chinese American parents and caregivers of accelerated learners ages 4-11 in New York City. Second, there was a very small sample size of just 34 respondents for the quantitative analysis, and only 11 for the qualitative strand. Third, translations were only provided for the quantitative strand, but not for the interview responses. This meant that only respondents who could read and write in English were able to participate in the open-ended

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{22} See Chin, G. J. (2013). A Chinaman's chance in court: Asian Pacific Americans and racial rules of evidence. \textit{UC Irvine L. Rev.}, 3, 965. One poignant example of how Chinese were looked down upon can be found in the \textit{Chinese Exclusion Case} of 1889, where the United States Supreme Court ruled that:

they remained strangers in the land, residing apart by themselves and adhering to the customs and usages of their own country. It seemed impossible for them to assimilate with our people or to make any change in their habits or modes of living. (130 U.S. 581, p. 130)


questions. Fourth, this study represents an initial exploration into Chinese American parent attitudes about gifted education. Finally, the focus of giftedness in this study was viewed through the lens of one particular cultural group, so the results might not be generalizable to other ethnic groups.

**Implications of the Findings**

This study breaks new ground in several areas, and presents opportunities for researchers, practitioners, policymakers, and public office holders to further push boundaries and better serve the needs of the Chinese American community living in New York City. Asian American students have been left out of the CR-SE discussion. Critical Asian studies (AsianCrit) ignores the nuanced racial realities of Chinese Americans and other communities under this umbrella and instead presents a myopic lens of Asians through a white/black dichotomy. Finally, Organizational Management Theory lends itself well to expansion into the study of motivation and perspectives in gifted education.

**For Researchers**

AsianCrit scholars should focus on giving voice to the actual realities of the various communities that comprise the ‘Asian’ umbrella. Chinese American parents in NYC who advocate for keeping gifted education have been labeled as ‘white adjacent’ and ‘upholding white supremacist values’ in order to silence them. Moreover, gifted education researchers have perpetuated harms against the community by examining so-called ‘overrepresentation’ in gifted programs as well as reinforcing the myth of the ‘model minority’. This has divided society along a black/white color line while forcing members of Asian populations to choose a side. In a sense, this is forced assimilation because groups comprising the Asian umbrella are being conditioned and shamed into choosing a side against their self-interest.
CR-SE scholars can further expand the boundaries by exploring the application of culturally responsive education for communities under the ‘Asian’ umbrella. So far, research in this area has ignored the needs of members of this population. In order to better serve the distinct communities of this group, it is imperative to disaggregate data. Because Chinese Americans in particular have a long history of oppression in this country, culturally based educational opportunities can remedy these effects.

Moreover, Chinese Americans have tapped into a rich cultural capital to persevere under these harsh realities they have faced, and these should be studied, honored, and valued. The ‘curriculum of the home’ is an especially promising area that may offer other marginalized groups tools to replicate success in their own homes. However, the issue of disaggregating data from the Asian umbrella must be approached with caution. Parent advocates from the Asian community have raised concerns that disaggregation is intended as a strategy to divide and conquer. They believe that the Asian label gives them strength in numbers so any attempts to disaggregate must be made in consultation with the community so that the benefits are clearly communicated, and the harms minimized.

Organizational Management’s Needs and Expectancy Theories lend themselves well to expansion into gifted education. These theories have long been utilized to study workplace motivation, and recently have been expanded to study motivation in higher education. The new theory of Expectancy-Value (EV) is especially promising. The results of the qualitative analysis here may facilitate development of an instrument so that quantitative data may be measured. An EV instrument will provide insight into the specific values Chinese American parents place on gifted education, and how strongly these motivate them to seek gifted programs for their children.
For Practitioners

The architects of the CR-SE Framework intended all students to receive its benefits. Teachers and administrators must expand the implementation of the Framework to all and listen to parents and students as to how their cultural needs can best be met in the curriculum as well as the school environment. The Framework requires all students’ cultures to be valued while connecting the curriculum to students’ lives and identities. Teachers must hold high expectations for all learners. Schools must be aware of past and present forms of bias and oppression, while building partnerships with families and communities. The NYCDOE recently added Lunar New Year and Diwali to its holiday calendar which is an important first step towards inclusion of Asian student populations. However, the history of all marginalized groups in America must be taught so that students have a greater understanding and respect for one another. It is vital for teachers to recognize the cultural capital each student brings so that this may be integrated into the classroom. Students should be given appropriate support to achieve the highest standards of learning. Parents and communities should be respected partners in children’s education.

For Policymakers & Public Office Holders

Policymakers should consult more with members of the Asian umbrella in order to ensure their needs are incorporated into decisions made that will impact their lives and well-being. Accelerated programs must be funded and maintained so that all gifted students have the opportunity to an education appropriate for their unique needs. The current policy of ‘dumbing down the top’ does nothing to close equity gaps and instead is dividing parents along racial lines and driving many families out of the public school system.

The last couple of election cycles have illustrated the political power of parents who are willing to fight to maintain gifted education opportunities for their children. The shift in the
congressional balance of power should alert politicians to be mindful of the critical needs and important issues of their Asian constituents. Chinese Americans in particular are greatly concerned about public safety and keeping accelerated education intact. Politicians who support defunding police and dismantling gifted education and specialized high schools will have trouble getting elected in a district with a large number of Asian residents. Parents have mobilized in NYC to run for their local school councils and community boards, and there is an increase in Chinese Americans running for City Council. It is clear that this community is demanding to be heard and are ready to wield political power to have their needs met and their rights vindicated.

**Conclusion**

During the final editing phase of this study, the Supreme Court ruled in *Students for Fair Admission v. Harvard* (U.S., 2023) that admissions policies in universities favoring one group at the expense of another are unconstitutional. However, the United States still has a long way to go to achieve equality in terms of educational opportunities. Equity dictates resources should be deployed to address achievement gaps for marginalized communities, but the High Court’s decision makes clear that these resources cannot be diverted from programs that benefit other marginalized groups. This study suggests gifted education is culturally relevant to one such group, Chinese Americans. Yet gifted education has been the center of the equity controversy, especially in New York City.

Chinese American parents feel strongly that gifted education presents the best opportunities for their children’s success. They have become politically mobilized over this issue, which has exacerbated hateful verbal and physical attacks against their community. Parent advocates in favor of keeping gifted education have been labeled as ‘white adjacent’ so they could be effectively silenced by being called out as racists. In a sense, Chinese Americans have become an
‘inconvenient minority’ (Xu, 2021) because on the whole they have managed to become successful in educational pursuits despite a long history of oppression in this country. Instead of celebrating their success against all odds, some researchers vilify them as being ‘overrepresented’ in gifted education and worse, being on the wrong side of the black/white dichotomy.

This study hopes for a shift in this paradigm which pits marginalized groups against each other. The late David Dinkins, New York City’s first Black mayor (1990 – 1994), referred to the city as a ‘gorgeous mosaic’ (Dinkins, 2013). He believed people could find ways to work together, live together and grow together regardless of skin color, origin, or what language is spoken. Unlike the concept of a ‘melting pot’ which was in vogue at that time, he believed communities did not have to assimilate in order to be accepted, and that their cultural capital added to the beauty of the city. The cultural capital of Chinese Americans is under studied and therefore ripe for exploration.
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GIFTED EDUCATION IS CRUCIAL FOR NYC

Are you a Chinese American Parent?

Do you have a child in Pre-K through 5th Grade?

Do you want to preserve gifted opportunities for your child?

If you answered ‘yes’ to all three questions, please use your phone to scan the code below to open the survey to let your voice be heard. Julie Milner (Julie.Milner@liu.edu), educational doctoral candidate at Long Island University, is conducting this research for her dissertation to establish the cultural relevance of gifted education for accelerated learners from the Chinese American community and their entitlement to have opportunities to access gifted programs.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete with an additional, optional short answer question set that will take about 10 minutes more. Make sure to click the option at the end if you would like the opportunity to express your thoughts in a longer interview (12 parents will be randomly selected from those who express an interest). The longer interview will be conducted online or via phone for no more than 30 minutes.

<<<Insert QVC code linking to survey here>>>
调查问卷征集1/2/2022

施行资优教育对于纽约市至关重要

请问您是华裔家长吗？
您的孩子是不是正处于学前班到五年级的学习阶段？
您想保护孩子的天赋吗？

如果以上三题，您都给予“肯定”答案，请下方手机扫码进入调查问卷，留下您的宝贵观点。长岛大学教育博士生 Julie Milner (Julie.Milner@liu.edu) 正在针对此领域开展专项研究，研究的根本目的：是为了明确面向华裔社区绩优生开展资优教育所具有的文化意义，同时为他们创造参与资优教育的机会。

此问卷需要耽搁您约10 分钟的宝贵时间。如果您可以额外抽出10 分钟，完成另外一份以简答题为主的附加问卷，我们将不胜感激。此外，如果您还愿意参与进一步调研来充分表达自己的想法，请务必点击文末选项（我们将从表达该意愿的家长朋友中，随机抽取12 人参加）。此后续调研将以线上通话或电话通话的形式进行，通话时间将控制在30 分钟以内。

<<<Insert QVC code linking to survey here>>>
APPENDIX C
Demographic Questions

English Version

DEMOGRAPHICS
Your responses to the following questions will remain anonymous:

1. What is your relationship to the child in grade Pre-K to 5th?
   Mother/Father/Other _____

2. How old are you? _____

3. Where were you born?
   US/China/Other ______

4. What is your immigration status?
   US Citizen/Green Card/Visa/Other

5. How long have you lived in NYC?
   Entire life/More than half my life/Over 10 years/5-9 yrs/1-4 yrs/ Less than 1 yr

6. How many people live in your household? _____

7. How many children do you have? ______

8. What is your educational level?
   Less than high school/ High school or equivalent/ Technical or trade school/ Associates degree/ Bachelor’s Degree/ Master’s Degree/ Professional or Doctorate/ Other

9. Did you or anyone in your family take the Gao Kao test in China?
   Me/My spouse/My sibling/My parents/My grandparents/Other

10. What is your annual household income before taxes?
    Under $10k/$10k-$25k/$26k-$36k/$37k-$81k/$82k-$172k/ $173k-$329k/ $330k-$418k/
    $419k-$628k/ Over $628k

11. What is your zip code? ______
人口统计

针对以下问题，您的作答将会被严格保密；

1. 您和孩子（学前班-五年级）的关系是？
   妈妈/爸爸/其他_____

2. 您的年龄是？_____

3. 您在哪里出生？
   美国/中国/其他_____

4. 您的移民现状是？
   美国公民/绿卡持有者/Visa 持有者/其他_____

5. 您在纽约市居住多久了？
   从出生到现在/半生在纽约/超过 10 年/5-9 年/1-4 年/1 年以内

6. 您家中有几口人？_____  

7. 您家中有几个孩子？_____

8. 您的受教育程度是？
   高中以下/高中或其他等效学历/职业技术学院/副学士/本科/硕士研究生/博士/其他

9. 您或您的家人参加过中国的高考吗？
   本人/伴侣/兄弟姐妹/父母/祖父母/其他

10. 您每年家庭税前收入是多少？
    低于 1 万美金/1 万-2.5 万美金/2.6-3.6 万美金/3.7-8.1 万美金/8.2-17.2 万美金/17.3-32.9 万美金/33.8 万美金/41.9-62.8 万美金/高于 62.8 万美金

11. 您的邮政编码是？____
APPENDIX D
AVS Instrument

English Version

Asian Values Scale (AVS; English version)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the following statements, then respond to each of the following statements by circling your answer using the scale from "1 = Strongly disagree" to "7 = Strongly agree" to indicate your agreement and disagreement of these statement.

1. One should not deviate from familial and social norms.
2. Occupational failure does not bring shame to the family.
3. One need not follow the role expectations (gender, family hierarchy) of one’s family.
4. The ability to control one’s emotions is a sign of strength.
5. Modesty is an important quality for a person.
6. Following familial and social expectations is important.
7. One should think about one’s group before oneself.
8. Children need not take care of their parents when the parents become unable to take care of themselves.
9. One need not follow one’s family’s and the society’s norms.
10. Educational failure does not bring shame to the family.
11. One should consider the needs of others before considering one’s own needs.
12. One’s family need not be the main source of trust and dependence.
13. One need not conform to one’s family’s and society’s expectations.
14. Family’s reputation is not the primary social concern.
15. One need not achieve academically to make one’s parents proud.
16. Parental love should be implicitly understood and not openly expressed.
17. One’s achievements should be viewed as family’s achievement.
18. One should not be boastful.
19. Children should not place their parents in retirement homes.
20. The worst thing one can do is bring disgrace to one’s family reputation.
21. Elders may not have more wisdom than younger person.
22. One should be humble and modest.
23. When one receives a gift, one should reciprocate with a gift of equal or greater value.
24. One should have sufficient inner resources to resolve emotional problems.
亚洲价值观尺度（AVS; Chinese version）

价值观问卷说明：下列陈述句描述了一些亚洲社会的价值观。请阅读下列陈述句，并根据您对每句观点的态度，同意或不同意，选择（从 1 非常不同意到 7 非常同意）。

1. 人不应该违背家庭和社会的行为标准。
2. 事业上的失败不会使家庭蒙羞。
3. 人不需要遵从他的家庭要他在家里所扮演的角色（例如，性别，家庭地位等等）的期望。
4. 能够控制情绪表明他强大。
5. 谦虚是一个人重要的品质。
6. 遵从家庭和社会的期望是重要的。
7. 人应该先考虑集体再来考虑个人。
8. 当父母没能力照顾他们自己的时候，孩子们是不需要照顾他们的父母的。
9. 人不需要遵从家庭和社会的行为准则。
10. 学业上的失败不会使家庭蒙羞。
11. 人应该先考虑别人的需要，再考虑自己的需要。
12. 一个人不需要把他的家庭作为他主要信任和依靠的根源。
13. 人不需要遵从家庭和社会寄予的期望。
14. 家庭的名声名誉不是社会上主要看重的。
15. 人不需要取得学业上的成功而让家长为之自豪。
16. 父母应该含蓄（不明言）地表达对孩子的爱，而不是公开地表达。
17. 个人的成就应该被视为是家庭的成就。
18. 人不应该自吹自擂。
19. 孩子们不应该把其父母放在养老院。
20. 一个人能做的最坏的事情就是令家庭的名誉蒙羞（或让家庭丢脸）。
21. 年长的人不一定比年轻人有更多的智慧。
22. 人应该谦虚且谦逊。
23. 收到礼物时人们应该以相当价值或更高价值的礼物回赠。
24. 人应该内心强大以助于他解决情感上的问题。
APPENDIX E
NAQ Instrument

English Version

NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (NAQ)

This scale contains 20 statements that may describe you and the types of things you may like to do. For each statement, indicate your agreement or disagreement by filling in the corresponding "bubble" on the answer sheet. Use the following scale to indicate your agreement.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. I try to perform my best at work.
2. I spend a lot of time talking to other people.
3. I would like a career where I have very little supervision.
4. I would enjoy being in charge of a project.
5. I am a hard worker.
6. I am a "people" person.
7. I would like a job where I can plan my work schedule myself.
8. I would rather receive orders than give them.
9. It is important to me to do the best job possible.
10. When I have a choice, I try to work in a group instead of by myself.
11. I would like to be my own boss.
12. I seek an active role in the leadership of a group.
13. I push myself to be "all that I can be."
14. I prefer to do my own work and let others do theirs.
15. I like to work at my own pace on job tasks.
16. I find myself organizing and directing the activities of others.
17. I try very hard to improve on my past performance at work.
18. I try my best to work alone on a work assignment.
19. In my work projects, I try to be my own boss.
20. I strive to be "in command" when I am working in a group.
需求评估问卷（NAQ） 1/2/2022

1 = 非常不符合  
2 = 不符合  
3 = 既不同意也不反对  
4 = 符合  
5 = 非常符合

1. 我努力在工作中表现最好。  
2. 我花费了大量时间与人交流。  
3. 我想要选择那些极少被监督束缚的职业。  
4. 我喜欢在项目中担责。  
5. 我是一个勤奋工作的人。  
6. 我是一个“有人缘”的人。  
7. 我喜欢的工作是能够按照自己的节奏来。  
8. 比起下命令，我更愿意接受命令。  
9. 我认为尽力将工作做到最好非常重要。  
10. 如果我可以选择的话，我会选择团队协作而不是孤军奋战。  
11. 我希望自己的事自己说了算。  
12. 我想要在团队领导中发挥积极作用。  
13. 我努力敦促自己“尽己所能”。  
14. 我更愿意每个人各司其职。  
15. 我喜欢按照自己的节奏完成工作任务。  
16. 我发现自己正在组织指导他人的活动。  
17. 我非常努力地提升自己过往的工作成绩。  
18. 我尽自己的最大努力去独立完成一项工作任务。  
19. 在我的工作项目中，我希望自己说了算。  
20. 我在团队协作中会努力争取“指挥官”的角色。
APPENDIX F
Interview Questions (English only)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about your child aged from Pre-K to 5th.
2. What are some characteristics and abilities your child has that make him/her gifted?
3. Why did you place or want to place your child in a gifted program?
4. Tell me about the gifted program your child attends, if any – or tell me what you’d like to see in a gifted program?
5. What would it mean to you if there were no more gifted programs?
6. What does “gifted” mean to you?
7. What does “gifted education” mean to you?
8. How did you prepare your child to get into a gifted program?
9. What makes a gifted program more special than attending regular school?
10. How would you meet your child’s educational needs if there are no more gifted programs?
11. If you could send a message to the people that decide whether to keep gifted education, what would you say to convince them?
## APPENDIX G

### Instrument Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPSS/ Raw #</th>
<th>AV Needs</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ach</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/6</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/16</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>2.912</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/18</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/19</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/21</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/23</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/24</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/25</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/26</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/28</td>
<td>4.292</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/29</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/30</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color Key:**
- Average level
- Moderate level
- High level
- Very high level
- Low level
## APPENDIX H

### Themes Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Harms</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking, perseverance. Reading level grades ahead, fairly self-regulated, not prone to tantrums, very mature, very intuitive, hardworking. Positive, creative, hardworking, intelligent. Ability to perform better than others. Intelligent, good speaking qualities, exceptional qualities, talented students. Inquisitive, active, affectionate, compassionate, friendly, hands-on learner, doesn’t give up if interest piqued, find solution to problem, easily makes friends and joins in play. Brains work differently. Multiple talents. Study more. Likes to excel at her subjects. Loves routine, positive praise. Independent does well on tests, logic, reasoning, teaches others. Smart. Works hard for future. Parent can see as compared to other children. Understands things very well. Creative thinker. Hardworking children. Strong in science, math, writing.</td>
<td>Better education, learn in advance, strength, learn at faster rate, customized, advanced, better future. Challenging academic program to push child, local school, diversity of personality in class, accelerated and rigorous, grouping of kids by ability makes it easier to learn at own pace, no extra money to run. See what child can do, inspire potential, higher opportunity to get into better universities. Classmates at same standards, drive you to succeed, challenges children more. Prove herself. Inquiry-based teaching and learning, students accountable for learning. A place to offer children talents. Learn more. American dream! Gives autonomy on students’ own studies and learning. Hardworking children that know school is not a play place. Children together help each other grow. Wide range of activities. Special present from God for hard workers. Improve futures.</td>
<td>Less opportunity. Less chances to inspire their potential. Will move out of NYC. Child’s way of learning not accommodated. Rote teaching or repetitive memorization not effective like hands-on experiences. Not all families can afford extracurricular activities, many sacrifices are made. Move. Current test unfair. Gifted kids suffer if mixed with kids that aren’t there to learn. Bad habits will affect gifted kids and harm them. No enriched arts and extracurricular programs. Children not happy. Parents sad.</td>
<td>Read and exercise more, tutoring, private schools. Private school, tutoring. Move to LI or NJ. Maybe enrichment programs. After school tutoring. Parents have to teach children themselves. Find schools that have programs or afterschool programs such as scuba diving, aviation, STEM, dance, or art. Pay out of pocket for tutoring.</td>
<td>Keep it for kids need it. I hope programs can last longer to give kids more chances and better ability; Give our kids a brighter and more colorful life! You are being unfair to Asian students. Keep gifted education available; it is a gift to those who have earned it (hopefully). Keep G&amp;T programs. Give the education according to ability. Find their talents and put energy to develop. All kids have some talent or interest that should be developed in school. Not all kids are gifted though. Kids are our future. If you take away from kids, you hurt the future. Anyone that would hurt children should not be in a position to make these decisions. Parents are watching what they do, and we will fight back because these are our children’s lives they are playing with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Individual Narratives

Respondent 1

The first respondent is a 30-year-old teacher born in China who is a Green Card holder and has lived in NYC over 15 years. This person has a master’s degree and earns over $82,000 per year, and lives in a three-person household. He had an average score for Asian Values and scored very high in Achievement and Autonomy Needs. In fact, his Achievement score was the highest possible. He was moderately high in the Need for Dominance. This respondent believes that gifted children are strong learners who are hardworking and show perseverance, and that gifted education is better because it allows students to learn in advance, at a faster rate, and is customized to fit their needs so they may have a bright future. If there were no gifted educational opportunities, he believes children would have less opportunities for advancement and would have to turn to private schools and tutoring to meet their needs. This person would like to tell policymakers to “keep it, for kids need it.”

Respondent 2

The second respondent is a 37-year-old mother born in the US and has lived in NYC her entire life. She comes from a household of four, including two children. She has a bachelor’s degree and her family’s income is over $173,000 a year. She scored in the average range for Asian Values, had high scores in Affiliation and Dominance, and very high scores in Achievement and Autonomy. Her daughter is in the 3rd grade, reads at a 7th grade level, and has been in G&T since Kindergarten. Her girl is fairly self-regulated, very mature and intuitive, and not prone to tantrums. This mother believes that gifted children, like her own daughter, are hardworking and need accelerated and rigorous programs to challenge and push them
academically. She reports that her daughter’s class is very diverse and when kids are grouped by ability it makes it easier for them to learn at their own pace. If her daughter’s program were no longer available, she would get tutoring and place her in private school. She would like for policymakers to know that “G&T is a program that does not expend extra resources to upkeep the children that go through the program.”

**Respondent 3**

The third respondent is a 32-year-old mother of one child. She is a US citizen that was born in China and has lived in NYC over five years. There are five people in her household, and she has an associate degree with an income of over $37,000. Both of her parents took the Gaokao examination back in China and her seven-year-old daughter passed the G&T test last year. She had an average score on Asian Values, high score in Dominance, and very high score in Autonomy. She describes her daughter as positive, creative, hardworking, and intelligent, and wanted her to get into G&T to take a chance to see what she could do. She wanted the gifted program to inspire her potential. She believes gifted children are intelligent and hardworking, and that gifted programs improves their abilities and gives them more opportunities, especially to get into better universities. This year, now that the test has been cancelled, she explained that parents merely have to fill out a form and get a teacher’s recommendation for their children to have a chance to get in. This mother would like to tell policymakers, “I hope the gifted programs could last longer, cuz [sic] it could give kids more chances. Give our kids a brighter and more colorful life!”

**Respondent 4**

The fourth respondent is a 35-year-old mother born in the US who has lived in NYC her whole life. She and her husband have three children and she holds a doctorate degree. The
family’s income is over $82,000. She scored in the average range for all instruments except for the Need for Autonomy, which was high. She shares her experiences concerning her son who is in Pre-K. She believes he is gifted because of his ability to perform better than his peers. She’s not sure how to get him into a program but will pursue standardized testing and interviews. She believes gifted programs challenge the children more to help them perform better academically, and that matching peers according to ability allow them to study standards at the same pace and creates an atmosphere of competition which drives them to succeed. If there are no more gifted programs, she plans to move out of NYC to NJ or LI. She would like policymakers to know that if they cancel gifted programs, “You are being unfair to Asians!”

**Respondent 5**

The fifth respondent is a 40-year-old caretaker from a country that does not have a Chinese majority population. She is newly arrived in NYC and is undocumented. She has a master’s degree from her home country and makes $26,000 as a live-in nanny. She scored high in Asian Values and Need for Dominance and very high for Achievement. She believes the 10-year-old girl that she cares for is gifted because she is intelligent with good speaking qualities, but she has not had the opportunity to participate in gifted programs. She believes that children with exceptional qualities, like talent, should have special programming to meet their needs.

**Respondent 6**

The sixth respondent is a 46-year-old mother of two who was born and raised in NYC. She has a master’s degree and makes over $37,000. She scored average for Asian Values, moderate for Affiliation, and high for Achievement. Her Need for Dominance is lower than average. She shared about her son’s gifted education experience and reports that he is inquisitive, active, affectionate and shows compassion. She and her husband enrolled him in Tae Kwon Do
and soccer to help him get his extra energy out, make friends, and stay healthy. She describes him as friendly, and he loves to give her and his grandmother hugs. Although he is willing to help others in need, he usually does not take the initiative. The qualities that her son possesses that she believes make him gifted include him being a hands-on learner, not giving up if his interest is piqued to try to find a solution to a problem, and his ability to make friends and join in play somewhat easily. He passed the G&T test and was accepted into an inquiry-based gifted program. She especially likes this teaching method but prefers more accountability for student learning and better communication from the teachers, such as a newsletter or weekly summary blurb. Her son is graduating from elementary school, and she is unaware of gifted middle school programs. She is critical of test prep, rote teaching, and repetitive memorization because children need an academic environment that supports the way their brain works. She did not put her son through a test prep program to help him pass the G&T program, but instead worked on the DOE-provided practice test with him at home, as well as gave him a healthy dinner and good night sleep the day before his test. He currently attends an after-school program twice a week to work on math and reading. If there were no more gifted programs, she believes parents may try after-school enrichment, but acknowledges not all families have the resources to provide this for their children. She would like to tell policymakers, “Not all families can afford to have their child participate in extra-curricular activities, many sacrifices are made. Keep gifted education available, it is a gift to those who have earned it (hopefully).”

Respondent 7

The seventh respondent is a 21-year-old US-born older sister who moved back home last year after college to help care for her first-grade sister. Her sister is not in a gifted program, but she is talented in dance and piano. The parents pay for lessons, and they are not aware of any
public-school programs that provide this. They would like the child to attend such a program so that she can develop her talents and have more opportunities. The respondent scored average in Asian Values, moderate in Autonomy, and high in Achievement.

**Respondent 8**

The eighth respondent is a 40-year-old father with one five-year-old child that he would like to be a gifted program. He is a US citizen who was born in China and has lived in NYC over a decade. He has a bachelor’s degree and makes over $82,000. He scored average range in all instruments except for Need for Autonomy, where he scored low. He believes that gifted children study more and that they learn more in gifted programs than regular classes. If gifted education is canceled, he plans to move out of NYC. He would like policymakers to know, “keep G&T programs [because these are the] American Dream!”

**Respondent 9**

The nineth respondent is a US citizen born in the UK. She has lived in NYC over half her life. She is 48 and lives with her husband and their daughter, has a master’s degree and makes over $82,000. She scored in the average ranges for Asian Values and Need for Dominance, and was high for Achievement, Affiliation and Autonomy Needs. She describes her daughter as an only child who excels at her subjects, loves routine, and does well with positive praise. She believes her daughter’s academic success is due to her being independent and a good test taker because of her logic and reasoning. She is satisfied with her daughter’s present school and does not wish to move her into a gifted program. She believes that gifted students are those who are independent learners, excel at their strengths, and that gifted education should provide students with the ability to pursue their own interests with the opportunity to teach others about these interests. However, she asserts that the current test for G&E is unfair due to the focus on ELA
and math. She believes strongly that other areas should be assessed, such as science, music, art, and dance, and that gifted education should give students’ autonomy for their own learning. If there were no more gifted programs, she encourages parents to expose their children to different interests until they find something that aligns with their strengths, then match to a school that offers this. She also suggested finding afterschool programs with varied activities such as scuba diving, aviation, STEM, dance, or art.

**Respondent 10**

The tenth respondent is a 57-year-old father of three who was born in China and is now a US citizen. He has lived in NYC over two decades, has a trade, and makes around $37,000. He scored moderately high for Asian Values and very high for all four Needs. In fact, his Needs for Achievement and Autonomy were at the highest scores. He referenced having a daughter in gifted education whom he categorized as being smart and working hard to have a future. He stated that he knew she was gifted because he had two other children to compare her to, related that she is smart academically and understands things very well. He mentioned that she is a creative thinker who enjoys a wide range of activities like ballroom dancing, debate competitions, stock market game, Latin classes, robotics, art, and performance. He developed her potential early by using reading software and educational programs that a professor friend had recommended, reading to her in both English and Mandarin, and sending her to a bi-lingual preschool. When she was older, he enrolled her in art, piano, and acting classes as well. He believes gifted education should be for hardworking children that know school is not a play place and that having these children together will help them grow. Giftedness to him is a gift from God coupled with hard work to improve the future. He believes gifted programs are for children who are really smart in science, math, and writing, and that education should be matched according to
ability; that schools should find students’ talents and put energy to develop. He asserts all kids have some talent or interest that should be developed in school, but not all kids are gifted. He strongly believes gifted programs should only be given to gifted students, not to everyone, because gifted kids will suffer if mixed with kids that are not there to learn, and “their bad habits will negatively affect the rest of the class.” He mentioned that his daughter was in a regular class before entering a gifted program, and she was not happy there due to lack of enrichment. If there were no more gifted programs, this would make his family sad, but they would pay out of pocket to get the enrichment she needs. He expressed a stern message for policymakers: “I would tell them kids are our future. If you take away from kids, you hurt the future. Anyone that would hurt children should not be in a position to make these decisions. Parents are watching what they do, and we will fight back because these are our children’s lives they are playing with.”

**Respondent 11**

The eleventh respondent is a 40-year-old father born in China who is now a US citizen. He scored moderately high in Asian Values, high in Need for Autonomy, and very high in Need for Dominance. He’s lived in NYC over a decade and is married with three kids. He has a trade and makes less than $10,000. He has a nine-year-old daughter in a gifted program but did not share any other information.