




Investigation of the Gifted Students' Education Based on Its Cost

Figen Çam-Tosun ¹

Sema Tan ²

Abstract

Introduction: The purpose of this research was to investigate the cost parents paid for their gifted and non-gifted children, the type of expenses they made for their children's education and their opinions regarding the financial demands of their gifted children.

Method: In this qualitative study with a phenomenological approach, the data were collected from 20 parents of gifted and non-gifted students using structured interview forms. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and content analysis.

Findings: The findings indicated that the parents spent the most on school supplies for both gifted and non-gifted children for in-school environment. However, for out-of school expenditures parents spent the most on books, movies, and intelligence games for their gifted children while they spent the most on field trips and movies for their non-gifted children.

Discussion: Parents could not fully support the development of their children (especially gifted ones) due to their financial conditions. Also, parents reported that opportunities in regular schools were not enough to help their children realize and fulfill their own potential. It was concluded that gifted children needed environments enriched with more materials, sources, mentors, and facilities to reveal their true potential.

Keywords: Cost, expenditure, gifted children, parental income, potential.

To cite: Çam-Tosun, F., & Tan, S. (2021). Investigation of the gifted students' education based on its cost. *Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences Journal of Special Education*, 22(3), 677-698. <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.773728>

¹**Corresponded Author:** Asst. Prof., Sinop University, E-mail: figencam@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8303-2179>

²Asst. Prof., Sinop University, E-mail: sematan@sinop.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9816-8930>

Introduction

Gifted children are defined in many different ways in the literature. However, almost all of these definitions share some of the characteristics such as high or exceptional performance in different fields including mathematics, science, creativity, art, and leadership (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2018; National Association of Gifted Children [NAGC], 2008; No Child Left Behind Act, 2002). These children have intense, sustained interest (Johnsen, 2011). They prefer to actively engage in open-ended, original tasks (Shore et al., 2003). Due to the misbelief that gifted students do not need any instruction or guidance, most gifted students in regular education classrooms sit in a classroom environment waiting for their peers to learn the skills or knowledge that they have mastered at least a year before (Sternberg et al., 2011). However, in reality, the education they receive should be specifically designed for their talent and interest to acquire new knowledge. Considering the educational policy, school environment, and parents' approach which all play significant roles when designing the learning environment according to gifted children's needs and interests, each of these concepts should be explored in detail.

In Turkey, the education of gifted children has different steps. In the first step entitled identification, teachers in regular schools refer the potentially gifted students for screening in two of the three areas including visual art, music, and general intelligence. The ones who pass the screening test take an intelligence scale (i.e., Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised [WISC-R]) for the area of general intelligence, and performance test for music and visual art. Following the intelligence scale and performance tests, testers and specialists make the final decision on which children require special services for giftedness. The second step is attending Science and Art Centers (SACs) which are specifically designed for gifted students. The identified students hold the right to attend SACs operating after school hours and in the weekends (Çetinkaya & Döner, 2012; Tan, 2018). These centers are free for gifted children who receive full financial support from the government. Since they have limited capacity to serve all the identified children (Bakioğlu & Levent, 2013; Levent, 2011), the gifted students' educational needs attending these centers are not appropriately met. The Turkish Government made several attempts to improve the quality of gifted education. In the 2014-2018 development plan (Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı [State Planning Organization, SPO], 2013), it was stated that the physical and personnel infrastructure for gifted children would be strengthened. However, in reality, this statement did not meet their specific needs. Since the education of the gifted involves different areas to consider such as identification, acceleration, enrichment, and mentorship, the policy needs to be updated and reorganized to specifically respond to the needs in each of these areas.

Schools are obliged to effectively respond to the gifted children's physical, emotional, and intellectual needs by providing technological options and opportunities enriched with accelerative practices (VanTassel-Baska, 2005), as well as access to school clubs, elective courses, resource rooms, appropriate facilities including laboratories or ateliers, opportunities to attend to national and international competitions for different projects, and mentors. However, Hahn-Young and Balli (2014) point out that when schools have financial problems, the first services to be terminated are gifted and talented programs. In Turkey, although some opportunities have been provided for gifted students such as resource rooms, laboratories, and opportunities for different competitions, most of them have been either very limited (Cevher-Kılıç, 2015) or non-existent due to schools' financial shortcomings (Kazu & Şenol, 2012). Since schools do not have the budget stated in the legislation or financial sources that proportionately increase in accordance with the demand in schools, they face serious financial problems (Kurul, 2012). On average, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries spend \$10.500 a year on educating each student from primary to a college education. In Turkey, on the other hand, the amount spared for the education of each student is \$4.900 (OECD, 2018). Furthermore, Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu [TSI], 2018) stated that education expenditure per primary school student was \$1395, per middle school student was \$1488, and per high school student was \$2290. It was also documented that in 2016 the ratio of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to education budget was 4.21% while it was reduced to 3.63% in 2019 (MoNE, 2019). Even these data document how much is spent on the education which is less than required.

Parents have an undeniable impact on their gifted children when fulfilling their potential (Afat & Köksal-Konik, 2018; Ogurlu, 2016; Olszewski-Kubilius, 2008). Several studies highlighted the need for financial, social, educational, and emotional support for the parents of gifted children. Karakuş (2010) found that parents struggled when revealing their children's potential, helping them live up to these potentials, and responding to their social, emotional, and intellectual needs. Saranlı (2011) indicated that parents of gifted children needed guidance and counseling and they benefited from the guidance practices. Moreover, several researchers confirmed that parents'

socio-economic status (SES) had an impact on their gifted children's development (Çetinkaya & Kınca, 2015; Sidar, 2011; Uzun, 2006) as they could spend on their gifted children's education according to their income (Arthaud, 2008; Jang, 1995). Some gifted children were lucky considering that their parents were able to sponsor their needs and interests including dance lessons, art supplies, microscopes, or robotic materials (Davis et al., 2014; Sternberg et al., 2011). The not-so-lucky ones, on the other hand, silently wait for their schools to provide these materials.

The TSI (2017a) stated that when parents were divided into five categories based on the shares of their income from the lowest to the highest, parents in the lowest ended spending only 2.8% while parents in the highest-end spent up to 63.6% of their total income on their children's education. Based on these statistics, it is evident that children from the low-income families do not have access to the same opportunities as children from high-income families do. This inequality can only be eliminated by the government providing a variety of opportunities open for the use of every child regardless of their SES.

The literature reveals some limitations regarding educational policy, schools' opportunities, and parents' competencies for the education of the gifted. However, the studies examined that the educational expenditures for gifted children were very limited. Considering the income of parents has an impact on gifted children's education as revealed by previous studies, the need for examining the family expenditures on children's education stands as an important area to be explored. This study aimed to reveal the SES of parents so that the financial inequality among gifted children from low and high-income families would be compensated by the government.

This study investigated the parents' opinions regarding the cost of their gifted children's education along with their non-gifted children. The cost parents spared for their gifted and non-gifted children, the type of expenses made for their children's education and their opinions regarding the financial demands of their gifted children were examined. Considering these purposes, the answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What was the content of the parents' expenditures regarding their gifted children's education along with their non-gifted children's education for the following categories:
 - a. In-school environment?
 - b. Out-of-school environment?
2. How much did the parents spend on their gifted children's education in comparison to their non-gifted children's education?
3. On what categories did the parents spend on their gifted and non-gifted children's education?
4. What were the parents' opinions regarding how to address the financial demands of their gifted children?

Method

Design of the Study

This study was designed as a qualitative study. In this study, the aim was to identify the experiences and beliefs of parents regarding the cost of their gifted children's education along with the non-gifted ones. McMillan (2008) state that the purpose of phenomenological study is to describe and interpret the experiences of participants in order to understand the essence of the experience. Furthermore, phenomenological study can be considered as an attempt to approach a lived experience with a new perspective when eliciting rich and descriptive data (Anderson & Spencer, 2002). Therefore, we applied the principles of phenomenological design as part of this qualitative study.

Sample

The data were collected from the 20 parents of 20 gifted and 12 non-gifted children. In other words, the all 20 parents in the sample had at least one gifted child, and out of these 20 parents, 12 of them had one non-gifted child along with the gifted one. A purposeful sampling method was employed to select information-rich cases so that we could gather information in depth (Patton, 2002). The inclusion criterion for participants was that all parents had at least one gifted child enrolled in SACs along with regular schools. All the children whose parents participated in this study were registered in public schools. The demographic information about the parents was presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Information of the Parents

Categories		Mother (n)	Father (n)
Educational level	Primary & middle school	2	2
	High school	3	2
	University	12	14
	Graduate school	1	1
Occupation	Teacher	9	9
	Government officer	2	2
	Worker	-	4
	Unemployed	6	-
	Other	2	4
Monthly income (US Dollars) ^a	0-400	2	
	700-1200	3	
	1201-1600	7	
	1601-2000	8	
Number of children	1	5	
	2	12	
	3	1	

^aThe amounts provided in this row were calculated by totaling the income both mother and father made monthly. Also, the parents originally presented the monetary data in the currency of Turkish Liras. However, for this study, the amounts were converted into US dollars based on the currency rates at the time when the research was conducted. The reason that some of the numbers might not add up to 20 participants was that some of the parents were hesitant to share their demographic information.

Table 1 shows the number of parents in each category. For example, the number two under the category of mother or father represented the number of parents who graduated from primary or middle school. According to Table 1, most parents had a bachelor's degree, had been working as teachers, earned between \$1200-2000 in total, and had two children. The same type of table was also prepared for the children. The demographic information about the children of the participants was presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Demographic Information of the Children

Categories		Gifted	Non-gifted
Type of giftedness	Identified in music	2	-
	Identified in visual art	2	-
	General intelligence	9	-
	Category not defined	7	-
Grade level in regular school	Primary school	9	3
	Middle school	8	1
	High school	3	3
	Other (Kindergarten, university, and category not defined)	-	5
Gender	Female	7	9
	Male	13	1
	Not defined	-	2

According to Table 2, most of the gifted children were identified as gifted in general intelligence. The majority of the students in the gifted sample attended primary school, and were male. Most of the non-gifted children were out of K-12 and were female.

Data Collection Procedures

Based on the review of the literature, an interview form was developed to collect the data (Arthaud, 2008; Ballam, 2009; Colangelo & Dettman, 1983; Eriş et al., 2009; Hertzog & Bennett, 2004; Keirouz, 1990; Levent, 2011; Morawska & Sanders, 2009; Ulusoy, 2013) a list of questions was formed that asked parents' demographic information, opinions regarding the education of the gifted, and personal experiences of gifted education involving their socio-economic status. Then, the interview form was sent out to five different experts who hold Ph.D. degrees

including two in special education, two in educational management, and one in measurement and evaluation to obtain their opinions. Once these opinions were collected, the form was revised and updated along with the elimination of the unnecessary or redundant questions.

In the final version, the interview form (see appendix) had three parts. In the first part, the demographic information of the participants was collected. In the second part, structured questions regarding the type and amount of expenditures were included. In the third part, open-ended questions were used to reveal parents' opinions regarding to addressing the financial demands of their gifted children. Using these questions, the parents were expected to express their opinions regarding to the issues of how the financial demands of their gifted children were addressed both by themselves and by the government. After the format of the interview form was finalized, the approval from ethical board of the university was obtained (Approval Number: 2020/81).

The administrative office of the SACs was contacted to collect the data. The purpose of the research was explained to the officials working in the office. Then, the administrative office was asked to inform parents about the study and the contact information of the authors was left for parents. Among the parents who contacted the authors, the participants who were willing to participate in the study were included. The data used in this study consisted of written responses of gifted children's parents to a set of semi-open-ended and open-ended questions to the interview forms.

Data Analysis

The data provided in closed-ended questions of the interview were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The semi-open ended and open-ended questions, on the other hand, were analyzed using content analysis which was defined as a technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts to the contexts of their use (Krippendorff, 2004). The inferences were made based on the answers of the participants to structured interview questions. Furthermore, Miles et al. (2014) state that the use of content analysis is required when the issue is counting the frequency and sequencing of particular words, phrases, or concepts found in the data. The data analysis in this study was considered to be content analysis as the frequency of the related words, phrases, and concepts in the data was provided.

The reliability was ensured by using Miles and Huberman's (1994) formula for intercoder reliability. The codes of the two researchers of the study were calculated. Before the coding, we identified the categories and agreed on the categories. Then, we coded the data separately and calculated the intercoder reliability on the codes using the formula "Reliability = Number of Agreements / (Total Number of Agreements + Disagreements)" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We agreed on 103 of the codes and had a disagreement on 9 of the codes. Therefore, the intercoder reliability between the two researchers was calculated as 92% which was considered as highly reliable.

Results

The data was examined based on two categories to answer the first research question. The first category was the expenditures to sustain the education in the school environment. The second category was the voluntary expenditures to engage children in education. The parents' expenditures for their gifted and non-gifted students' in-school environment were shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Parents' Expenditures to Sustain the Education In-School Environment

Category	Codes	Gifted		Non-gifted	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Parents' status on school expenditures	Yes	17	85	12	100
	No	2	10	0	0
	Partially	1	5	0	0
Types of school expenditures	School supplies	13	65	9	75
	Food	9	45	7	58
	Transportation	4	20	6	50
	School fee	1	5	5	41.60
	Donation	1	5	0	0

Parents' expenditures for their children's school environment were examined under two categories. The first category was "Parents' Status on School Expenditures" which indicated whether the parents made any

payment to help their children sustain in the school environment. Three codes were formed under this category: the first code “yes” indicated that the parents made payments, the second code “no” showed that the parents did not make any payments, and the third code “partially” indicated that the parents make payments only when they thought it was absolutely necessary. Based on the data, 85% of the gifted students’ parents spent on their children’s education while 100% of the non-gifted students’ parents spent on their children’s education.

The second category was “Types of School Expenditures” which showed the types of expenditures parents spent on helping their children sustain in the school environment. The data demonstrated that both gifted (65%) and non-gifted students’ parents (75%) spent the most on school supplies. This finding was followed by food (45% for gifted, 20% for non-gifted) and transportation (58% for gifted, 50% for non-gifted) for both gifted and non-gifted students’ parents. The parents’ expenditures for their gifted and non-gifted students’ out-of-school environment were provided as the second part of the analyses of the first research question in Table 4.

Table 4

Type of Parents’ Expenditures to Sustain the Education in Out-of-School Environment

Types of expenditures	Categories	Gifted		Non-gifted	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Guidance and counseling	Yes	0	0	2	16.77
	Partially	0	0	0	0.0
	No	19	95	10	83.33
Purchasing books based on the area of interest	Yes	17	85	9	75.00
	Partially	1	5	0	0
	No	2	10	3	25.00
Field trips	Yes	15	75	10	83.30
	Partially	2	10	0	0
	No	3	15	2	16.70
Hobbies	Yes	16	80	4	33.33
	Partially	1	5	0	0
	No	3	15	8	66.70
Movie	Yes	17	85	10	83.30
	Partially	1	5	0	0
	No	1	5	2	16.70
Theatre, circus, etc.	Yes	10	50	7	58.30
	Partially	1	5	0	0
	No	7	35	5	41.70
Intelligence games	Yes	17	85	7	58.30
	Partially	2	10	0	0
	No	0	0	5	41.70

Note: Some of the participants left some of the questions unanswered, therefore the percentage values might not add up to 100 in all categories.

In Table 4, the types of parents’ expenditures for their children’s education were presented. Based on these findings, it was evident that the parents spent the most on books on the area of interest, intelligence games, and movies for their gifted children, while they spent the most on field trips and movies for their non-gifted children. On the other hand, guidance and counseling was the category that was spent on the least for both gifted and non-gifted children. However, when both gifted and non-gifted children were compared within the same category, it was found that the biggest gap in the presented opportunities was in the category of providing environments for their hobbies and intelligence games. The findings indicated that the parents spent considerably more money on intelligence games and hobbies for their gifted children than for their non-gifted children. The findings differed within the categories of (1) movies and (2) theatre and circus as the city in which the data were collected did not have regular theatre and circus opportunities. The movie theatre was open weekdays and weekends at the time when the data were collected. Therefore, the parents were supposed to make a trip to a neighbor city or wait for a show or theatre to come to their city to attend a theatre or circus show. It was a daily opportunity for them to watch a movie in the movie theatre in their city of residence.

Regarding the second and third research questions, eight categories were derived. Along with the expenditures for the in-school and out-of-school environment, six additional categories were formed based on the data. The amount and categories of expenditures that the parents spent on their children's education were presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Amount and Categories of Parents' Annual Expenditures for Their Children's Education

Categories	Expenditures interval	Gifted (n)	Total (%)	Non-gifted (n)	Total (%)
In-school	\$0-200	6	%80	1	%83
	\$201-600	5		4	
	\$601-1000	4		2	
	\$1001+	1		3	
Out-of-school (Tutorials, private lessons, etc.)	\$0-200	1	%25	-	%8.3
	\$201-600	3		-	
	\$601-1000	-		-	
	\$1001+	1		1	
Books	\$0-100	2	%45	2	%41.5
	\$101-200	2		1	
	\$201+	5		2	
Field trips	\$0-100	-	%20	-	%16.6
	\$101-200	1		-	
	\$201+	4		2	
Intelligence games	\$0-100	3	%30	1	%25
	\$101-200	1		1	
	\$201+	2		1	
Movies	\$0-20	1	%35	1	%33.3
	\$21-100	5		2	
	\$101+	1		1	
Theatre, circus etc.	\$0-20	2	%20	1	%16.6
	\$21-100	2		1	
	\$101+	-		-	
Hobby	\$0-20	1	%20	-	%8.3
	\$21-100	3		1	
	\$101+	-		-	

Note: The percentages given in the total columns were calculated by adding up the numbers for gifted and non-gifted categories, divided by the total number of gifted or non-gifted students, and multiplied by 100. For example, regarding the in-school category for gifted students the numbers for gifted students were added (6 + 5 + 4 + 1 = 16). This number was divided by the total number of gifted students and multiplied by 100 ((16 / 20) x 100 = 80). As for the non-gifted students for in-school category, this value was calculated as 83 ((10 / 12) x 100 = 83).

The parents were reluctant to indicate the amount of money they spent on their children's education. Out of 20 parents, only a few answered the question by indicating a specific amount. The rest either did not provide the specific amount or left the question unanswered. Therefore, the frequency of the categories was considerably lower for this table than the others. The findings indicated that the parents spent more money on their non-gifted children's in-school education than their gifted children.

Other than academic expenditures for in- and out-of-school environment, the biggest expenditure gap between gifted and non-gifted children was in the category of out-of school tutorials and hobbies which were followed by the intelligence games category. The analyses indicated that in the out-of school tutorials category, 25% of the parents of gifted students spent on their children's out-of school lessons while only 8% of the parents of non-gifted students spent on it. In the category of the hobby, four gifted children's parents spent up to \$100, while only one non-gifted child's parents spent up to \$100. Furthermore, in the category of intelligence games, six of the gifted children's parents spent up to \$201 and above. Only three of the non-gifted children's parents spent up to \$201 and above in this category. When the number of expenditures was considered in total, the "books" category was the one that was spent the most.

As for the fourth research question, the parents' opinions regarding how to address the financial demands of their gifted children were analyzed. Based on the findings, 65% of the parents stated that their gifted children had no financial demands while 35% of the parents confirmed that their gifted children had some demands. One of the parents' statements was given below:

“She knows our income. She knows that we do our best for her as it is. That might be the reason why she did not ask for anything more” (Parent 5)

Out of the children whose parents confirmed that their children had financial demands, they reported that 30% of them asked for funding for technological materials/gadgets, 15% for funding for private lessons/tutorials, 10% for funding for school supplies and 10% for funding for supplies based on the area of talent/interest. Although the rest of the parents agreed that their children had financial demands, they did not specifically state the type of the demand. One of the parent statements was:

“He asked for tutorials, telescope, spaceship materials...etc.” (Parent 17)

Along with the gifted students' financial demands from their parents, the data on the parents' opinions regarding the financial opportunities provided by the government were examined to identify whether the students' financial demands were met by the government. The findings were presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Parents' Opinions Regarding the Government's Financial Support for Their Gifted Children's Education

Codes	n	%
No expectations	2	9
Financial needs should be met	6	26
Scholarship, allowance, fund	6	26
Expert personnel	3	13
Supplies, materials, books	3	13
Self-contained learning environment	2	9
Socio-cultural activity	1	4

Twenty six percent of the parents expressed their opinions that their children's financial needs should be met by the government. Furthermore, some of the parents specified the type of financial support that they expected from the government. Only 9% of the parents stated that they did not have any expectations from the government for their gifted children's education. Some of the parents' statements were as follows:

“The gifted children should receive scholarships and be educated in self-contained schools or classrooms.” (Parent 11)

“Yes, it should be met. Extra materials, books, psychological support, and academically superior and productive teachers should be provided by the government.” (Parent 6)

Discussion

The parents' opinions regarding the financial demands of their gifted and non-gifted children for their education and the expenditures they made for their children's education were investigated. The findings indicated that 100% of non-gifted students' parents and 85% of gifted students' parents expended on their children's education for an in-school environment. The biggest part of these expenditures was school supplies. According to Turkish legislation, education is free for K-12. However, parents need to spend on additional materials such as books, notebooks, and project materials. The TSI revealed that in 2017, 2.3% of household expenditures of Turkish families were devoted to services for education (TSI, 2017b). In a study, Ulusoy (2013) found that families spent money on transportation, student services (providing diploma, identification card), books, meals, and so on. Therefore, the findings of this study were consistent with the literature.

When out-of-school environment expenditures were examined, we found that the first three categories that parents spent on the most were the books based on the area of interest, movies, and intelligence games for the gifted while these categories were field trips, movies, and books for non-gifted children. The biggest difference between gifted and non-gifted students in terms of out-of-school environment expenditures was that gifted students

preferred intelligence games more while non-gifted students preferred to go on field trips more. There might be two possible explanations. The first is that gifted students require a certain level of challenge to engage in learning, and intelligence games might be a source to satisfy this need (Plucker & Callahan, 2014). The second is that gifted students tend to work alone (French et al., 2011) while non-gifted students do not have a preference. Regarding these points, Özbay (2013) suggested that to enrich gifted students' learning, parents could engage students in field trips and travel as well as movies and books. However, gifted students might feel uncomfortable in field trips due to their preference of working alone.

The parents' annual expenditures for in-school education were examined and found that expenditures for students' education varied for gifted and non-gifted students. The annual expenditures for non-gifted students clustered around the \$201-600 range for in-school education while it clustered around \$0-200 for gifted students. Both gifted (25%) and non-gifted students' parents (33%) spent in the range of \$201-600. However, the majority of the parents (30%) allocated a range of \$0-200 for gifted students. When the data of this study were revisited to explain why more parents fell into the range of \$0-200 in terms of annual expenditures, it was found that all 6 parents were with low-income (up to \$600 per month) and probably were only able to spend up to \$200 for their gifted children. This finding was consistent with the literature that families with low incomes spent less on education (Hesapçioğlu & Taymaz, 1998). Furthermore, the reason for the non-gifted students' parents fell in the category of \$201-600 was because gifted children in the sample of this study were aged between 8 and 15 while the non-gifted children were between 4 and 18. The parents of non-gifted children provided two reasons for this high level of expenditure. The first one was that the pre-school education was not free by the time the data was collected. The reason was that despite free education among public universities, the other expenditures such as housing, meal plans, books, transportation, etc. significantly raised the monthly expenditure. Therefore, the expenses of pre-school and college-aged children involved in the sample of this study were the reasons why the parents spent more on their non-gifted children's education.

When the out-of-school expenditures were examined, it was evident that gifted students were more interested in different types of books, intelligence games, and hobbies than non-gifted students. Considering the curiosity and persistence characteristics of gifted students (Johnsen, 2011), this finding was expected. Furthermore, the findings indicated that the biggest differences between the expenses of gifted and non-gifted students were in the categories of out-of school lessons and hobby. This might be because of the wide range of interests gifted students have as part of their characteristics (Johnsen, 2011). Also, Bakioğlu and Levent (2013) stated that gifted students were significantly different than non-gifted students, and therefore needed more extra-curricular activities. Considering the fact that it has been in gifted students' nature to wonder and learn new information, it was expected that they might have asked from their parents to provide the tutorials in different subjects and materials for different hobbies as extracurricular activities.

Another finding of this study indicated that parents thought gifted children's financial needs for education should be addressed. More specifically, they expected the government to provide scholarships, expert personnel, and materials for education for their gifted children. When Turkey's average annual expenditure per student was compared to the ones in OECD countries, it was evident that the OECD countries spent three times more than Turkey. In 2014, the total expenditure for each student in Turkey was \$43.442, while the average of OECD countries for the total expenditure for each student was \$123.637 (OECD, 2017). Therefore, it can be deduced that because of this low financial support from the government, schools cannot properly meet students' financial needs. However, parents expected the government to provide the opportunities that they were not able to due to their limited income.

It was also found that most of the gifted children did not have financial demands from their parents. The reason could be that children might be aware of their parents' socioeconomic status and not want to pressure their parents financially with their demands. Ballam (2009) describes her personal experience and states that "mindful of the costs involved, I ensured that my interest in these endeavors remained concealed" (p. 18) which is consistent with the finding of this study. Furthermore, some of the parents stated that they did their best for their gifted children. Seward and Gaesser (2018) found that parents of the gifted children in rural areas were supportive of their children for receiving the best education possible. Considering the fact that the data of this study were collected from the parents in a small city, their supportive approach to gifted children might also be another reason for children to be aware of parents' efforts. Therefore, this might be a reason for children to not to have any financial demands. On the other hand, some of the parents in this study stated that their children had some financial demands from them. Gifted children who had financial demands usually insisted on technological devices and

gadgets in their area of interest. Taking the typical characteristics of gifted children into account such as having hobbies/collections related to the area of interest along with an intense curiosity and persistence (Johnsen, 2011), the finding was expected that the children in the sample asked for devices or tutorials in their area of interest.

Limitations

This study is limited with the self-reported data of the participants. Furthermore, the participants of this study were from the low and middle socioeconomic status. Therefore, future studies including children from private schools with high-income families might result in different findings.

Implications for Practice and Research

The purpose of this research was to investigate parents' opinions regarding the cost of their gifted and non-gifted children's education. We found that more money was required to help gifted children fulfill their potential. Considering that parents spend more money than they could afford, schools need to meet these financial needs by providing more opportunities. Furthermore, the educational system needs to allow students to study in their area of interest. Further research in different cities and countries with more opportunities needs to be conducted to determine whether the findings of this study are valid for other samples.

In practice, changes and improvements are needed starting from the inner circle (classrooms) to the outer circle (educational system) to satisfy the gifted children's educational needs. The gifted children need more knowledgeable and experienced teachers who are aware of the enrichment, acceleration, and mentoring of gifted children. Also, resource rooms need to be more actively used to engage students in learning in regular schools. Schools need to provide more materials, devices, and gadgets as well as clubs, organizations, and associations to help them work in their area of interest. Additionally, the system needs to become flexible enough to allow children, especially the gifted ones, to study in their areas of interest. It also needs to lean towards the path of being talent-oriented rather than test-oriented. Finally, our findings indicate that none of the parents of gifted students receive any type of guidance or counseling for their gifted children. Parents need to learn more about children's characteristics to better help them with their needs.

Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that parents could not fully support the development of their children (especially gifted ones) due to their financial conditions. Also, parents reported that opportunities in regular schools were not enough to help their children realize and fulfill their own potential. It was concluded that gifted children needed environments enriched with more materials, sources, mentors, and facilities to reveal their true potential.

Information Note

Below, the prices of relevant products and services mentioned in this study were provided based on the Turkish/USA currency. The rates belong to the day the data were collected for this study. 1 Turkish Lira equaled to 4.85 US Dollars; the cost of an average book was 3.10 USD; one movie ticket was 2.10 USD; one theatre ticket was 5.15 USD; one circus ticket was 3.10 USD; average intelligence game was 15 USD, and a bus ticket to the closest city (100 miles) was 7.50 USD.

Authors' Contributions

The authors took part in all stages of the study equally.

Acknowledgment

Authors thank to all participants who supported our research.

References

- Afat, N., & Köksal-Konik, A. (2018). Üstün zekâlı çocuğu olan ebeveynlerin farkındalıkları: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Awareness of gifted parents: A scale development study]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 220, 79-104. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/milliegitim/issue/40715/488436>
- Anderson, E. H., & Spencer, M. H. (2002). Cognitive representations of AIDS: A phenomenological study. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(10), 1338-1352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732302238747>
- Arthaud, K. (2008). *Household expenditure for children's education*. <http://libdcms.nida.ac.th/thesis6/2008/b158764.pdf>
- Bakioğlu, A., & Levent, F. (2013). Üstün yeteneklilerin eğitiminde Türkiye için öneriler [Suggestions for gifted education in Turkey]. *Journal of Gifted Education Research*, 1(1), 31-44. <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423937374.pdf>
- Ballam, N. (2009). Gifted and growing up in a low-income family: Mindsets, resilience, and interventions. *Teachers and Curriculum*, 11, 17-20. <https://doi.org/10.15663/tandc.v11i1.41>
- Cevher-Kılıç, V. (2015). Türkiye'de üstün ve özel yetenekli çocuklara yönelik bir eğitim politikası oluşturulamaması sorunu üzerine bir değerlendirme [An evaluation over unavailable education programme policy for gifted and talented children in Turkey]. *21. Yüzyılda Eğitim ve Toplum Eğitim Bilimleri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(12), 145-154. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/egitimvetoplum/issue/32107/355913>
- Colangelo, N., & Dettmann, D. F. (1983). A review of research on parents and families of gifted children. *Exceptional Children*, 50(1), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440298305000103>
- Çetinkaya, C., & Döner, I. (2012). Türkiye'de üstün yeteneklilere tanınan hakların incelenmesi [Investigation of right of gifted and talented education in Turkey]. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 2(3), 7-20. <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423911389.pdf>
- Çetinkaya, C., & Kınca, R. Y. (2015). Üstün zekâlı ve yetenekli çocukların demokrasi eğitimi [Democracy education of gifted and talented children]. *Journal of Gifted Education Research*, 3(1), 1-22. <http://web.aebsohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=bccacf01-105b-4b96-815f-db9d5d739b9e%40sdc-v-sessmgr03>
- Davis, G. A., Rimm, S. B., & Siegle, D. B. (2014). *Education of the gifted and talented*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Eriş, B., Seyfi, R., & Hanoz, S. (2009). Perceptions of parents with gifted children about gifted education in Turkey. *Gifted and Talented International*, 24(1), 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332276.2009.11674861>
- French, L. R., Walker, C. L., & Shore, B. M. (2011). Do gifted students really prefer to work alone? *Roeper Review*, 33(3), 145-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2011.580497>
- Hahn-Young, M., & Balli, S. J. (2014). Gifted and talented education (GATE): Student and parent perspectives. *Gifted Child Today*, 37(4), 236-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217514544030>
- Hertzog, N. B., & Bennett, T. (2004). In whose eyes? Parents' perspectives on the learning needs of their gifted children. *Roeper Review*, 26(2), 96-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190409554249>
- Hesapçioğlu, M., & Taymaz, H. (1998). *Türkiye'de eğitim yönetimi [Education management in Turkey]*. Kültür Koleji Eğitim Vakfı Yayınları.
- Jang, Y., G. (1995). Expenditure on education for female-headed and married-couple households. *Journal of the Family Economics and Resource Management Division of AAFCS*, 33(42), 45-50.
- Johnsen, S. K. (2011). *Identifying gifted students: A practical guide*. Prufrock Press.
- Karakuş, F. (2010). Üstün yetenekli çocukların anne babalarının karşılaştıkları güçlükler [Difficulties that families of gifted students face]. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 6(1), 127-144. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/160766>

- Kazu, İ. Y., & Şenol, C. (2012). Üstün yetenekliler eğitim programlarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (BİLSEM örneği) [Views of teachers about gifted curriculum (Case of BİLSEM)]. *e-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 13-35. <https://acikerisim.firat.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11508/12379/289684.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Keirouz, K. S. (1990). Concerns of parents of gifted children: A research review. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 34(2), 56-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629003400202>
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage Publications.
- Kurul, N. (2012). *Eğitim finansmanı [Financing education]*. Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Levent, F. (2011, February 25-27). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklara devletin sunması gereken haklar [The rights that the state must offer to gifted children]* [Sözlü bildiri]. I. Türkiye Çocuk Hakları Kongresi, İstanbul, Türkiye. <http://www.faruklevent.com/dosyalar/kongre.pdf>
- McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (5th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage Publications.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education]. (2018). *Özel eğitim hizmetleri yönetmeliği [Special education services policy]*. T.C. Resmi Gazete, (30471), 7 Temmuz 2018, 22-77. <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180707-8.htm>
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [Ministry of National Education]. (2019). *2020 yılı bütçe sunusu [Presentation of 2020 budget]*. <http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/www/dokumanlar/icerik/30tüik>
- Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. R. (2009). Parenting gifted and talented children: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(3), 163-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986209334962>
- National Association of Gifted Children [NAGC]. (2008). *What is giftedness?* <https://www.nagc.org/resources-publications/resources/what-giftedness?id=574>
- No Child Left Behind Act. (2002). P.L. 107-110 (Title IX, Part A, Definition 22). <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-107publ110/pdf/PLAW-107publ110.pdf>
- Ogurlu, Ü. (2016). Üstün yetenekli çocuğa sahip ailelere yönelik eğitim programının ailelerin ebeveyn özyeterliklerine ve farkındalıklarına etkisi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 45(209), 144-159. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/milliegitim/issue/36141/406069>
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2008). The role of the family in talent development. In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children: Psycho-educational theory, research, and best practices* (pp. 53-70). Springer.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2017). *Education at a glance 2017: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2017-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2018). *Education at a glance 2018: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2018_eag-2018-en#page1
- Özbay, Y. (2013). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklar ve aileleri [Gifted children and their families]*. T.C. Aile ve Sosyal Politikalar Bakanlığı.
- Patton M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Plucker, J. A., & Callahan, C. M. (Eds.). (2014). *Critical issues and practices in gifted education: What the research says*. Prufrock Press.

- Saranlı, A., G. (2011). *Üstün yetenekli çocukların ailelerine yönelik geliştirilen aile rehberliği programlarının etkililiğinin incelenmesi [Investigation of the effectiveness of parent guidance programs developed for gifted child parents]* (Tez numarası: 297205) [Doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Seward, K., & Gaesser, A. H. (2018). Career decision-making with gifted rural students: Considerations for school counselors and teachers. *Gifted Child Today*, 41(4), 217-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217518786986>
- Shore, B. M., Rejskind, F. G., & Kanevsky, L. S. (2003). Cognitive research on giftedness: A window on creativity and teaching for creativity. In D. Ambrose, L. M. Cohen, & A. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Creative intelligence: Towards theoretic integration* (pp. 181-210). Hampton Press.
- Sıdar, R. (2011). *Bilim sanat merkezlerinde okuyan öğrencilerin yaratıcılıklarının problem çözme becerilerine etkisi [The effect of creativity of problem-solving skills on students attending in science and arts resource centers]* (Tez numarası: 277430) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Niğde Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Strateji ve Bütçe Başkanlığı [State Planning Organization]. (2013). *Onuncu kalkınma planı [Tenth development plan]*. <http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/Pages/KalkinmaPlanlari.asp>
- Sternberg, R. J., Jarvin, L., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2011). *Explorations in giftedness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tan, S., (2018). Özel yetenekli öğrencileri tanılama. F. Şahin (Ed.), *Özel yetenekli öğrenciler ve eğitimleri [Gifted students and their education]* içinde (pp. 1-22). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu [Turkish Statistical Institute]. (2017a). *Gelire göre sıralı %20'lik gruplarda tüketim harcamasının türlerine göre dağılımı [Shares of quintiles ordered by income in expenditure types]*. http://tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1012
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu [Turkish Statistical Institute]. (2017b). *Hane halkı tüketim harcamalarının dağılımı [Distribution of household consumption expenditures in Turkey]*. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1012
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu [Turkish Statistical Institute]. (2018). *Eğitim seviyelerine göre öğrenci başına eğitim harcamaları [Education expenditure per student by level of education]*. http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1018
- Ulusoy, B., (2013). *Ailelerin ilköğretim düzeyinde yapmış oldukları hanehalkı eğitim harcamaları [Families' education expenses in primary school level]* (Tez numarası: 331690) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Kastamonu Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Uzun, A. (2006). *Üstün veya özel yetenekli öğrencilerin sosyal bilgiler dersine ilişkin tutumları ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişki [Attitudes of gifted or special ability student toward the social studies and their academic achievements]* (Tez numarası: 188921) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi]. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (2005). Gifted programs and services: What are the nonnegotiables? *Theory into Practice*, 44(2), 90-97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4402_3

Appendix

Questionnaire Form For Parents with Gifted Children

Demographic Information

	Identified with giftedness (Yes/No- If yes please state the area of ability)	Gender	Grade level	The type of transportation used to receive services in SAC (On foot, school bus, or private vehicle)	The type of transportation used to arrive school (On foot, school bus, or private vehicle)
1st child					
2nd child					
3rd child					
4th child					

Occupation of the Mother:

Occupation of the Father:

Monthly Income of the Mother:

Monthly Income of the Father:

Education Level of the Mother:

Education Level of the Father:

Is your economic status sufficient to support your identified gifted child with different alternatives for education?

- Yes, I provide adequate alternative education support
- Partially sufficient. I can provide alternative education support as much as I can.
- No, it is not enough. I cannot provide educational support outside the ones provided by the state.

In this section, write your answers in the space given below the questions.

- Does your gifted child make different financial demands from you outside of school in order to produce novel/original products (private lessons, technological tools, courses)?

Yes No

If yes, what types of demands?

- What are your expectations from the state to cover the education expenses of gifted children?

Questions

In this section, there are questions about your gifted and non-gifted children. Write the answers to the questions on the side in the relevant box.

	For your child identified with giftedness	For your non-gifted child	If yes, how much do you monthly spend on average for your gifted child?	If yes, how much do you monthly spend on average for your non-gifted child?
Do you spend for your child's school?				
What do you think about the sufficiency of this amount you spend?				
What does your spending for your child's school include? (food, transportation, school supplies etc.)				
Does your child need education outside of school?				
Do you spend for your child other than the school expenses? (Tutoring for talent area, study center etc.)				
What do you think about adequately meeting your child's needs outside of school?				
Do you receive counseling (guidance) services for your child?				
Do you have your child receive counseling (guidance) services?				
Do you buy books to your child based on his/her interest?				
Do you take or send your child to field trips?				
Do you make your child engage in a hobby?				
Do you take your child to the cinema or museum?				
Do you take your child to the theatre or circus?				
Do you buy intelligence games for your child?				
Does the state support your child?				
If yes, what type of support? (food, transportation, school supplies, tutoring, additional courses, money)				



Özel Yetenekli Öğrencilerin Eğitiminin Maliyet Açısından İncelenmesi

Figen Çam-Tosun¹

Sema Tan²

Öz

Giriş: Bu araştırmanın amacı, özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların eğitimleri için ebeveynlerin yaptığı harcamaların türü, maliyeti ve özel yetenekli çocuklarının finansal talepleri hakkındaki görüşlerini incelemektir.

Yöntem: Bu çalışma nitel araştırma modellerinden fenomenoloji kullanılarak tasarlanmıştır. Çalışmada veriler özel yetenekli tanısı konmuş ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocuğu olan 20 ebeveynden yapılandırılmış görüşme formu ile toplanmıştır. Çalışmada analiz yöntemi olarak betimsel istatistik ve içerik analizi tercih edilmiştir.

Bulgular: Bulgulara göre okul içi kategorisinde ebeveynlerin hem özel yetenekli hem de tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları için en çok harcamayı okul malzemeleri alanında yaptıkları belirlenmiştir. Okul dışı harcamalarda ise özel yetenekli çocuklar için en çok kitaplar, filmler ve zeka oyunlarında harcama yapılırken tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklar için geziler ve filmler alanında harcama yapmışlardır.

Tartışma: Çalışmada, ebeveynlerin finansal koşulları nedeniyle özel yetenekli çocuklarının gelişimini tam olarak destekleyemedikleri ortaya konulmuştur. Ayrıca, ebeveynler okullarda sağlanan fırsatların özel yetenekli çocuklarının kendi potansiyellerini fark etmeleri ve gerçekleştirmelerine yardımcı olmak için yeterli olmadığını düşünmektedirler. Özel yetenekli çocukların potansiyellerini gerçekleştirmek için daha fazla malzeme, kaynak, rehber ve tesislerle zenginleştirilmiş ortamlara ihtiyaç duydukları sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Maliyet, harcamalar, özel yetenekli, ebeveynlerin geliri, potansiyel.

Atf için: Çam-Tosun, F., & Tan, S. (2021). Özel yetenekli öğrencilerin eğitiminin maliyet açısından incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 22(3), 677-698. <https://doi.org/10.21565/ozelegitimdergisi.773728>

¹*Sorumlu Yazar:* Dr. Öğrt. Üyesi, Sinop Üniversitesi, E-posta: figencam@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8303-2179>

²Dr. Öğrt. Üyesi, Sinop Üniversitesi, E-posta: sematan@sinop.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9816-8930>

Giriş

Özel yetenekli çocuklar alanyazında çok farklı şekilde tanımlanmıştır. Her ne kadar alan uzmanları bu tanımlama konusunda farklı görüşler ortaya koysalar da bu tanımların neredeyse tamamında matematik, fen, yaratıcılık, sanat ve liderlik gibi farklı alanlarda yüksek veya istisnai performans gibi özelliklere değinilmiştir (National Association of Gifted Children [NAGC], 2008; No Child Left Behind Act, 2002; Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2018). Bu çocukların yoğun ve sürekli ilgileri vardır (Johnsen, 2011) ve aktif olarak açık uçlu ve özgün görevlere katılmayı tercih ederler (Shore vd., 2003). Sahip oldukları bu özellikler nedeni ile özel yetenekli öğrencilerin herhangi bir eğitim ya da rehberliğe ihtiyaç duymadığı gibi yanlış bir inanış toplum içerisinde yaygındır. Bu nedenle, özel yetenekli öğrenciler çoğu kez özel eğitime tabi tutulmak yerine, genel eğitim sınıfı ortamında akranlarının kendilerinin en az bir yıl önce öğrendikleri becerileri öğrenebilmeleri için beklemek durumunda kalırlar (Sternberg vd., 2011). Oysa bu öğrencilerin aldıkları eğitim, onların öğrenmelerini sağlamak için kişisel ilgi, ihtiyaç ve yeteneklerine göre özel olarak tasarlanmalıdır.

Okullar özel yetenekli çocukların fiziksel, duygusal ve bilişsel ihtiyaçlarını çeşitli kulüpler, seçmeli dersler, destek eğitim odaları, laboratuvarlar, atölyeler, teknolojik fırsatlar, mentörlük olanakları sunmanın yanı sıra ulusal ya da uluslararası projelere katılma gibi bazı zenginleştirme ve hızlandırma uygulamalarına yönelik fırsatlar da sağlamakla yükümlüdürler (VanTassel-Baska, 2005). Ancak Hahn-Young ve Balli'nin (2014) de belirttiği gibi okulların finansal açıdan problemleri olduğunda, sonlandırılan ilk program genellikle özel yetenekli öğrenciler için uygulanan programlardır. Türkiye'de özel yetenekli çocuklar için her ne kadar destek eğitim odaları, laboratuvarlar ve yarışmalara katılım gibi olanaklar sağlansa da olması gereken daha pek çok olanak ya sınırlı (Cevher-Kılıç, 2015) ya da okulların mali sıkıntıları yüzünden hiç sağlanamamaktadır (Kazu & Şenol, 2012). Bu konuda özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinin duyduğu sosyal, eğitimsel, duygusal ve finansal destek ihtiyacı öne çıkmaktadır. Ebeveynlerin, çocuklarının potansiyellerini ortaya çıkarmada güçlü etkisinin olduğu bilinmektedir (Afat & Köksal-Konik, 2018; Ogurlu, 2016; Olszewski-Kubilius, 2008). Ancak yapılan çalışmalar, bu etkinin ebeveynlerin sosyo-ekonomik düzeyleri doğrultusunda değişim gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur (Çetinkaya & Kınca, 2015; Sıdar, 2011; Uzun, 2006).

Bu çalışmada, ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları için ayırdıkları bütçe, çocuklarının eğitimi için yapılan harcamaların türü ve özel yetenekli çocuklarının finansal taleplerinin karşılanması hakkındaki görüşlerini araştırmak amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda aşağıdaki araştırma sorularına cevap aranmıştır:

1. Ebeveynler özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarının eğitimine yönelik aşağıdaki kategorilere göre ne tür harcamalar yapmaktadırlar?
 - a. Okul içi ortamlar
 - b. Okul dışı ortamlar
2. Ebeveynlerin tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarının eğitimi ile karşılaştırıldığında özel yetenekli çocuklarının eğitimine yaptıkları harcamanın tutarı nedir?
3. Ebeveynler özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları için hangi kategorilerde harcama yapmışlardır?
4. Ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli çocuklarının finansal taleplerinin karşılanması ile ilgili görüşleri nelerdir?

Yöntem

Desen

Bu çalışmada ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarının eğitimlerine yönelik yaptıkları harcamalara dair görüşlerini incelemek amaçlanmış ve çalışma nitel araştırma kullanılarak tasarlanmıştır. Katılımcıların tecrübelerinin özünü anlamak ve yorumlamak için kullanılan nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden fenomenoloji (McMillan, 2008), bu çalışmada yer alan katılımcıların özel yetenekli çocuklarına dair finansal tecrübelerini belirlemek için tercih edilmiştir.

Çalışma Grubu

Veriler toplamda 20 özel yetenekli ve 12 tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları bulunan 20 ebeveyn den toplanmıştır. Yani bu 20 ailenin her birinde en az bir özel yetenekli çocuk bulunmaktayken, 12 ailede de özel

yetenekli çocuğun tipik gelişim gösteren bir kardeşi bulunmaktadır. Katılımcıların çoğunluğu üniversite mezunudur (12 anne, 14 baba). Katılımcıların meslek grupları arasında öğretmen (9 anne, 9 baba), memur (2 anne, 2 baba), işçi (4 baba), bulunmaktadır. Ebeveynlerden 6'sı kendini işsiz olarak tanımlamıştır. Ailelerin aylık gelirleri 1200-2000\$'dır (15 aile). Çoğu ailede (12) çocuk sayısı ikidir.

Veri Toplama Süreci

Araştırma verilerinin toplanması için araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen bir görüşme formu kullanılmıştır. Bu formun geliştirilmesi esnasında sırasıyla belirli basamaklar takip edilmiştir. Öncelikle alanyazın taranmış ve ebeveynlerin demografik bilgilerini, özel yeteneklilerin eğitime ilişkin görüşlerini ve özel yeteneklilerin eğitimi için sosyo-ekonomik durumlarını içeren kişisel deneyimlerine yönelik soruların bir listesi oluşturulmuştur (Arthaud, 2008; Ballam, 2009; Colangelo & Detman, 1983; Eris vd., 2009; Hertzog & Bennett, 2004; Keirouz, 1990; Levent, 2011; Morawska & Sanders, 2009; Ulusoy, 2013). Daha sonra bu form, geçerliğin sağlanması amacıyla içlerinde 2 özel eğitim uzmanı, 2 eğitim yönetimi uzmanı ve bir ölçme ve değerlendirme uzmanı olmak üzere toplam 5 uzmana görüşleri alınmak üzere yönlendirilmiştir. Son olarak ise geliştirilen form uzmanlardan gelen görüşler doğrultusunda revize edilmiş, gereksiz ya da tekrarlı bulunan sorular formdan çıkarılmış ve forma son şekli verilmiştir (bk. Ek). Buna göre formun son hali üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde katılımcıların demografik bilgilerini içeren sorular, ikinci bölümde harcama miktarı ve türlerine yönelik yapılandırılmış sorular, üçüncü bölümde ise ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli çocuklarının finansal taleplerine yönelik görüşlerini belirlemek için kullanılan açık uçlu sorular yer almaktadır.

Veri Analizi

Formlar aracılığıyla elde edilen verilerin analizinde metin içeriklerinden tekrarlanabilir ve geçerli çıkarımlar yapma tekniği olarak tanımlanan içerik analizi (Krippendorff, 2004) tekniğinin yanı sıra betimsel istatistik yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın güvenilirliğinin sağlanması için Miles ve Huberman'ın (1994) nitel araştırmalarda kodlayıcılar arası güvenilirlik formülü kullanılmış, buna göre kodlayıcılar arası güvenilirlik %92 ile yüksek güvenilirliğe sahip olarak bulunmuştur.

Bulgular

Birinci araştırma sorusuna cevap verebilmek için eldeki veriler iki farklı kategoride incelenmiştir. Birinci kategori olan ebeveynlerin okul içi harcamalara yönelik durumları ve harcama türleri çocukların okul ortamında desteklemek için ebeveynlerin harcama yapma durumları ve harcamalarının türlerini belirlemek amacıyla oluşturulmuştur. Buna göre ebeveynlerin %85'i özel yetenekli çocukları için okul ortamına yönelik harcamalar yaparken, tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların ebeveynlerinin tamamı okul ortamına yönelik harcama yapmışlardır. Yapılan okul harcamalarının türleri incelendiğinde çocuklarını okul ortamında desteklemek için harcama yapan ebeveynlerin hem özel yetenekli (%65) hem de tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklar (%75) için en önemli harcamayı kırtasiye malzemelerine yaptıklarını göstermektedir. Bu harcamayı sırasıyla yiyecek (özel yetenekli çocukların %45'i, tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların %20'si), ve ulaşım (özel yetenekli çocukların %58'i, tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların %50'si) takip etmektedir. Ayrıca bir diğer kategori olarak ebeveynlerin hem özel yetenekli hem de tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları için yaptıkları okul dışı harcamaların türleri incelenmiştir. Buna göre özel yetenekli çocukları için çoğunlukla ilgi alanlarına yönelik kitaplara, zekâ oyunlarına ve sinema etkinliklerine para harcarken, tipik gelişim gösteren çocukları için alan gezileri ve sinema etkinliklerine eşit derecede harcama yaptıkları bulunmuştur. Ebeveynlerin çoğu harcama yaptıkları miktarları belirtmekte tereddüt etmişler, ebeveynler çoğunlukla ya soruyu cevapsız bırakmış ya da spesifik bir miktar belirtmeksizin cevaplamışlardır. Yapılan araştırmanın bulgularına göre okul içi harcama kategorisinde ebeveynlerin tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarına özel yetenekli çocuklarına oranla daha fazla harcama yaptıkları ortaya çıkmıştır.

Okul içi ve okul dışı akademik ihtiyaçların karşılanması için yapılan harcamalar dışında, özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklara dair yapılan harcamalar arasındaki en büyük farkın hobiler kategorisinde olduğu, bunu ise zeka oyunları kategorisinin izlediği tespit edilmiştir. Veriler analiz edildiğinde, hobiler kategorisinde ebeveynlerin %20'si özel yetenekli çocuklarının hobilerini desteklemek için harcama yaparken, tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarda ebeveynlerin sadece %8.3'ü harcama yaptıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca, özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinden 6 tanesi zekâ oyunları için yaptığı harcamaların yıllık 201\$ ve üzerinde olduğunu belirtmiş, buna karşın tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların ebeveynlerinden yalnızca 3 tanesi bu tutarda harcama yaptığını beyan etmiştir. Ayrıca yapılan toplam harcamalar incelendiğinde kitap kategorisi genel olarak her iki grup için de en çok harcama yapılan kategori olarak belirlenmiştir.

Son olarak, özel yetenekli çocukların finansal taleplerinin karşılanmasına yönelik elde edilen bulgulara göre, ebeveynlerin %65'i özel yetenekli çocuklarının kendilerinden herhangi bir finansal talepte bulunmadığını beyan ederken, ebeveynlerden %35'i özel yetenekli çocuklarının kendilerinden finansal talepte bulunduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Çocukların kendilerinden finansal talebi olduğunu belirten ebeveynlerden %30'u çocuklarının kendilerinden teknolojik cihazlar istediğini, %15'i özel ders veya kurs talebinde bulunduğunu, %10'u okul malzemesi talebinde bulunduğunu ve %10'u ise ilgi alanları doğrultusunda materyaller talep ettiğini belirtmişlerdir. Ebeveynlerin geri kalanı, çocuklarının maddi talepleri olduğu konusunda hemfikir olsalar da talebin türünü özellikle belirtmediler. Ayrıca ebeveynlerin %26'sı devlet tarafından çocuklarının finansal ihtiyaçları kapsamında desteklenmek istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Ebeveynlerin sadece %9'u özel yetenekli çocuklarının eğitimi için devletten hiçbir finansal beklentileri olmadığını ifade etmişlerdir.

Tartışma

Bu çalışmada ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli ve tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklarının eğitimi için yaptıkları harcamalar, bu harcamaların türleri ve özel yetenekli çocuklarının finansal taleplerinin karşılanması hakkındaki görüşleri incelenmiştir. Buna göre tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların ebeveynlerinin tamamı, özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinin ise %85'i çocuklarının eğitimlerine dair yaptıkları harcamalarda en çok miktarın okul gereçleri için kullanıldığını beyan etmişlerdir. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Anayasasında yer alan 42. maddeye göre 12 yıllık eğitim zorunlu ve ücretsizdir, ancak ebeveynlerin çocuklarının eğitimini desteklemek adına farklı kitap, defter, proje materyalleri gibi bazı gereksinimlerini gidermek için harcama yapmaları gerekmektedir. Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu'nun verilerine göre (2017b) Türkiye'de aile bütçesindeki hane içi harcamaların %2.3'ü eğitim giderlerine ayrılmıştır. Başka bir çalışmada Ulusoy (2013) ailelerin eğitimde ulaşım, öğrenci servisleri (diploma, kimlik kartı vb.), kitap, yemek ve benzeri kategorilerde harcamalar yaptığını belirlemiştir. Bu nedenle bu çalışmanın bulguları literatür ile benzerlik göstermektedir.

Bu çalışmada ebeveynlerin okul içi eğitim için yaptıkları yıllık harcamalar incelenmiş ve özel yetenekli çocuklar ile tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklara yönelik yapılan harcamalarda farklılıklar tespit edilmiştir. Buna göre okul içi harcama kapsamında tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklar için ebeveynlerin %83'ü harcama yaparken, özel yetenekli çocuklar için ebeveynlerin %80'i harcama yaptığını bildirmiştir. Özel yetenekli çocuklar için ebeveynlerin çoğunluğu (6) 0 ila 200\$ arasında harcama yaparken, bu rakam tipik gelişim gösteren çocukların ebeveynleri (4) için 201 ila 600\$ arasında yoğunluk göstermiştir. Bu bulgunun sebebi katılımcıların demografik bilgileri ile açıklanabilir zira eldeki verilerde yer alan demografik bilgiler incelendiğinde 0\$ ila 200\$ arasında yıllık harcama yapan özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinin tamamı aylık kazancı en fazla 600\$ olan sosyo-ekonomik düzeyi düşük olan ebeveynlerdir. Bu nedenle yapılan yıllık 200\$ eğitim harcamasının ailenin finansal olanakları çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi gerekmektedir. Bu Hesapçioğlu ve Taymaz'ın (1998) düşük gelirli ailelerin eğitim için daha az harcama yaptıklarına ilişkin ifadeleri ile de paralellik göstermektedir.

Okul dışı harcamalara bakıldığında tüm alanlarda özel yetenekli çocukları için daha fazla ebeveynin harcama yaptığı görülmektedir. Ebeveynlerin harcamalarına göre özel yetenekli çocukların farklı alanlardaki kitaplar, zekâ oyunları ve hobiler konusunda tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklara göre daha fazla ilgili olduğu söylenebilir. Özel yetenekli çocukların meraklı karakterleri ve ısrarcı özellikleri düşünüldüğünde bu bulgu beklendik bir bulgudur (Johnsen, 2011). Bunun yanı sıra, okul dışı harcamalarda özel yetenekli çocuklar ile tipik gelişim gösteren çocuklar için yapılan harcamalar arasındaki en büyük fark okul dışı dersler ve hobi kategorilerinde oluşmuştur. Bunun sebebi, özel yetenekli çocukların bir özelliği olarak geniş ilgi alanlarına sahip olması gösterilebilir. Bakioğlu ve Levent'in (2013) de belirttiği gibi özel yetenekli çocuklar akranlarından belirgin olarak farklılık gösterirler ve bunun için müfredat dışı programlarla desteklenmeye ihtiyaç duyarlar. Tüm bunlar göz önüne bulundurulduğunda, bu çalışmadaki özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinden farklı alanlarda özel ders ve farklı hobiler için finansal ihtiyaç oluşturmaları beklendik bir bulgudur.

Bu çalışmanın bir başka bulgusu olarak da özel yetenekli çocukların %65'inin ebeveynlerinden herhangi bir finansal talepte bulunmamasıdır. Bunun sebebi olarak özel yetenekli çocukların ebeveynlerinin sosyoekonomik durumlarının farkında olması ve onlara kendi taleplerini belirterek daha fazla baskı yapmak istememeleri gösterilebilir. Ballam (2009) kendi kişisel deneyimlerinden yola çıkarak yaptığı bilimsel çalışmasında, masrafları düşünerek ilgi alanlarını gizli tutmayı tercih ettiğini beyan etmiştir. Bu da bulguların alanyazın ile uyumlu olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, bazı ebeveynler çocukları için ellerinden geleni yaptıklarını beyan etmişlerdir. Seward ve Gaesser (2018) kırsal kesimde yaşayan ebeveynlerin özel yetenekli çocuklarını en iyi eğitimi almaları için desteklediklerini ortaya koymuşlardır. Bu çalışmanın verilerinin de nispeten küçük bir şehirden toplandığı göz

önüne alındığında, sonuçlar alanyazın ile uyumluluk göstermektedir. Diğer taraftan, çocukları finansal talepte bulunan ebeveynler, çocuklarının genellikle ilgi alanlarına yönelik teknolojik cihaz talebinde bulunduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Özel yetenekli çocukların ilgi alanlarına yönelik hobileri olduğu, yoğun bir merakla sahip olduğu ve ısrarcı oldukları göz önünde bulduğunda (Johnsen, 2011), özel yetenekli çocukların bu istekleri beklendik bir sonuçtur.

Son olarak, ebeveynler, özel yetenekli çocukların finansal taleplerinin devlet tarafından karşılanması gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Ebeveynler, devletten özellikle burs, uzman personel ve özel yetenekli çocuklara hitap edecek materyallerin sağlanmasını beklemektedirler. Türkiye'nin öğrenci başına Ekonomik Kalkınma ve İşbirliği Örgütü (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]) ortalamasının üçte biri kadar harcama yaptığı (OECD, 2017) göz önüne alındığında, eğitime gerekenden daha az harcama yapıldığı ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu durumda, devletten okullara gelen finansal desteğin düşük olması, okulların özel yetenekli çocukların ihtiyaçlarını yeteri kadar karşılayamamalarına neden olmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, ebeveynler kendi kısıtlı olanakları nedeniyle sağlayamadıkları fırsatları, devletin karşılamasını beklemektedirler.

Sonuç

Bu çalışmanın sonucunda, ebeveynlerin finansal koşulları nedeniyle özel yetenekli çocuklarının gelişimini tam olarak destekleyemedikleri ortaya konulmuştur. Ayrıca, ebeveynler okullarda sağlanan fırsatların özel yetenekli çocuklarının kendi potansiyellerini fark etmeleri ve gerçekleştirmelerine yardımcı olmak için yeterli olmadığını düşünmektedirler. Özel yetenekli çocukların potansiyellerini gerçekleştirmek için daha fazla malzeme, kaynak, rehber ve tesislerle zenginleştirilmiş ortamlara ihtiyaç duydukları sonucuna varılmıştır.

Yazarların Katkı Düzeyleri

Çalışmanın bütün aşamalarında yazarlar ortaklaşa görev almışlardır.

Teşekkür

Araştırmamıza destek veren katılımcılarımıza teşekkür ederiz.

Ek

Özel Yetenekli Çocuk Sahibi Olan Aile İçin Anket Formu

Kişisel bilgiler

	Özel yetenekli tanısı (var/yok) (Varsa hangi alan)	Cinsiyet	Kaçıncı sınıf	BİLSEM' e ulaşım (Yürüyerek, servisle, özel araçla)	Okula ulaşım (Yürüyerek, servisle, özel araçla)
1. Çocuk					
2. Çocuk					
3. Çocuk					
4. Çocuk					

Annenin Mesleği:

Babanın Mesleği:

Annenin Aylık Geliri:

Babanın Aylık Geliri:

Annenin Eğitim Düzeyi:

Babanın Eğitim Düzeyi:

Özel yetenekli olarak tanılanan çocuğunuza alternatif eğitim desteği sağlayabilmek için ekonomik durumunuz yeterli mi?

- () Evet, yeterli alternatif eğitim desteği sağlıyorum.
 () Kısmen yeterli yapabildiğim kadar alternatif eğitim desteği sağlayabiliyorum.
 () Hayır, yeterli değil devlet dışında eğitim desteği sağlayamıyorum.

Bu kısımda soruların altında verilen boşluğa yanıtınızı yazınız.

- Özel yetenekli çocuğunuz özgün/ orijinal ürünler ortaya koyabilmek (özel ders, teknolojik araçlar, kurslar) için sizden okul dışında farklı maddi taleplerde bulunuyor mu?
 () Evet () Hayır
 Evetse ne tür talepler?
- Özel yetenekli çocukların eğitim giderlerinin devlet tarafından karşılanması konusunda beklentiniz nedir?

Sorular

Bu kısımda özel yetenekli tanısı olan ve tanısı olmayan çocuklarınızla ilgili sorular bulunmaktadır. Yandaki soruların yanıtlarını ilgili kutucuğa yazınız.

	Özel yetenekli tanısı olan çocuğunuz için;	Özel yetenekli olarak tanılanmayan çocuğunuz için;	Cevap evetse, özel yetenekli çocuğunuz için aylık ortalama ne kadar harcıyorsunuz?	Cevap evetse, özel yetenekli olmayan çocuğunuz için aylık ortalama ne kadar harcıyorsunuz?
Çocuğunuzun okulu için harcama yapıyor musunuz?				
Harcadığınız bu miktarın yeterliği konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?				
Çocuğunuzun okulu için yaptığınız harcama neleri kapsıyor? (yemek, servis, kırtasiye vb.)				
Çocuğunuz okul dışında eğitime ihtiyaç duyuyor mu?				
Çocuğunuzun okulu dışında eğitimi için harcama yapıyor musunuz? (Yeteneği ile ilgili özel ders, etüt merkezi gibi)				
Çocuğunuzun okul dışında ihtiyaç duyduğu eğitimi yeterince karşılamamız konusunda ne düşünüyorsunuz?				
Çocuğunuz için danışma (rehberlik) hizmeti alıyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuza danışma (rehberlik) hizmeti aldırıyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuza ilgi alanlarına göre kitap alıyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuzun gezilere götürüyor/gönderiyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuzun bir hobi ile uğraşmasını sağlıyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuzun sinemaya, müzeye götürüyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuzun tiyatroya, sirke götürüyor musunuz?				
Çocuğunuza zekâ oyunları alırmısınız?				
Devletin çocuğunuza verdiği destekler var mı?				
Varsa nedir? (yemek, servis, kırtasiye, özel ders, kurs, para)				