

UDC 316.334(045)

**PROGRAMS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS:
BARRIERS FOR ETHNIC MINORITIES
IN THE UNITED STATES**

V. M. Alfimov

The article provides an overview of the socio-cultural and educational research focused on US ethnic minorities. The article focuses on the data of American researchers. Particular attention is paid to the language factor, which is regarded as the main barrier for ethnic minorities in the United States for participation in programs for gifted and talented students.

Key words: *Ethno-cultural education, ethnic minorities, programs for gifted and talented students, the language barrier.*

Statement of the problem in general aspect. In 2015 the US Department of Education made three 5-year demonstration grant awards to develop and expand models serving students who are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs, particularly ethnic minority, economically disadvantaged, English language learners, and students with disabilities, to help reduce gaps in achievement and to encourage the establishment of equal educational opportunities for all students.

A study by the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) found that some ethnic groups are significantly less likely than their White counterparts to be involved in gifted programming [29]. The NELS study provided statistics for Asian, White, African American, Hispanic, and Native American students. Based on this classification, the Asian, Hispanic, and Native American groups are the most likely to contain students whose native language is not English. The study found that 17.6% of Asian students, 6.7% of Hispanic students, and 2.1% of Native American students were involved in gifted programming, compared with 9% of White students [29]. In addition, there has been a significant increase in the rate at which certain ethnic groups have been identified for gifted programming, but this rate shows no sustained rise for Hispanic students over the past 3 decades [10]. Although the underrepresentation of minority students in gifted programs has

been acknowledged in the literature for many years [11; 20; 21], serious attention has only recently been drawn to the educational concerns of gifted students whose native language is not English [6].

Students with limited English proficiency are often underserved in gifted programs and overrepresented in special education programs [10; 25; 34]. Although it is expected that these students will be represented in gifted programming and special education programming at a rate representative of the school-age population, this is not occurring [20]. Plummer D. estimated that culturally and linguistically diverse students are “underrepresented by 30% to 70% in national gifted programs and overrepresented by 40% to 50% in special education programs” [28].

The analysis of recent research and publications. In recent years, the developing and expanding models serving students who are underrepresented in gifted and talented programs are under review in various aspects. Involving the youth from ethnic minorities in gifted programming was studied by Coleman M., Cross C., Donovan M., Ford D., Frasier M., Gallagher J., Garcia J., Grantham T., Goodman M., Maker J., Marland S., McKenzie J., Patton J., Peterson J., Plucker J., Plummer D., Resnick D., Soto L. D., Vasquez O.

Ethnic minorities and minority education, multiculturalism and national identity in the USA were highlighted by Bogue D. J., Brown M.E., Glazer N., Guibernau M., Guidieri R., Horowitz Donald L., Hutchinson J., Levinson D., Lieberman S., McAll C., Moynihan Daniel P., Musgrave Thomas D., Naylor L. L., Rex J., Rhea J. Tilden, Smith A.D., Sowell T., Thernstrom S. A., Waters M. C.

The problems of educating school-age persons (five to seventeen years of age) who spoke a language other than English in the United States studied Artiles A.J., August D., Berenyi J., Combs M.C., Hakuta K., Ingold C.W., Fleischman H., Gal S., Hopstock P., Kloss H., Kogan E., McLaren P., Ortiz A.A., Ovando C.J., Schmidt R., Shannon S., Wiley T., Wang S. C., Woolard K.

Language Education Policies to International Human Rights Standards are investigated by Crawford J., Cummins J., Gándara P., Hammarberg T., Hopkins M., Jhingran D., Leibowitz A. H., Reyhner J., Rosado L., Singh N., Wright S. Bilingual Education research is conducted by Brisk M., Collier V. P., Combs M. C., Cobb B., Crawford J., Espinosa L., Hsu C., Fasciano H., Kronauge C., Littlejohn J., Ovando C. J., Reynolds C. W., Stewner G., Steinberg Lois S., Thomas W. P., Vega D.

Accessibility of ethnic minorities to Gifted and talented programs in the USA is considered in the normative documents and various programs as well: "Racial and Ethnic Representation in Gifted Programs: Current Status of and Implications for Gifted Asian", "Council of the Great City Schools. Educating English Language Learners in the Nation's Urban Schools", "National Center for Education Statistics. Statistics in Brief: Public School Student, Staff, and Graduate Counts by State", "U.S. Census Bureau's projections", "The Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act", "U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education", "Convention on the rights of the child. United Nations General Assembly Resolution, 20 September, 1989".

Representation by race and ethnicity of students in gifted education was studied by Baldwin, Ford, Frasier, Grantham, Harris, Torrance.

The aim of the given paper is to analyze the main factors that have influence on involving the youth from ethnic minorities in gifted programming in the United States; to review the researches which illuminate American understanding of racial ideologies and social justice in multilingual states; to summarize the latest documents regarding the problems of education the youth from ethnic minorities in such a diverse society, as the USA.

Main material presentation. Famous American scientists Ford, Grantham, Guertin, Johnson, Plucker, Reis, Saccuzzo have examined the educational needs of several special populations of students: Asian, Pacific Islanders, African Americans and Latinos; students with disabilities, students who speak a language other than English from migrant families, who are gifted and talented. In 1979, approximately 1 in 10 school-aged children spoke a language other than English at home; by 2003, the proportion rose to nearly 1 in 5 (9.9 million) children (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2005) [38]. Between the 1989-1990 and 2004-2005, 2010-2015 school years, none-English-speakers enrollment in public schools more than doubled from 2,030,451 students to 6,555,729 according to National Center for Education Statistics. The number of English language learners (ELLs) is getting increase. Camarota S. stated that the largest country of origin of ELLs is Mexico; immigrants from Mexico account for 2.9 million, or one third, of the national increase in ELLs in the U.S. school-age population since 1982 [7]. This phenomenal growth is not limited to certain states in the U.S. Although the Western region of the country has seen the most dramatic growth in students who speak languages other than English in the home (29% of 5-17-year-olds in 1999), even states

in the Midwest, which have the lowest proportion of such students (8% in 1999), have experienced tremendous growth in the ELL student population, as Kochhar, Suro, Tafoya stated in 2005.

Castellano J. and Diaz E. studied that despite increased awareness of the need to identify more ELLs into gifted programs, this population remains underrepresented in GT programs. Thus, many ELL students are not receiving the educational services necessary. Failure to provide necessary educational services, including the provision of challenging academic work in the native language, may lead to overall underachievement [8].

Barkan J. and Bernal E. confirm that regrettably, research indicates that educational systems have focused their attention on the weaknesses rather than on the cognitive strengths of culturally and linguistically diverse students [4].

Aguirre N. states that frequently, due to the inherent language barriers between ELLs and American schools, ELL students have fewer opportunities compared to their native English-speaking peers to be noticed by teachers for behaviors traditionally characteristic in America of gifted and talent students [1]. Inherently, ELL students' giftedness may manifest in specific ways that are framed within and that emphasize the students' linguistic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. That is, aptitudes and characteristics of talent potential are culturally defined and embedded [11; 23]. Identification procedures ought to concentrate on a broader conception of giftedness that includes nontraditional approaches that consider culture [12]. Therefore, as Harris, Rapp, Martinez, and Plucker state, assessment and referral practices should aim at inclusiveness of culturally based characteristics of giftedness [14]. Gallagher J. and Coleman M. identified two barriers of traditional assessment procedures in identifying ELL students as gifted and talented. First, poor communication often exists between educators who teach gifted and talented students and teachers of other special populations, such as special education and ELL students. This lack of communication reduces opportunities to observe and know children, including ELL children, in multiple educational settings. The opportunity for ELL children to be identified for having exceptional gifts and talents is increased when educators collaborate to bring together information about a child from multiple sources and multiple environmental influences. Second, the lack of explicit identification policies regarding proper identification of gifted students from underrepresented groups is another barrier to valid and reliable identification procedures for this population [14]. Hernández R., Marcelo S., and Rochín R. define additional barriers to effective practices for identifying

ELL students as gifted and talented cited in the literature include low teacher expectations of minority students [13]; Frasier M. selected biases in standardized testing [11]; McKenzie J. stressed the noninclusive or lack of cultural relevancy of our definition of 372 Journal for the Education of the Gifted giftedness [22]; and Soto L. noticed negative reactions by school personnel toward non-English-speaking students [32].

Census Bureau projections through 2050 indicate an increasingly diverse nation: between 2010 and 2050, the Hispanic population will grow from 49.7 million to 132.8 million, an increase of 83 million or 167 percent. The group's share of the nation's population will almost double, from 16 percent in 2010 to 30 percent in 2050. The Asian population will grow 213 percent, or from 14.4 million to 34.4 million. Asians' share of the population will double, from 4.7 percent to 7.8 percent. The black population will grow from 39.9 million to 56.9 million, an increase of 17 million or 46 percent. The black share of the population will remain relatively the same at around 13 percent. The non-Hispanic white population will increase by only 1 percent, from 200.9 million to 203.3 million, a gain of 2.5 million. The non-Hispanic white share of the population will decline from 64.7 percent in 2010 to 46.3 percent in 2050.

Identification of gifted students is not an easy process. Gifted and talented learners are unique and challenging students. Like all gifted and talented students, they are curious, creative, observant, and sensitive. All gifted and talented students are the best and brightest of any community in which they live. They are members of the community and future leaders of their generation. Critically important to educators is the definition stated that gifted and talented students are those identified as possessing outstanding abilities, who are capable of high performance and require appropriate instruction and educational services commensurate with their abilities and needs beyond those provided by the regular school program. Gifted and talented children include those children with demonstrated achievement or potential ability. Students with gifts and talents will demonstrate achievement or potential ability, or both, in any of the following areas or in combination: general intellectual ability, creative thinking, leadership ability, visual and performing arts ability, specific ability aptitude.

As stated previously, one barrier to identification may in fact be the people expected to look for gifts and talent among students – their teachers. Teachers often have the responsibility of nominating students for gifted programs. A study by Peterson J. and Margolin L. found that teachers did not refer any students of limited English proficiency for gifted identification

[26]. However, some researchers indicate that teachers are more likely to nominate students who cooperate, answer questions correctly, and are punctual, advantageous behaviors in the United States mainstream culture. These qualities may not be advantageous or considered expressions of giftedness in other cultures. In addition, teachers are more likely to nominate students who resemble other gifted students with whom they have had contact. According to Cohen L. [9], teachers may lack the knowledge and understanding of the cultural, linguistic, and cognitive skills of ELLs. Bermúdez A., Rakow S., Márquez J., Sawyer C., Ryan C state that together, the above issues may result in a population of ELL students whose limited English proficiency and cultural differences may disguise their talents to teachers and other school staff [5].

Founded in 1983 by the U.S. English organization, the English Only (EO) movement was established in an effort to make English the official language of the United States. Efforts to apply this movement started with the nation's increasing number of immigrants and the "growing discontent with bilingual education" [24]. 'Official English' is a political movement in the United States of America which contends that national unity, American identity and the English language itself are threatened both by immigration and languages other than English. Also known as 'English Only', this movement's primary areas of focus are educational policy for language minority children, linguistic access to political and civil rights (such as the right to access voting materials and drivers' licensing exams in languages other than English), and a constitutional amendment that would give English the status of the sole official language of the United States [31]. The EO movement has received strong attention from the media. Funding and campaigns have helped the movement progress and "by 2010, 26 states had active Official English laws on their books" [24]. Although English is still not specified as the nation's official language, some states, including California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, were successful in their promotion of EO instruction. For example, in California, an initiative supported by politician and millionaire Ron Unz received great support for EO instruction, despite its attempt to devalue bilingual education [24]. Proponents of the EO movement argue that the principles that guide their movement would help the United States to resolve issues related to racism that are so common in certain divided nations where multilingualism is prevalent. Opponents of legislating English as the official language argue that making English the official language would aggravate issues of racism and discrimination. In fact, U.S. English has sparked an attitude of hostility towards Asian and Latino groups [24].

English-only programs have also had a negative impact on Native Americans as the loss of Native American indigenous languages have resulted in a loss of cultural identity for many of their people [16; 18; 19; 24; 35; 36; 37; 39; 40].

The history of U.S. educational legislation is grounded in the changing conceptions about the most effective way to provide high quality education for all students. In fact, the Supreme Court has recognized the fundamental role education plays, not only in individual success, but in maintaining a prosperous society [3]. Language of instruction became the focal point of discussions over time, as more and more students came to the classroom from non-English speaking home environments. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, English Language Learner (ELL) enrollment has increased by 65% over the past ten years. The Census also predicts that students who come from homes that speak a language other than English will make up 40% of the entire school-age population by 2030 [39]. According to Article 29 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child (1989) “the education of the child should be directed to the development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values, for the national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may originate, and for civilizations different from his or her own”. Along the same lines, Article 30 states that “a child belonging to an (ethnic, religious, or linguistic minority) should not be denied the right to use his or her own language [40]. Access to education in one’s native language should be intimately connected with the question of democratic practices. No doubt, immigrant learners need to learn the language of the host country but this should happen in a way that will enable them to not only read the word but also the world.

Schmidt R. [31] examines bilingual education in the public schools, “linguistic access” rights to public services, and the designation of English as the United States’ “official” language. He illuminates the conflict by describing the comparative, theoretical, and social contexts for the debate. The source of the disagreement, he maintains, is not a disagreement over language per se but over identity and the consequences of identity for individuals, ethnic groups, and the country as a whole. Title VII thus resulted in significant funding as well as needed attention to the instructional needs of language minority students while, at the same time, ensuring the integrity of language minority students’ educational content and environment. Title VII was eliminated in 2002 with the enactment of *No Child Left Behind Act*.

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was an educational reform signed into law by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002. It was a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and funded federal programs aimed at improving education in U.S. public schools by increasing accountability standards. The overall intent of the law was to provide all children in the United States with a significant and equal opportunity to achieve high academic standards. The U.S. Department of Education established basic objectives in NCLB which included: the acquisition of highly qualified teachers, student achievement of higher academic standards, student competency in reading and math, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) student competency in English, and higher rates of high school graduation [15].

All students, including those with limited English proficiency (LEP) and those with other special educational needs, have rights guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution, federal legislation and decisions handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court. As Multicultural Education, Training and Advocacy, Inc (META) stated, all students have a right to freedom from discrimination, the right to education programs responsive to their language needs, the right to protection under the law, and the right to special education testing and programs. In order to provide these guaranteed opportunities, accommodations must be made to serve special needs of students.

Ovando C. J. and Combs M. C. summarized the point that both bilingual education and special education are interventions aimed at improving educational services to students whose needs have not been met by traditional methods of providing universal public education [24]. The challenges in educating LEP students and students of other special needs begin in correctly identifying them. Students of LEP have been heavily overrepresented and also underrepresented in special education programs throughout the United States. LEP students and traditional special needs children both often fall behind their peers, but for different reasons. The reasons need to be determined and addressed appropriately in order for the student to attain academic success. Artiles A. J. and Ortiz A.A. stressed, “Before assessing a child for special education, first assess the instructional program” [2]. The federal Department of Education dictated in its inclusion requirements for Title I that LEP students need to be assessed to extents practical “in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what such students know and can do, to determine such students’ mastery of skills in subjects other than English”. Research shows that early intervention is most effective in turning around student progress

with regard to students who are falling behind their peers; so timely notice, assessment, and intervention are crucial for student success. In conclusion, LEP students have a very difficult time keeping up with their peers who have begun learning the language of instruction since birth. LEP students are in a fragile academic position and need as much help from teachers and outside sources as they can get. Teachers need to be trained to be aware of nuances between LEP students who may have greater English language deficiencies than other LEP students and LEP students with further special needs.

The diversity of students with limited ability in English is great. Some of these students are foreign-born immigrants to the United States—some with and some without prior schooling. Some of them are literate in their native language. They came to the United States at different ages and for different reasons—some to escape civil war or strife and political persecutions, while some were attracted to the opportunities in the United States, and still others drawn by its various programs of refuge and asylum. Most limited English proficient (LEP) students, however, are born in the United States to immigrant parents, and they start school with a native language other than English and with varying degrees of speaking ability in English (and so are increasingly referred to as English language learners, or ELLs).

American researchers are now identifying ways to improve both the English language proficiency and the academic performance of ELL students. Preparing English language learners for academic success, from the Center for Public Education, synthesizes the current research and offers some valuable lessons. Academic English proficiency is key to student achievement, especially in the secondary grades. Too often, however, students are reclassified as proficient in English on the. On average, it takes four to seven years for ELL students to become proficient in the kind of language used in textbooks. Attention to oral language skills and reading and writing skills.

The Congress is making spending decisions for fiscal year 2017 over the next few months. The first step is that the House and Senate appropriations subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education will hear from colleagues and the Obama administration about funding priorities. The purpose of the Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act is to orchestrate a coordinated program of scientifically based research, demonstration projects, innovative strategies, and similar activities that build and enhance the ability of elementary and secondary schools to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented students. The Javits Act focuses resources on identifying and serving students who are traditionally

underrepresented in gifted and talented programs, particularly minority, economically disadvantaged, English language learners, and students with disabilities, to help reduce gaps in achievement and to encourage the establishment of equal educational opportunities for all students.

In addition to the demonstration grants, the Javits program funds a National Research and Development Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth, which conducts a focused program of research that includes an exploratory study, an impact evaluation, and leadership and outreach activities to ensure that the research informs education practice.

In the given context, experience of the USA can be very useful for Ukraine, especially in the context of developing conceptions of state language policies in Ukraine.

References

1. Aguirre, N. ESL students in gifted education. In J. A. Castellano (Ed.), *Special populations in gifted education: Working with diverse gifted learners* (pp. 17–27).
2. Artiles A. J., Ortiz, A. A. English language learners and special education: A summary of English language learners with special education needs. Center for Applied Linguistics. National Education Association. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/inclusion>.
3. Berenyi J. “Appropriate action,” inappropriately defined: amending the equal education opportunities act of 1974. *Washington and Lee Law review*.- 2008.- Pp. 640-659.- <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol65/iss2/7>
4. Barkan, J., & Bernal, E. (1991). Gifted education for bilingual and limited English proficient students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 35, pp.144–147.
5. Bermudez, A., Rakow, S., Marquez, J., Sawyer, C., & Ryan, C. Meeting the needs of the gifted and talented limited English proficient student: The UHCL prototype. *Proceedings of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED360872)
6. Bernal, E. M. Three ways to achieve a more equitable representation of culturally and linguistically different students in GT programs. *Roeper Review*, 24, 82–88.
7. Camarota, S. *Immigration from Mexico: Assessing the impact on the United States*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.
8. Castellano, J. A., & Diaz, E. I. (Eds.). *Reaching new horizons: Gifted and talented education for culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
9. Cohen, L. (1998). *Meeting the needs of gifted and talented minority language students: Issues and practices*. Silver Spring: Maryland National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED309592)
10. Donovan, M., & Cross, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

11. Frasier, M. Multiple criteria: The mandate and the challenge. *Roeper Review*, 20(2), A-4.
12. Johnsen, S. (1999, Spring). What the research says about Latino gifted and talented students. *Tempo*, 19(2), 26-31.
13. Hernandez, R., Marcelo, S., & Rochin, R. I. (2001). Latino youth: Converting challenges to opportunities (JSRI Working Paper No. Journal for the Education of the Gifted 50). East Lansing: Michigan State University, The Julian Samora Research Institute.
14. Harris, B., Rapp, K., Martinez, R., & Plucker, J. (2007). Identifying English language learners for gifted and talented programs: Current practices and recommendations for improvement. *Roeper Review*, 30, 26-29.
15. Ingold C. W., Wang S. C. The teachers we need: Transforming world language education in the United States: National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland. Retrieved from: http://www.nflc.org/publications/the_teachers_we_need.pdf
16. Gal S. "Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, - 1998.-3-47.
17. Gallagher, J., & Coleman, M. R. (1994). A Javits project: Gifted education policy studies program final report. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Gifted Education Policy Studies Program. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 40(1), 41-48.
18. Kroskrity P. "Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, - 1998.-103-220.
19. Lippi-Green R. "Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts". *Language in society* 23, - 1994.- 163-98.
20. Maker, J. Quality education for gifted minority students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 6, 140-153.
21. Marland, S. P., Jr. Education of the gifted and talented: Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and background papers submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, 2 vols. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Government Documents, Y4.L 11/2: G36)
22. McKenzie, J. (1986). The influences of identification practices, race, and SES on the identification of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30, 93-95.
23. Montgomery, D. (Ed.). (2001). *Able underachievers*. London: Whurr. National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Elementary and secondary enrollment of ELL Students in U.S.: 1989-90 to 2004-2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/expert/faq/08leps.html>
24. Ovando C. J., Combs M. C. *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (5th edition). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. - 2003.- pp. 141-155.

25. Patton, J. The disproportionate representation of African Americans in special education: Looking behind the curtain for understanding and solutions. *Journal of Special Education*, 32, pp. 25-31.
26. Peterson, J. S., & Margolin, L. (1997). Naming gifted children: An example of unintended reproduction. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 21, 82-100.
27. Plucker, J. A. (1996). Gifted Asian-American students: Identification, curricular and counseling concerns. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 19, 315-343.
28. Plummer, D. (1995). Serving the needs of gifted children from a multicultural perspective. In J. L. Genshaft, M. Birely, & C. L. Hollinger (Eds.), *Serving gifted and talented students: A resource for school personnel*, pp. 285-300.
29. Resnick, D., & Goodman, M. (1997). Research review. Retrieved from http://www.nwrel.org/nwedu/fall_97/article6.html
30. Saccuzzo, D. P., Johnson, N. E., & Guertin, T. L. (1994). Identifying underrepresented disadvantaged gifted and talented children: A multifaceted approach (Vol. 1-2). (ERIC DocumentReproduction Service No. ED368095).
31. Schmidt R. *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. - Retrieved from http://www.temple.edu/tempress/titles/1505_reg_print.html
32. Soto, L. D. (1997). *Language, culture and power: Bilingual families and the struggle for quality education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
33. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
34. Vasquez, O. Latinos in the global context: Beneficiaries or irrelevant? *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6, 119-137.
35. Wiley T. Language planning, language policy, and the English-only movement./ In Finegan & Rickford, *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century*.// Cambridge University Press - 2004. - pp. 324-328.
36. Wiley T. G. A brief history and assessment of language rights in the United States. In J. W. Tollefson, *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (2nd ed.). London, England: Routledge. - 2013. - pp. 61-90
37. Wiley T. G., Lukes M. English-only and standard English ideologies in the United States. *TESOL Quarterly*, 3. - 1993. - pp. 511-530.
38. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The condition of education 2005* (NCES 2005- 094). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
39. The United States Department of Education. (n.d.). Part A - English Language Acquisition,
40. *Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg40.html>
41. Convention on the rights of the child. United Nations General Assembly Resolution, 20 September, 1989. <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>.

**ПРОГРАММЫ ДЛЯ ОДАРЕННЫХ И ТАЛАНТЛИВЫХ
УЧАЩИХСЯ: БАРЬЕРЫ ДЛЯ ЭТНИЧЕСКИХ МЕНЬШИНСТВ
В США****В.Н. Алфимов**

В статье представлен обзор социокультурных и педагогических исследований, ориентированных на этнические меньшинства США. Статья фокусируется на данных американских исследователей. Особое внимание уделяется языковому фактору, который рассматривается как основной барьер для этнических меньшинств в США для участия в программах для одаренных и талантливых учащихся.

Ключевые слова: этнокультурное образование, этнические меньшинства, программы для одаренных и талантливых учащихся, языковой барьер.

**ПРОГРАМИ ДЛЯ ОБДАРОВАНИХ І ТАЛАНОВИТИХ УЧНІВ:
БАР'ЄРИ ДЛЯ ЕТНІЧНИХ МЕНШИН У США****В.М. Алфімов**

У статті представлений огляд соціокультурних і педагогічних досліджень, орієнтованих на етнічні меншини США. Стаття фокусується на даних американських дослідників. Особлива увага приділяється мовному фактору, який розглядається як основний бар'єр для етнічних меншин у США для участі в програмах для обдарованих і талановитих учнів.

Ключові слова: етнокультурна освіта, етнічні меншини, програми для обдарованих і талановитих учнів, мовний бар'єр.

Алфімов Валентин Миколайович – доктор педагогічних наук, професор кафедри педагогіки Східноукраїнського національного університета імені Володимира Даля (Северодонецьк, Україна). E-mail: alfimov_val@meta.ua

Alfimov Valentyn Mykolayevych – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Department of Pedagogics, Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University, Severodonetsk, Ukraine. E-mail: alfimov_val@meta.ua

УДК [37.036:373.51]-053.5-058.65

**ЕСТЕТИЧНЕ ВИХОВАННЯ ДІТЕЙ УКРАЇНИ,
ПОСТРАЖДАЛИХ ВІД ВІЙСЬКОВОГО КОНФЛІКТУ,
ЯК ПЕДАГОГІЧНА ПРОБЛЕМА****А. Ю. Бовт**

У статті розглянуто вплив військового конфлікту на психологічний стан дітей, їхню життєдіяльність і формування світогляду; охарактеризовано роль та переваги естетичного виховання дітей України, які постраждали від військового конфлікту.

Ключові слова: естетичне виховання, військовий конфлікт, негативні психологічні наслідки, роль та переваги естетичного виховання, світогляд.

Постановка проблеми в загальному вигляді та її зв'язок з важливими науковими і практичними завданнями. Військовий конфлікт, який розпочався в Україні у 2014 році, значно змінив політичну, соціально-економічну, культурну та освітню ситуацію в країні. Постають нові проблеми, наслідки яких відчули майже усі громадяни України. Військові дії, обстріли з важкої техніки, чисельні руйнування, загибель людей не могли не вплинути на психологічний стан громадян України. Особливо найуразливішою віковою категорією виявилися діти. На нашу думку, освіта, а саме естетичне виховання, яке покликане привносити у життя дітей красу та радість творчості, є одним з чинників відновлення душевної рівноваги та подолання негативних психологічних наслідків пережитих подій.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій, в яких започатковане вирішення даної проблеми і на які спирається автор. Проблеми естетики та естетичного виховання привертати увагу видатних вітчизняних та зарубіжних педагогів, психологів, філософів. Серед них Г. Шевченко, М. Фіцула, С. Максимюк, Н. Мойсеюк, С. Пальчевський, М. Пашенко, Б. Лихачов, Г. Ващенко, С. Мельничук, В. Бутенко, О. Лосев, О. Буров, Ю. Борев, М. Каган, Л. Столович, Дж. Дьюї, І. Айзнер. Вони розглядали історію розвитку естетики як філософської науки, сутність естетичного виховання та його особливості для різних вікових груп, описували різні методи та засоби здійснення естетичного виховання у школах та вищих навчальних закладах.