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ABSTRACT

A comparative study of teacher and parent perceptions of first grade children’s multiple intelligences was conducted. In addition, race/ethnic origin and gender differences were examined. The sample consisted of three classrooms, each from different public charter schools in Tallahassee, Florida. Three teachers and 40 parents were asked to complete the Multiple Intelligences Developmental Assessment Scale (MIDAS)-KIDS, “My Young Child” (MYC) to assess their children’s multiple intelligences. Twenty-eight of the children’s were female, 12 were male. Twenty-six children were Caucasian, 6 African American, 4 East Indian, 2 Hispanic, and 2 Asian. Children’s ages ranged from 6 to 7 years old.

Parent perceptions of children’s mathematical and natural intelligences were significantly higher than teacher perceptions. Gender contributed significantly to teacher and parent perceptions of girls’ greater spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences. Race also contributed significantly to teacher and parent perceptions of children of color’s greater mathematical and linguistic intelligences.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

It is a prevailing assumption that when parent and teachers continue to work together a more meaningful educational experience for children occurs. Parent and teacher beliefs, perceptions, and experiences guide instruction and child learning in the home and at school. As parents interact with their children in the home and other community environments and teachers with children in a school environment, some differences in these adults’ perceptions of children’s capacities, including intelligence are to be expected. Surprisingly, little research has been conducted to explore parent and teacher perceptions of children’s intelligences, particularly their multiple intelligences.

It is increasingly recognized that children’s intelligence is multifaceted. Gardner (1991) suggested that beyond the two intelligences receiving most focus in educational settings—linguistic and mathematical—there are others that more fully define human intellectual capacity. The theory of multiple intelligences, advanced by Gardner (1999), provides a unique view of human intelligence and allows for curriculum development (Lazear, 2003) that is truly individualized embracing differentiation not homogenization (Eisner, 2004). The work of Gardner and others encourages an expansive view of children’s intellectual gifts, as opposed to a view of progress based on standardized test performance.

Researchers have long studied the differences between boys and girls performance in the classroom (Furnham & Gasson, 1998; Furnham et al., 2002a; Furnham et al., 2002b). In Florida and on the national level, girls are better prepared when they enter school and are more likely to enter college than males while boys’ test-taking abilities and level of mathematics proficiency continues to be higher than girls (Florida Department of Education, 2001). As the gap continues to widen between girls’ and boys’ proficiencies and standardized testing continues to be the assessment tool of choice, ways to minimize stereotyping as well as recognizing influences that shape boys’ and girls’ achievement level at an early age will also contribute to Florida’s educational ascension. For this reason, this study seeks to fill the gap of literature in using a validated assessment tool to help parent and teachers assess multiple intelligence levels in their children.
Admittedly, most instruction in elementary schools today provides for children’s use of two intelligences (Stanford, 2003). Because past ideas about education systems were constructed with the assumption that a particular set of values and ways of thinking could be transferred to the child (Cannella, 1997), curricula largely continues to be implemented using only linguistic and mathematical intelligences. Opportunities for the exercise of kinesthetic, spatial, musical, and other intelligences today are often relegated to an occasional half-hour special period or are altogether eliminated from the school schedule. When schools elect to incorporate a wider range of learning activities to allow children to utilize their unique abilities or multiple intelligences, traditional forms of assessment are inadequate. For example, assessing children’s kinesthetic skill across the curriculum requires a different tool than giving a grade for physical education class performance. With the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” (Shearer, 1999), teachers are now able to assess and develop curricula that promote children’s multiple intelligences. With a clearer picture of children’s intelligences, using the perceptions of parents and teachers, it is hoped that teachers can provide a more holistic environment that recognizes the realistic differences that each child brings to the classroom.

Statement of the Problem

A comparison of parent and teacher perceptions of first grade children’s multiple intelligences was examined. In addition, the influence of gender and race/ethnicity on parent and teacher perceptions was considered. It was the expectation of this researcher that this information would be valuable for understanding and appreciation of each child’s intellectual gifts and the basis for planning to support each child’s learning.

Research Questions

1. Are there differences in teacher and parent perceptions of their child’s multiple intelligences?
2. Are there differences in teacher and parent perceptions of their child’s multiple intelligences as a function of gender?
3. Are there differences in teacher and parent perceptions of their child’s multiple intelligences as a function of race?
Definitions

1. **Child/Student**: A 6-7 year old child attending school as a first grader

2. **Parent/Caregiver**: guardian of the child/student

3. **Intelligence**: the ability to solve problems or create products that are valued within one or more cultural settings (Gardner, 1999): The types of multiple intelligences used in this study are linguistic/verbal, logical/mathematical, visual/spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, musical/rhythmic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic

   a. The first multiple intelligence, **linguistic/verbal**, describes a child who uses words effectively whether oral or written. A child with high levels of linguistic intelligence could enjoy reading books and playing word games, does developmental spelling that is advanced for his age, and communicates to others in a highly verbal way (Gardner, 1999).

   b. The second multiple intelligence, **logical/mathematical**, describes a child who uses numbers effectively and who reasons well. A child with high levels of logical/mathematical intelligence may ask a lot of questions about how things work, enjoys counting and playing with numbers, and enjoys putting things in categories (Gardner, 1999).

   c. The third multiple intelligence, **visual/spatial**, describes a child who perceives the world from different perspectives and angles. This child will likely exhibit reports of clear visual images, have the ability to read maps, and is known to be a daydreamer (Gardner, 1999).

   d. The fourth multiple intelligence, **bodily/kinesthetic**, describes a child with the ability to use the body to express emotion, to play a game, and to create a new product. A child who displays a high level of bodily/kinesthetic intelligence also excels in one or more sports, fidgets while seated for a long period of time, and is very dramatic in expressing himself (Gardner, 1999).

   e. The fifth multiple intelligence, **musical/rhythmic**, describes a child that has the capacity to recognize and use rhythm and tones patterns and is sensitive to sound from the environment, the human voice, and musical instruments. This child remembers melodies of songs with ease, has the
ability to distinguish notes, and is sensitive to environmental noises, i.e. rain on a rooftop (Gardner, 1999).

f. The sixth multiple intelligence, interpersonal, describes a child with the ability to work cooperatively with others in a small group, as well as the ability to communicate verbally and nonverbally with other people. This child enjoys talking with peers, seems like a natural leader, and is known to be street smart (Gardner, 1999).

g. The seventh multiple intelligence, intrapersonal, describes a child whose internal aspects of self, such a knowledge of feelings, range of emotional responses, thinking processes, self-refection, and sense of intuition about spiritual realities. A child that possesses high levels of intrapersonal intelligence displays a sense of independence and strong will, does well when left alone, and has high self esteem (Gardner, 1999).

h. The eighth multiple intelligence, naturalistic, describes a child who recognizes patterns in nature and classify objects, masters taxonomies, and is sensitive to other features of the natural world. Because naturalistic intelligence is the newest of the multiple intelligence very little information is listed on specific attributes as of yet. (Gardner, 1999).

Assumptions
The following assumptions are made for this study:

1. All students have the capacity of all eight intelligences.
2. All students can learn.
3. Students learn differently.
4. Students learn better when they are taught using curricula based on the multiple intelligence theory (Gardner, 1999).
5. Parent and teacher responses to the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC are true. In other words, they respond with an answer they believe to be correct.
6. Parents have the acquisition of general literacy skills, basic reading and writing, and are able to read and understand the materials that were distributed in this study.
Delimitations

The researcher establishes the following delimitations for the study:

1. The study was limited to a convenience sample of 40 students/parents and three teachers.
2. The sample was limited to classrooms selected from two charter schools in Tallahassee, Florida.
3. The study was limited to teachers and parents who gave consent to participate in this study.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

To guide the development of proposed investigation of parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences, a review of the literature was conducted. In this chapter, the following topics are discussed: (a) history, philosophy and constructs, and applications of multiple intelligences; (b) teacher and parent responsibility in children’s education; (c) teacher and parent perceptions of boys’ and girls’ multiple intelligences; and race as a function of perceptions.

Multiple Intelligences

History of the Multiple Intelligences Theory

Gardner (1991) attributes the development of the theory of multiple intelligences to the scientific thought of Darwin, Piaget, Dewey, Chomsky, and Rozin. Multiple Intelligence Theory is a theory-grounded analysis of student strengths, a concerted effort to relate these strengths to meaningful adult roles, the creation of curricular materials and learning centers that fosters these strengths in a natural way, and the development of assessment procedures that can provide reliable information about, and yield pertinent recommendations of a student’s profile of capacities at a given moment in his development.

Philosophy and Constructs

The underlying philosophy of multiple intelligence research (Gardner, 1991) currently recognizes eight multiple intelligences: (a) linguistic/verbal, (b) logical/mathematical, (c) visual/spatial, (d) bodily/kinesthetic, (e) musical/rhythmic, (f) interpersonal, (g) intrapersonal, and (h) naturalistic—and that educational programs should foster the development of all intelligences. After 20 years of re-conceptualization, Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory encompasses a new way of understanding cognitive development and intelligences.

As with any theory, the criterion that enables each intelligence to stand on its own provides a necessary framework that prohibits other scientists from adding other intelligences randomly or without context. By setting up these eight criteria, each intelligence adheres to the strictest measure and is standardized for future use in research. The eight criteria are listed below (Gardner, 1999, p.36):
1. Does the construct have the potential of being isolated by brain damage?
2. Does the construct have an evolutionary history and evolutionary plausibility?
3. Does the construct have an identifiable set of core operations?
4. Is the construct susceptible to encoding in a symbolic system?
5. Does the construct have a distinct developmental history, along with definable set of expert “end state” performances?
6. Does the construct appear in examples of idiot savant, prodigies, and exceptional people?
7. Can the construct be supported by experimental psychological tasks?
8. Can the construct be supported by psychometric findings?

As the theory of multiple intelligences continues to grow and evolve by adding new intelligences and examining new methods for its application, each new construct appears to strengthen Gardner’s effort in establishing the theory of multiple intelligences as an integral part of understanding cognitive processing.

*Applications of the Multiple Intelligence Theory*

Using the multiple intelligences theory, Gardner conducted a study—Project Zero’s Project Spectrum—to apply in the classroom. Project Spectrum’s research is based on the belief that each child exhibits a distinctive profile of different abilities or spectrum of intelligences. These intelligences are not fixed; rather, they can be enhanced by educational opportunities such as an environment rich in stimulating materials and activities (Krechevsky & Seidel, 1998). The Spectrum approach recognizes and values children individualized abilities as oppose to valuing regurgitated material and standardized testing (Diaz-Lefebvre, 2004).

For five years, Gardner and his colleagues at Project Spectrum established the framework for many multiple intelligences theory-based curricula used today. And with several schools integrating the theory of multiple intelligences into their curriculum, in 1998, Project Zero established Project SUMIT (Schools Using Multiple Intelligences Theory) (Project Zero, 2003).

Project SUMIT embarked on finding different ways schools utilized the multiple intelligences theory. Project SUMIT conducted site visits and telephone conferences to find out how administrators were integrating the theory of multiple intelligences into
practice. Administrators encouraged teachers to contribute in design process of implementing multiple intelligence theory which is essential for the implementation (Hoerr, 2004). Conclusions from Project SUMIT indicated that many schools were using multiple intelligence theory for developing curriculum by encouraging the strengths of students and teachers (Project Zero, 2003).

Although the theory was first brought to the mainstream through *Frames of the Mind* (Gardner, 1985), the implications of Gardner’s research led to many interpretations of how children develop cognitively and how learning environments affect learning exchange between teacher and student. Multiple Intelligences Theory has created an innovative method to change the way educators look at the current educational system and by establishing a theory that recognizes and validates different ways of understanding and learning. This theory confirms the individuality of all students.

Multiple Intelligences Theory has obvious educational implications, with a proven track record for school excellence (Mettetal et al., 1997) For example, the Key Learning School in Indianapolis, a magnet elementary school devotes its curriculum time to each of the intelligences. The Key Learning School adopted the theory of multiple intelligences by incorporating themes and video portfolios into its curriculum. With the population of the Key Learning School selected through a lottery and its minority enrollment encompassing 45% of the population, each child attending Key Learning School is afforded the chance to learn in a very unique environment. At the present time the Key Learning School has expanded to include middle school grades and continues to encourage learning through the use of multiple intelligences theory. Incorporating the multiple intelligence theory into classrooms make schools more engaging, students better rounded, and more motivated to succeed (Quigley, 1994). With its unique ability to arrange the structure and curricula to encompass the constructs of the theory of multiple intelligences, the Key Learning School success continues to be a testament as to how well this theory can be used in teaching students today.

While some applications of the theory have been beneficial and at the least been helpful in providing new ways of understanding how children interpret and respond to instruction, there are some misinterpretations of the theory. Gardner (1999) noted that his boiling point was reached when he saw a list of the ethnic and racial groups aligned with
particular intelligences. Race is often used as a variable to identify variance in data analysis and results. Understanding race not as a predictor of children’s intelligences, but as a contributing factor of society’s perceptions of children and adult cognitive abilities, helps researchers to better explain causality between perceptions and intelligences.

And although most misinterpretations are not as harmful as racial profiling using multiple intelligences, here is another example of a misinterpretation that tends to be more common. Gardner has noted many misinterpretations including interchanging multiple intelligences for learning styles. Gardner concluded that although someone might have distinct intelligences, that in no way suggests his/her particular learning style in exploiting or using those intelligences. Multiple intelligences are much more than a set of characteristics displayed by a student when responding to certain stimuli. Using the eight constructs, some of which are biological, each intelligence is examined to fit certain criteria. This is what also sets it apart from a particular learning style.

Lastly, applications using the multiple intelligences theory are ever changing. There is no set method coined as the signature method of implementation and instruction for the theory of multiple intelligence, only the interpretation of it by educators and administrators who implement the method in their curriculum. Because families are important for children learning and development (Connors & Epstein, 1995), and by using the expertise of educators and parents, this holistic approach will seemingly benefit the child as well as the educational system that adopts it.

Teacher and Parent Responsibility in Children’s Education

Teaching a child is a demanding responsibility. Over time parent and teacher accountability for the success of a child’s education has changed from separate duties and tasks to a collaborative effort (Connors & Epstein, 1995). Through parent-teacher collaboration, issues of blame for student underachievement are diminished as parents and teacher garner resources to improve their children’s performance. The responsibility to help a failing child continues to be the responsibility of parents and teachers.

Parents, particularly mothers, can provide positive interactions with their child to promote positive development in intelligence and attachment (Barnard & Solchany, 2002). They provide the basis for the beginning interactions needed to be successful in the education system. These interactions are not just one sided. Instead, these
bidirectional interactions make each parent an active partner in the process of learning (Lerner et al., 2002).

As children grow, the interactions and needs of children change. Likewise, the parent changes how they interact with a child as well as the added responsibility of monitoring the interactions of others (Collins, 2002). As children enter school, the added interaction of teacher with parent and child brings a new dimension of responsibility to the role of parenting.

Teachers also play an important role in the responsibility of educating children. Collaborating with parents to provide a well-rounded educational experience for the child can enhance that role. However, if parents do not have confidence in the ability of the teacher, the school, or does not believe the teacher will be likely to communicate to them, parents are less likely to be involved with the educational process (Ames et al., 1995). Furthermore, parents are more likely to be involved if teachers make a continuous effort to communicate and provide outreach (Patrikakou & Weissberg, 1998). The importance of parental involvement in a child educational career is essential. By providing parental perceptions as input along with teacher perceptions of student abilities, both teacher and parent have an invested awareness in the student.

Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Boys’ and Girls’ Intelligences

Gender stereotyping has played a major role in parent’s perceptions of their children’s abilities and their multiple intelligences (Furnham et al., 2002b). Research findings mimic beliefs that boys and girls have higher level of intelligences in distinct areas. Parents and teachers tend to rate boys as having higher ratings of mathematical and spatial intelligences than girls (Furnham & Gasson, 1998). Girls, however, are rated as having higher ratings of interpersonal intelligences (Furnham et al., 2002a).

In only one study (Furnham et al., 2002a) does Furnham access parent and teacher perceptions of children’s general intelligence (IQ) as well as their multiple intelligences. In this case, however, no standardized measure of multiple intelligences is used. Rather, the researchers simply define each multiple intelligences and ask the respondent to complete a matrix. No details of the matrix or psychometric properties were reported. The contribution of the proposed study lies in the use of a published inventory with established psychometric properties.
Perceptions and Race

Classrooms are a small reflection of a larger and more diverse society. Within that society lays stereotypes about race and cognitive abilities that continue to effect how teachers interact with students in the classroom (Tettegah, 1996). The perception teachers have about themselves and students are greatly influenced by the race/ethnicity they belong to as well as the race and ethnicity of the student (Atkinson & Thompsom, 1992). In an effort to discover what factors influence teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences, race as a function of perception has been added for discovery. Race has not been added to somehow provide ethnic multiple intelligence labeling. Instead, it has been added as a variable to identify its relationship with perceptions of children intelligences and abilities, which continue to be a problem in schools and society.
CHAPTER III

Methods

The purpose of this study was to compare parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences using the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC and to provide the data to teachers and parents to be used as a tool to foster a compatible learning environment for each participating child. The following procedures were used in this study: (a) selection of sample, (b) use of the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC, (c) collection of data, and (d) analysis of data.

Sample

A convenience sample of 3 classrooms (one first grade classroom (classroom A) and 2 combined kindergarten-first grade classrooms (classrooms B and C)), 3 teachers, 40 students and their parents/caregivers were included in this study. Classroom A consisted of 13 females, 7 males. By ethnic origin, 12 students were Caucasian, 4 African American, 2 East Indian, and 2 Hispanic. Classroom B and C consisted of 15 females, 5 males. By ethnic origin, 14 students were Caucasian, 2 African American, 2 Asian, and 2 East Indian. Each parent shared the same ethnic origin of their child. Children ranged in age from 6 to 7 years old. Teachers in classroom A, B, and C were Caucasian females. Seventy-five research packets were given to teachers for completion and disseminated to parents, 25 to Classroom A, 30 to Classroom B and C. Thirty-two mothers and 8 fathers completed the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC. Completion rate of inventories were 73%.

Statement of Procedures

Approval was obtained from the Florida State University Human Subjects Committee (Appendix A). Each teacher received a research packet which consisted of a formal letter explaining the study and procedures (Appendix D), a teacher consent form (Appendix E), parent letters (Appendix F) and consent forms (Appendix G), and MIDAS-KIDS, MYC inventories (Appendix H). Each child’s level of multiple intelligences was assessed. Next, each child’s assessments were summarized and discussed with each corresponding teacher for teacher and parent use in ongoing child assessment and curriculum planning in their schools.
Measure

MIDAS-KIDS, MYC is a Likert-scaled, other-completed inventory that consists of eight activities (intelligences), skills, and interests as it relates to each child (Shearer, 1999). The MIDAS-KIDS, MYC inquires about developed skill and levels of participation and enthusiasm for a wide variety of activities in daily life (Shearer, 1999). Each inventory is written in a fourth/fifth grade level, takes approximately 25 minutes to complete, and has 70 questions. Scores were compiled into brief summaries called profiles. These profiles are used by teachers as reference tools in parent-teacher conferences and individualized curriculum planning.

The MIDAS-KIDS, MYC has undergone development since 1994 and was recently validated on a sample of 2,241 children. Reliability of the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC was tested and calculated using a ranged from a low of .83 for kinesthetic and linguistic to a high of .91 for intrapersonal (Shearer, 1999). Construct validity was examined by conducting an exploratory factor analysis using a random sample of 908 of the total participants. A seven-factor simple structure solution was found. A confirmatory factor analysis was then conducted on the second half of the sample of 909 participants. The same factor pattern was found with strong congruency coefficients ranging from .97 to .98.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations are presented for teacher and parent perceived ratings of each intelligence. An independent sample t-test was performed to compare means of the teacher and parent perceived ratings of each multiple intelligence. To examine the intervention effect of child gender and race/ethnicity on parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used with gender as the first covariate and race as the second covariate.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Differences between teacher and parent perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences were examined. Forty parent/caregivers and 3 teachers completed the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC to assess eight multiple intelligences in each child. Data was analyzed by using version 11.0 of the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS, 2001). An alpha level of .05 or better was used for this study.

This chapter is divided into three parts (a) analyses of teacher and parent perceptions of children’s intelligences (b) analyses of teacher and parent perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences as a function of gender (c) analyses of teacher and parent perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences as a function of race/ethnicity.

Analyses of parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences

Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for parent and teacher perceptions on each of the eight multiple intelligences. Table 2 presents the independent sample test of each intelligence perceived by teachers and parents. Analyses of the Lavene’s Test for Equality of Variances yielded a significant differences for mathematical intelligence, $F(3,36)= 4.671$, $p=.037$, and natural intelligence, $F(3,36)= 5.998$, $p=.019$, with parents rating children’s performance in these two domains higher than teachers.

Analyses of parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligence as a function of gender

Means and standard deviations of each multiple intelligence accessed by teachers and parents by gender are presented in Table 3. To access the function of gender in parent and teachers perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on each intelligence. Analysis of the Levene's Test of Equality of Variances yielded a significant gender effect for spatial intelligence $F(3,36) =5.077$, $p=.030$, interpersonal intelligence $F(3,36) =9.626$, $p=.004$, and intrapersonal intelligence $F(3,36) =12.743$, $p=.001$ indicating that parent and teacher perceived level of spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences were significantly higher for female than male children.
Analyses of parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligence as a function of race/ethnicity

Means and standard deviations of each multiple intelligence assessed by teachers and parents by race/ethnicity are presented in Table 4. To assess the function of race in parent and teachers perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on each intelligence. Analysis of the Levene’s Test of Equality of Variances yielded a significant effect of race for teacher and parent perceptions of mathematical intelligence, $F(3,36) = 6.865, p = .013$, and linguistic intelligence, $F(3,36) = 6.537, p = .015$, indicating that the teacher and parent perceived level of mathematical and linguistic intelligences were significantly higher for children of color than for Caucasian children.

Summary

Significant differences were found between parents and teachers in their perceptions of children’s mathematical and natural intelligences. Female children were perceived by teacher and parents to have greater spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences. Children of color were perceived by parents and teachers to have greater mathematical and linguistic intelligences than Caucasian children.
Table 1

*Means and standard deviations of parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES</th>
<th>RATER</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>62.35</td>
<td>17.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>60.83</td>
<td>25.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINESTHETIC</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>61.26</td>
<td>21.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>64.31</td>
<td>27.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MATH/LOGICAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>60.12</td>
<td>14.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>21.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>15.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>22.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>62.46</td>
<td>15.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>57.48</td>
<td>17.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>60.90</td>
<td>15.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>64.18</td>
<td>20.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPERSONAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>57.77</td>
<td>17.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>62.62</td>
<td>19.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NATURAL</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>16.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>28.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes significant effect
Table 2

*Independent sample t test of parent and teachers perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINESTHETIC</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MATH/LOGICAL</td>
<td>4.671</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPERSONAL</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NATURAL</td>
<td>5.998</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes significant effect
Table 3

*Total means and standard deviations of parent and teacher perceptions of boys’ and girls’ multiple intelligences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62.34</td>
<td>17.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.84</td>
<td>29.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINESTHETIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Female</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>22.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>28.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH/LOGICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.81</td>
<td>17.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>19.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70.04</td>
<td>15.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.57</td>
<td>23.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.98</td>
<td>16.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>15.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Female</td>
<td>67.76</td>
<td>15.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>17.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Female</td>
<td>66.33</td>
<td>16.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>17.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.08</td>
<td>22.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>27.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes significant effect
Table 4

*Total means and standard deviations of parent and teacher perceptions of Caucasian children’s and children of color’s multiple intelligences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES</th>
<th>MEAN (Caucasian)</th>
<th>MEAN (Children of Color)</th>
<th>STD. DEVIATION (Caucasian)</th>
<th>STD. DEVIATION (Children of Color)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>60.47</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>19.291</td>
<td>25.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINESTHETIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>57.16</td>
<td>71.22</td>
<td>22.850</td>
<td>24.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH/LOGICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>52.84</td>
<td>*67.47</td>
<td>18.208</td>
<td>14.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>65.18</td>
<td>66.47</td>
<td>19.468</td>
<td>19.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUISTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>*67.66</td>
<td>15.982</td>
<td>14.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>17.089</td>
<td>18.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>57.35</td>
<td>64.46</td>
<td>18.917</td>
<td>18.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>49.22</td>
<td>56.03</td>
<td>25.622</td>
<td>20.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of Color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * denotes significant effect
CHAPTER V  
Discussion

This chapter integrates the findings presented in Chapter IV with the theory of multiple intelligences and current research to determine implications for future research and practice in the field of child development and education. Understanding factors that contribute to parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences will increase opportunities for successful understanding of young children’s levels of multiple intelligences.

The current study assessed parent and teacher perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences. Results from statistical analyses showed parents’ perceptions of children’s mathematical and natural intelligences were higher than the perceptions of teachers. Interestingly, parents tended to evaluate musical intelligence higher than teachers. This finding confirms the observation of Connors and Epstein (1995) that parents often have different views about their child’s abilities than the views of their children’s teachers, likely derived from their experiences with their children in different environments. It is noteworthy, however, that parent and teacher perceptions of children’s kinesthetic, linguistic, spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences were relatively the same in this research study. These findings suggest a need for teachers and parents to communicate regarding children’s experiences and learning at home and at school. By communicating with each other, both teacher and parent can better assess the child’s strengths and weakness and offer activities that build on strengths in each intelligence.

Results also indicated girls’ interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences were perceived as higher than that of boys by both parents and teachers, consonant with findings of Furnham et al., 2002a, 2002b, yet results also showed that girls’ spatial intelligence were perceived as higher than boys by both parents and teachers. This is in contrast to the research of Furnham et al. (2002a; 2002b). As with Furnham, stereotyping appears to continue to play a role in how teachers and parents view and socialize children collectively. If perceptions guide behavior, it can be reasoned that if boys are not guided into areas that are stereotypically viewed as girl activities and are shielded from those interactions that build skills in these areas, they are left at a disadvantage. This is also
true for girls. The theory of multiple intelligences affirms that every child can learn and has the ability of all eight intelligences (Gardner, 1991). Recognizing stereotypical interactions and misguided behaviors, may allow adults to encourage the use of all intelligences.

Lastly, results indicated race contributed significantly to teacher and parent perceptions of children of color’ greater mathematical and linguistic intelligences. This finding was somewhat surprising given the tradition of underestimation of children of color’ academic performance in general (Thernstrom, 2003, Perry et al., 2003, Florida Information Notes, 2002). Given that children attend public charter school by parent choice, this finding may reflect differences in families in this sample that are not representative of the public school population as a whole. Although, perceptions of children’s abilities are based on a number of factors, including race/ethnicity, further research should be done to understand what contributes to teacher and parent perceptions.

The prevailing views and ideas of society necessarily permeate into the classroom. In general, among these views are perceptions of children’s intelligences which may color views of individual children’s intellectual capacities. Recognition that parents and teachers may have similar and dissimilar perceptions based on their unique interactions with the child in different environments should propel both parents and teachers to work together to create learning environments that nurture each child’s multiple intelligences.

Limitations

Limitations in this study included small sample size chosen for convenience. A larger sample size, randomly chosen would allow generalization of findings to the population of first grade children. It is also impossible to know whether program features such as the presence of a teacher’s aide permitted teachers in this study to know children intelligences better. Accordingly, findings regarding gender and race as functions of teacher and parent perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences can only be generalized to the children in the current study. It was not possible to determine the contribution of teacher and parent gender to perception in this current investigation.

Response rate also was a limitation. Several children could not be included in this study because parents did not complete the survey. Measurement represents a final
limitation. No comparative measure of MIDAS-KIDS, MYC is presently available to determine construct validity.

**Direction and Future Implications**

With the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), administrators, teachers, and parents are focusing on ways to elevate achievement scores in the classroom. The theory of multiple intelligences gives teachers and parents applicable ways to develop eight intelligences whereas traditional public school classrooms encourage mathematical and linguistic intelligences. Use of the MIDAS-KIDS, MYC as an assessment tool may be one means of assuring that all children’s intellectual gifts are developed.

This study also points to the need for the continuing research in teacher and parent perceptions of child performance. For example, a study of parent and teacher perception of children’s multiple intelligences that take into account parent and teacher beliefs of how children should learn. The differences and similarities between parents’ and teachers’ views in this research study, as compared to other studies, specifically implicate additional study. Nonetheless locally, these findings can be useful to participating teachers and parents as they endeavor to help their children succeed academically. Because race and gender were found to be functions of teacher and parents perceptions of children’s multiple intelligences, more research should continue to investigate demographic indicators of children, parents, and teachers to determine how those variables effect perceptions in learning.
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APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATOR LETTER
November 1, 2004

Dear School Administrator:

I am writing to request the participation of a first grade classroom to participate in “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”. As you know from our earlier conversations, I am interested in the perceptions parents have of children’s multiple intelligences at home versus perceptions teachers have of student intelligences at school and how those perceptions can be used in planning learning activities and the classroom environment.

If you approve of a first grade class teacher and parent to participate in “A Teacher’s and Parent’s Perception of their Young Children’s Multiple Intelligences”, each teacher and parent will need to consent to participate.

I will ask you to give the attached letter of request to a first grade classroom teacher for approval. Upon receipt of his/her okay, I have included a packet of letters of request with consent forms for distribution to parents. When the parental consent forms have been returned, the classroom teacher as well as the parents can begin to fill out an inventory for each student. Each inventory takes about 25 minutes to complete and there should be two inventories per child, one from the teacher and one from the parent.

Although this seems like a lot of time for a teacher to commit to a study, the overall benefit of the information acquired from this study will not only benefit you and your school, but will give teachers a clear picture of the abilities each child has in their classroom. Not only that, but also this inventory could be used as an assessment tool for all students at school. Can you imagine the great benefit of knowing what attributes students have before they arrive in class?

After each parent and teacher assesses their child using the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child”, correlations between parent and teacher ratings will be calculated and summarized. Summaries may be used in parent-teacher-child conferences and will provide both teacher and parent with a useful picture of their child’s unique intellectual gifts.

At the conclusion of this research project, summaries of the parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to the school administrator and first grade teacher for their records. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or will be destroyed by June 2005.

If you, your classroom teacher, or parents have any questions or concerns, please call me at 916.548.6116. My e-mail address is mahagonyrose@yahoo.com.

Sincerely yours,

Sherelle Hessell
PO Box 238
Madison, FL 32341
mahagonyrose@yahoo.com
(916) 548-6116
APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATOR CONSENT FORM
School Administrator Consent Form

I, _______________________, freely and voluntarily give you, Sherelle Hessell permission to ask first grade teacher, _____________________, and give you, Sherelle Hessell, permission to ask the parents of a first grade class at the School of Arts and Sciences to participate in the research project, “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”.

· I understand that you will ask a first grade teacher and the parents of that first grade class to fill out the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” as it relates to each first grade student.
· I understand that the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” takes 25 minutes to complete per child.
· I understand that each student’s identity and scores will be shared with the researcher, teacher, school administrator, parent, and Florida State University.
· I understand there are benefits for participating in this research project, which includes a summary of each child’s multiple intelligences that were in the corresponding first grade class. This knowledge can assist in awareness of student’s strengths and weaknesses in the home and in the classroom.
· I understand that the first grade teacher as well as each parent is free not to participate, if they choose.
· I understand that after the conclusion of this research project, summaries of the parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to the school administrator and first grade teacher for their records. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or destroyed by June 2005.
· I understand that there will be no penalty for them not participating.
· I understand that I may call Sherelle Hessell at (916)548-6116 or email her at mahagonyrose@yahoo.com with any questions or concerns.
· I understand that I may call Dr. Christine Readdick, Supervising Professor, at 850.644.5054 or the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at 850.644.8673 with any questions or concerns.

I have read and understand this form.

Administrators’ name (Printed) ________________________________

Administrators’ name (Signature) ________________________________ Date ___________
November 1, 2004

Dear First Grade Teacher,

I am writing to request your participation in “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”. I am a Florida State University graduate student studying the perceptions parents have of children’s multiple intelligences at home versus perceptions teachers have of student intelligences at school and how those perceptions can be used in planning learning activities and the classroom environment.

If you approve to be a participant in “A Teacher’s and Parent’s Perception of their Young Children’s Multiple Intelligences”, you will be asked to fill out one MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” for each students in your classroom. Each inventory takes about 25 minutes to complete. I have also included a packet of letters of request with consent forms for distribution to parents. When the parental consent forms have been returned, parents can begin to fill out an inventory for their child.

Although this seems like a lot of time to commit to a study, the overall benefit of the information acquired from this study will benefit you and your students by giving a clear picture of the abilities each child has in the classroom. Not only that, but also this inventory could be used as an assessment tool for all students at school. Can you imagine the great benefit of knowing what attributes students have before they arrive in class?

After you and the parents of each student have assessed each child using the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child”, correlations between parent and teacher ratings will be calculated and summarized. Summaries may be used in parent-teacher-child conferences and will provide you with a useful picture of each child’s unique intellectual gifts.

At the conclusion of this research project, summaries of parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to you and the school administrator. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or will be destroyed by June 2005.

If you or parents have any questions or concerns, please call me at 916.548.6116. My e-mail address is mahagonyroze@yahoo.com.

Sincerely yours,

Sherelle Hessell
PO Box 238
Madison, FL 32341
mahagonyroze@yahoo.com
(916) 548-6116
APPENDIX E

TEACHER CONSENT FORM
Teacher Consent Form

I, __________________________, freely and voluntarily give consent to participate in the research project, “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”.

- I understand that I will be asked to fill out the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” as it relates to each first grade student in my class.
- I understand that the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” takes 25 minutes to complete per child.
- I understand that each student’s identity and scores will only be shared with the researcher, teacher, school administrator, and parent.
- I understand there are benefits for participating in this research project, which includes a summary of each child in my class multiple intelligences. This knowledge can assist in my awareness of my student’s strengths and weaknesses in the home and in the classroom.
- I understand that I am free not to participate, if I choose.
- I understand that there will be no penalty for not participating.

I understand that after the conclusion of this research project, summaries of the parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to the school administrator and first grade teacher for their records. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or destroyed by June 2005.

- I understand that there will be no penalty for them not participating.
- I understand that I may call Sherelle Hessell at (916)548-6116 or email her at mahagonyrose@yahoo.com with any questions or concerns.
- I understand that I may call Dr. Christine Readdick, Supervising Professor, at 850.644.5054 or the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at 850.644.8673 with any questions or concerns.

I have read and understand this form.

Teacher’s name (Printed)  ______________________________________

Teacher’s name (Signature)  ______________________________ Date  ____________
Dear First Grade Parent,

I am writing to request your participation in “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”. I am a Florida State University graduate student studying the perceptions parents have of children’s multiple intelligences at home versus perceptions teachers have of student intelligences at school and how those perceptions can be used in planning learning activities and the classroom environment.

If you approve to participate in “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”, you will be asked to fill out one MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” for your child. Each inventory takes about 25 minutes to complete.

Although this seems like a lot of time to commit to a study, the overall benefit of the information acquired from this study will not only benefit you and your child, but it will give teachers a clear picture of the abilities each child has in their classroom. Not only that, but also this inventory could be used as an assessment tool for all students at school. Can you imagine the great benefit of a teacher knowing what attributes students have before they arrive in class?

After you and your child’s teacher have assessed each student using the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child”, correlations between parent and teacher ratings will be calculated and summarized. Summaries may be used in parent-teacher-child conferences and will provide both you and the teacher with a useful picture of each child’s unique intellectual gifts.

At the conclusion of this research project, summaries of parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to the school administrator and first grade teacher for their records. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or will be destroyed by June 2005.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at 916.548.6116. My e-mail address is mahagonyrose@yahoo.com.

Sincerely yours,

Sherelle Hessell
PO Box 238
Madison, FL 32341
mahagonyrose@yahoo.com
(916) 548-6116
APPENDIX G

PARENT CONSENT FORM
Parent Consent Form

I, _______________________, freely and voluntarily give consent to participate in the research project entitled, “Teacher and Parent Perceptions of Child Multiple Intelligences”.

- I understand that my child’s first grade teacher will fill out the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” as it relates to my child.
- I understand that I will be asked to fill out the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” Inventory as it relates to my child.
- I understand that the MIDAS-KIDS, “My Young Child” takes 25 minutes to complete per child
- I understand that my child’s identity and scores will only be shared with the researcher, teacher, school administrator, and parent
- I understand there are benefits for participating in this research project, which includes a summary of my child’s multiple intelligences. This knowledge can assist in my awareness of my child strengths and weaknesses in the home and in the classroom.
- I understand that I am free not to participate, if I choose
- I understand that there will be no penalty for not participating
- I understand that after the conclusion of this research project, summaries of the parent and teacher ratings will be handed over to the school administrator and first grade teacher for their records. All other materials related to this research project will be submitted to Florida State University for the fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Sciences and/or destroyed by June 2005.
- I understand that there will be no penalty for them not participating
- I understand that I may call Sherelle Hessell at (916)548-6116 or email her at mahagonyrose@yahoo.com with any questions or concerns
- I understand that I may call Dr. Christine Readdick, Supervising Professor, at 850.644.5054 or the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at 850.644.8673 with any questions or concerns

I have read and understand this form.

Parent’s name (Printed) ____________________________________________

Parent’s name (Signature) ___________________________ Date __________
MIDAS-KIDS

"My Young Child"

C. Branton Shearer, Ph.D.

©
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INSTRUCTIONS

Please read!

These questions take about 25 minutes to answer. There are 8 areas of activities, skills and interests covered. You may be surprised by what you know about your child when you think carefully. You can complete this with your child or another parent. For questions that give you several choices, pick the one activity your child is strongest in and rate that activity only.

You do not have to answer or guess at every question because each one has an "I don't know" or "Does not apply" choice. Use this answer whenever it is necessary. For example, some of the questions may ask about activities that are for an older child or were never available.

FOR EXAMPLE:
1. How well can your child sing? If "D" is your choice then darken this 'circle':
   A= Not very well
   B= Fair
   C= Fairly well
   D= Very Well
   E= Outstanding
   F= I don't know

-> Darken one 'circle' only for each question with a pencil.
The circles marked G, H, I and J are not used.
-> Please do not write on the answer sheet or questionnaire.
-> Erase all changes completely.

The profile will only be as accurate as your answers.
It is important that you give honest responses.
Be fair to your child.
Do not over or under rate what your child can do.
It's O.K. to respond that you do not know.
MUSICAL

1. How well can your child sing?
   A= Not very well
   B= Fair
   C= Fairly well
   D= Very well
   E= Outstanding
   F= I don't know

2. Do you (or maybe a musician or teacher) think that your child has musical talent?
   A= A little
   B= A fair amount
   C= About average
   D= More than average
   E= A great deal
   F= I don't know

3. Does your child ever drum, hum or sing to him/herself?
   A= Never or once in a while
   B= Sometimes
   C= Often
   D= Almost all the time
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know

4. Does your child make up songs just for fun like while playing?
   A= Never or rarely
   B= Maybe once or twice
   C= Sometimes
   D= Often
   E= All the time or almost
   F= I don't know

5. How well can your child keep the beat to music while clapping or tapping feet?
   A= Not very well or just fair
   B= Well
   C= Very well
   D= Excellent
   E= Outstanding
   F= I don't know

6. Does your child enjoy music, taking lessons or performing?
   A= Somewhat or a little
   B= About average
   C= Quite a bit
   D= Very much so
   E= A great deal
   F= I don't know. Never had the chance

7. Does your child like to clap hands or move to the sound of music?
   A= Sometimes
   B= Often
   C= Very often
   D= Almost all the time
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know

8. Is your child good at singing along with music or people like on tapes, radio or TV, etc.?
   A= Not at all
   B= Fair
   C= Fairly good
   D= Very good
   E= Outstanding
   F= I don't know

9. Does your child enjoy playing with musical instruments?
   A= Sometimes
   B= Often
   C= Very often
   D= Almost all the time
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know. No opportunity

KINESTHETIC

10. How well can your child hop, skip or gallop?
    A= Fairly well
    B= Well
    C= Very well
    D= Excellent
    E= Outstanding
    F= I don't know or does not apply
11. How good is your child at tumbling or jumping rope?
A = Fair
B = Good
C = Very good
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

12. Does your child often want to do things like dance lessons, swimming, skating, etc.?
A = Every once in a while
B = Sometimes
C = Often
D = Very often
E = All the time
F = I don't know or never had the chance to try

13. Can your child manipulate small objects such as blocks, stringing beads or shoe laces?
A = Fair
B = Well
C = Very well
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

14. How well can your child cut with scissors or fasten things like buttons or snaps?
A = Fairly well
B = Well
C = Very well
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

15. How well can your child dance or move to the beat?
A = Fair
B = Well
C = Very well
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

16. How well can your child balance while standing on one foot or walking on a curb?
A = Fair
B = Well
C = Very well
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

17. How good is your child at any sport or other physical activity such as climbing stairs or on playground equipment, etc.?
A = Fair
B = Good
C = Very good
D = Excellent
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know

LOGIC / MATH

18. Did your child easily learn numbers and counting?
A = It was hard
B = It was fairly easy
C = It was easy
D = It was very easy
E = Learned much quicker than other children
F = I don't know or does not apply yet

19. Can your child easily do "take away" or subtraction?
A = No or once in a while
B = Sometimes
C = Often
D = Very often
E = All the time
F = I don't know or does not apply yet

20. Does your child count easily and work carefully with basic math (for his/her age)?
A = Not very well
B = Fairly well
C = About average
D = Excellent or above average
E = Outstanding
F = I don't know or does not apply yet
21. How is your child at science activities like solving problems, measuring or experiments?
A= Not very good
B= Fairly good
C= About average
D= Very good or excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don't know

22. How is your child at logical thinking and sorting objects according to sameness and differences?
A= Fair
B= Good
C= Very good
D= Excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don't know or does not apply yet

23. Does your child try to figure out why and how things work?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know

24. Has your child ever collected something and tried to learn everything about it such as dinosaurs, horses, baseball, dolls, etc.?
A= Maybe once or twice
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know or does not apply yet

25. If you showed your child a model pie, how easily would s/he be able to identify fractions such as 1/2, 1/3, etc.
A= Couldn't do it
B= Just fair
C= Well
D= Very well
E= Excellent
F= I don't know or does not apply yet

26. Does your child ever draw on or decorate school papers, notebooks or presents?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know. Does not apply yet

27. Does your child work independently on craft activities such as cutting & pasting or paper airplanes?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know

28. How well does your child take things apart and then put them back together? For example, models, household objects, Legos or puzzles.
A= Fair
B= Good
C= Very good
D= Excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don't know

29. Does your child ever create designs for cards, crafts, clothes or inventions?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know or does not apply

30. Does your child enjoy art class and carefully draw, color or paint pictures?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know
31. Does your child enjoy using his/her imagination or daydreaming?
A= A little
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don’t know

32. How is your child at playing games such as T-ball, tossing beanbags or playing catch?
A= Fairly good
B= Good
C= Very good
D= Excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don’t know

LINGUISTIC

33. How hard was it for your child to learn the alphabet or learn how to read words?
A= It was hard
B= It was fairly easy
C= It was easy
D= It was very easy
E= Learned much quicker than all the kids
F= I don’t know. Does not apply yet.

34. Does your child learn rhymes, poems or songs by heart?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don’t know

35. Can your child identify letters and their sounds or sound out words?
A= Fairly well
B= Well
C= Very well
D= Excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don’t know or does not apply yet

36. Does your child create stories, say rhymes or make up words to songs?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don’t know

37. Can your child talk people into doing things his/her way when s/he wants to?
A= Not very well
B= Fairly well
C= Well
D= Very well
E= Outstanding
F= I don’t know

38. How easily does your child understand verbal instructions given by adults?
A= Fair or not very well
B= Well
C= Very well
D= Excellent
E= Outstanding
F= I don’t know

39. Does your child have a large vocabulary and quickly learn new words?
A= Not really
B= Somewhat
C= About average
D= Better than average
E= Outstanding
F= I don’t know

40. Does your child ever try to use big words that older kids or adults use?
A= Never or rarely
B= Every once in a while
C= Sometimes
D= Many times
E= Almost all the time
F= I don’t know
41. Can your child dictate or create an interesting note or letter to someone?

A= Not very well
B= Fairly well
C= Well
D= Very well
E= Excellent
F= I don't know. Does not apply yet.

42. Has your child ever created a little book or poem just for fun?

A= Never
B= Maybe once
C= Several times
D= Many times
E= Almost all the time
F= I don't know

INTERPERSONAL

43. Does your child ever offer to help people around the house or in school?

A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Very often
E= All the time
F= I don't know

44. Is your child ever the leader when doing things at school or among friends?

A= Never or rarely
B= Every once in a while
C= Sometimes
D= Many times
E= Almost all the time
F= I don't know

45. Does your child try hard to understand the feelings of other children or adults?

A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don't know

46. Is it hard for your child to solve a problem with a friend or sibling without an argument?

A= It's always hard
B= Many times it's hard
C= Sometimes it's hard
D= It's hard every once in a while
E= It's easy almost all the time
F= I don't know

47. Does your child easily take turns and be part of a team?

A= Rarely
B= Every once in a while
C= Sometimes
D= Often
E= All the time
F= I don't know

48. Has your child ever helped a friend learn something new or solve a problem?

A= Maybe once or twice
B= Several times
C= Many times
D= A great many times
E= Almost all the time
F= I don't know or does not apply yet

49. How hard is it for your child to understand what a parent or teacher expects of him/her?

A= Many times it's hard
B= Sometimes it's hard
C= Most of the time it's easy
D= It's almost always easy
E= It's always easy
F= I don't know

50. Does your child ever know the right thing to do or say that gets a quick response from someone?

A= Once in a while
B= Occasionally
C= Many times
D= Often
E= Almost all the time
F= I don't know
51. Is it easy for your child to sense when someone is in a "bad mood"?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don't know

INTRAPERSONAL

52. Can your child keep his/her feelings and temper under control?
A= It can be very hard
B= Many times it's hard
C= Sometimes it's hard
D= Many times it's easy
E= It's very easy
F= I don't know

53. Is it easy for your child to switch from one activity and start on another when s/he has to?
A= Most of the time it's hard
B= Sometimes it's hard
C= Many times it's easy
D= It's often easy
E= It's always easy
F= I don't know

54. Does your child ever correct his/her mistakes before they are pointed out?
A= No or rarely
B= Once in a while
C= Sometimes
D= Often
E= All the time or almost
F= I don't know

55. How well can your child concentrate for his/her age?
A= Not very well
B= Fairly well
C= Well
D= Very well
E= Excellent
F= I don't know

56. Does your child work well on his/her own?
A= Not very well
B= Fairly well
C= Well
D= Very well
E= Excellent
F= I don't know

57. Does your child work on a project until it is completed?
A= Once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Most of the time
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don't know

58. Can your child easily make up his/her own mind about something?
A= Sometimes
B= Often
C= Usually
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don't know

59. How is your child at making decisions or plans for him/herself?
A= Not good at all
B= Fairly good
C= Good
D= Very good
E= Excellent
F= I don't know

60. Can your child get prepared, organized and complete a task independently (for his/her age)?
A= Every once in a while
B= Sometimes
C= Often
D= Almost all the time
E= All the time
F= I don't know
NATURALIST

61. Has your child ever taken care of a pet or other animal?
   A= Never or rarely
   B= Maybe once or twice
   C= Sometimes
   D= Often
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know. No opportunity

62. Does your child make sure that a pet has plenty of food and water?
   A= Every once in a while or rarely
   B= Sometimes
   C= Often
   D= Almost all the time
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know. No opportunity

63. How is your child at handling a pet or giving simple commands such as sit, stay or come?
   A= Fairly good
   B= Good
   C= Very good
   D= Better than average
   E= Excellent
   F= I don't know. No opportunity

64. Is your child curious about nature and look for animals in the neighborhood, collect plants, bugs or other things?
   A= Sometimes
   B= Fairly often
   C= Often
   D= Almost all the time
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know

65. Does your child care about the earth and try to think of ways to stop pollution or help the animals?
   A= Not that I know of
   B= Maybe a little
   C= Sometimes
   D= Yes, quite often
   E= Almost all the time
   F= I don't know

66. Has your child ever taken care of plants or helped to grow things?
   A= Not that I know of
   B= Maybe once or twice
   C= Sometimes
   D= Often
   E= All the time or almost
   F= I don't know. No opportunity

67. Does your child easily recognize different kinds of plants?
   A= Not at all
   B= Maybe every once in a while
   C= Sometimes
   D= Often
   E= Very often
   F= I don't know

68. Is your child curious about how the human body works or things like electricity & magnets?
   A= Maybe a little
   B= Somewhat
   C= About average
   D= More than average
   E= A great deal
   F= I don't know

69. Is your child interested in any of these activities: cooking, shopping, fishing or camping?
   A= Every once in a while
   B= Sometimes
   C= Often
   D= Very often
   E= All the time
   F= I don't know

70. Is spending time with nature important to your child?
   A= Not really
   B= A little
   C= Somewhat
   D= Quite a bit
   E= Very much so
   F= I don't know

You're done!
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