

School Developments through the "Revolving Door Model" in Germany. A qualitative Empirical Study analyzing Selection Criteria and School Support Programs for Gifted Young Students in Germany

Dr. Silvia Greiten¹

Abstract

In Germany the *Revolving-Door-Model* is considered to be an established and well-known conception for promoting young gifted students. This model as well as the *Enrichment Model* goes back to Joseph Renzulli. Schools in the Netherlands and Germany began to develop their own conceptions in the 1980ies. This paper focuses two questions: How has the model developed in Germany? Which criteria for participation in the model are applied in the German school system? Data collection for analyzing the *Revolving-Door-Model* was effected by applying questionnaires in 42 schools. The evaluation was carried out by analyzing the content. 17 different models revealing a wide variety of structures in school systems could be identified. However, contrary to Renzulli's concept, the selection of students in Germany is predominantly focused on grades of performance. The priority assigned to diagnostic being affected in many differentiating ways in the original model can hardly be found in German models. This article presents the different promotion programs within the context of the *Revolving-Door-Model*, the different forms of diagnostic as well as the selection criteria established when collecting the data about the students in school.

Key Words: Giftedness, Revolving Door Model, school development, questionnaire study

1. Introduction

In Germany and above all in the federal state of North Rhine Westphalia (NRW) the *Revolving Door Model* is a well-known means of promoting gifted students (Greiten, 2016a; Bildungs portal NRW/Themen/Begabtenförderung/ Das Drehtürmodell (w.y.)). So far there hasn't been any research work on this subject. Thus reason was given to initiate a study intending the description of school practice and school development processes. This article is based on the results of a questionnaire study carried out in 42 schools of North Rhine Westphalia. The initial definition of the theoretical context of the *Revolving Door Model* is followed by a representation of the findings on different types of the *Revolving Door Model*, the meaning of diagnostic and the selection criteria within the different concepts. Finally the development in North Rhine Westphalia will be compared with Renzulli's conception of the *Revolving Door Model*.

1.1 The Revolving Door Model according to Renzulli

The *Revolving Door Model* is the result of Joseph Renzulli's conception in the 1970ies. At that time Renzulli was in charge of the *Teaching the Talent Program* at Connecticut University. His intention was to promote students within the school system by individualizing their learning processes. By implementing enrichment measures such as having access to additional contents and applying their own learning styles students should go through learning and working process that would enhance their motivation and also deepen their knowledge. Enrichment initially meant enhancement by offering contents that cannot be found in regular classroom instruction.

¹ Bergische Universität Wuppertal, Gaußstraße 20, 42285 Wuppertal, Germany.

By applying enrichment offers Renzulli above all focused on individual learning speeds, learning styles and the access to research-based learning, priorities that can hardly be implemented in regular classroom instruction. Thus he developed the Three-Phase *Enrichment Triad Model* (Renzulli, 1976, 1977a, 1977b) which later on was complemented by the metaphor of the *Revolving Door* (Renzulli, Reis & Smith, 1981) which was the description of the basic organization form. Within the regular school system students take part in a promotion program offered in parallel to the regular classroom instruction. That way they are able to leave the lesson and to work individually on self-selected subjects. As a logistic support the program includes a multifaceted diagnostic, a resource room, a specially trained staff, and the creation of a talent pool and the structure of a multi-phase program. This way the enrichment idea, a school organized model and a multi-perspective diagnostic were combined within the sophisticated concept of the *Revolving Door Model*. The model was later on amplified into the *Schoolwide Enrichment Model* (Renzulli & Reis, 1985; Renzulli, 1994).

The *Revolving Door Model* is designed to promote discovery and development of talents and the prophylaxis of underachievement by individualized learning (Renzulli, 1976; Renzulli et al., 1981). Renzulli was inspired by the concepts of *Bloom's Taxonomies* and *Guilford's Structure of Intellect Model* (Renzulli, 1976). These concepts describe cognitive processes including their different steps and factors and they are designed to differentiate learning processes and to determine higher values of specific processes. Renzulli's reflections on promotional measures are based on the idea of complicated differences existing within the cognitive processes going on in the challenging learning situations of the Enrichment (Renzulli, 1976). Basing his argumentation on an analogy to the work of scientists, he postulated that young students were able to go through similar processes acting as questioners, researchers and discoverers on an adequate level according to the practice of the relevant professions. He defined the field of activities widely: the work procedures of scientists in a narrower sense as well of composers and authors e.g. should serve as models. He focused on their creative processes that they applied for reaching their goals (Renzulli, 1976).

The *Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness* (Renzulli, 1978, 1986) showing the concurrence of *above average ability*, *task commitment* and *creativity* (Renzulli, 1978, 1986; Renzulli et al., 1981, 19) as conditions for the development of high giftedness and high performances constituted another theoretical basis for the development of enrichment measures. The concurrence of the factors described in the clusters produces the development of giftedness and high performance. This access to the development of giftedness becomes evident in the *Revolving Door Model*: The development of the participants, their learning and working processes are regarded and used as diagnostical information for the arrangement of additional measures (Greiten, 2016a). The enhancement of giftedness is the specific goal of this concept (Baum, Renzulli & Hébert, 1995). The outstanding aspect of this access: special giftedness is not reduced to the IQ but is placed into a wider context, thus including a wide variety of talents. As a consequence the diagnostical perspective changes from *status information* to *action information* (Renzulli et al., 1981, p. 31f.).

When Renzulli designed his promotion model, the selection for promotion programs by means of IQ-tests was the dominant procedure in the USA. As a consequence just 5% of every age group were admitted to participate (IQ>125). But Renzulli intended to create talent pools for 15 to 25% of each age group, thus being able to observe and nominate students for additional measures on a higher level (Renzulli et al., 1981): the basic selection criterion is information on learning, motivation, creativity, leadership behavior or a freely selectable subject, provided by all teachers for all students of their class lists. By applying another form sheet they collect information on performances and interests. The data collection is complemented by applying ability tests. If this information is sufficient, the student will automatically get into the talent pool. Alternatively students can nominate themselves or can be nominated by other students, go through specific ability tests or introduce special products resulting from specific working contexts. In these cases a commission will take the decision of admission.

Thus information on psychometric developmental, sociometric aspects and the performance of students can be collected for the initial process (Renzulli et al., 1981): During their work within the enrichment measures information on students' activities is collected by the accompanying teachers. Agreements are contracted and observations of activities are recorded by means of a management plan. Students, parents and teachers document the process course and the *Revolving-Door Model* conception by filling in evaluation forms at the end of each measure.

Without mentioning any further details it becomes apparent that this approach to diagnostic is highly significant within the *Revolving Door Model* concept as its target is not only the nomination of students, but above all, the development of multifunctional gifts and as it controls systematically the succeeding learning and working process stages. This systematization is focused on the identification of specially gifted students (Renzulli et al., 1981).

The *Enrichment Model*, based on the organizational form of the *Revolving Door*, consists of three stages (Renzulli, 1977a, 1977b; Renzulli et al., 1981; Renzulli, Reis & Stednitz, 2001): In Type I the participants are able to work on a subject of their choice individually or in group work lead by their own interests. This phase is very important for the observation process carried out by teachers. They collect hints for possible projects in Type III and talk with the students about their experiences in order to be able to take common decisions for the participation in the following stages. Type II is characterized by research-based learning. The scientific approach serves as a model thus enabling the participants to work professionally on the selected subject: The basic skills of systematic work are acquired by specifically acquiring adequate methods, offering challenges for creative thinking as well as supporting creative processes in order to accelerate the efficacy of working processes. The preceding learning processes are accumulated in Type III. In this program phase students work on real-world problems, applying scientific methods, they create a product which finally can be discussed in target groups that are related to this topic.

The working processes are normally carried out in a resource room where specially trained staffs support the individual working process. A week schedule determines the time structure and presents different offers (Renzulli et al., 1981). The numbers of participants will continually be reduced from Type I to Type III in order to be able to intensively promote highly gifted students with established structures and intensive interests and to motivate them for high performance in research-based learning.

Based on the *Revolving Door Identification Model* Renzulli and Reis (1985) developed the *Schoolwide Enrichment Model* (Renzulli, 2003), which was complemented by the *high-end learning theory* (Renzulli, 1999) and later on by the *Renzulli Learning System* (Renzulli & Reis, 2012).

The conception according to Renzulli cannot easily be transferred into the German School System. The peculiarities of the German School System and the significance of the promotion of giftedness and gifted students are important systematic factors when trying to implement the *Revolving Door Model* in Germany. More details of both aspects will be commented in the following chapter.

1.2 The German School System

In most federal states the school system is separated into levels of education, such as the primary level (*Primarstufe*) (grades 1 to 4, partly to 6), the secondary level I (*Sekundarstufe I*) (grades 5 or 7 to 10) and the secondary level II (*Sekundarstufe II*) (grades 11 to 12 or 13) which offers the final secondary school leaving certificate (*Abitur*). In parallel to secondary level II the vocation school (*Berufskolleg*) also offers all school learning certificates. The school system of secondary school I offer three possibilities: According to their performance on the primary level students traditionally are able to attend a secondary modern school (*Hauptschule*), a junior high school (*Realschule*), both offering a certificate after grade 10, and a grammar school (*Gymnasium*) (leaving certificate after grade 12 or 13, depending on the federal state involved). Classroom instruction in secondary level I is predominantly effected in age group classes. Course selections are possible in age group 8 or 9, in the case of a second foreign language in grade 6 or 7. But there are also other school types in the respective federal states claiming the status of a standard community school (*Gemeinschaftsschule*) and offering a late selection with qualifications for *Abitur*, Vocational Diploma (*Fachabitur*) or a Medium Level Diploma (*mittlerer Bildungsabschluss*). Due to the mentioned different school structures in the federal states the secondary school system in Germany is characterized by diversities (Kiel & Weiß, 2016).

The development of inclusive schools is diverging in the different federal states. It is just in some individual primary level schools that learning groups with different shares of handicapped children have been established during the past 10, 20 or 30 years. In addition to the regular school system schools for handicapped children (*Sonderschulen*) also called *special schools* (*Förderschulen*) offer seven different focal points of support in the respective federal states. Precondition for being admitted is a special school diagnostic revealing a specific promotion requirement (information on the German school system: Deutscher Bildungsserver. Aufbau und Struktur des Schulsystems (w.y.)), Eurydice.

Countries/Germany Overview (w.y.)). Due to the *UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, schools have initiated a reform process aiming a introducing inclusion into all schools.

1.3 Significance of the Promotion of Giftedness and Gifted Students in Germany

The status of giftedness and gifted students promotion in German schools was determined in two expertises of the *Federal-States-Commission* in 2001 (Bund-Länder-Kommission, BLK) and 2004 (Holling, Preckel, Vock & Schulze Willbrenning, 2004). Early school enrolment and skipping of grades is possible in all federal states with individual different regulations. The final secondary school leaving certificate (*Abitur*) can regularly be achieved in most federal states after 12 years or after 13 years in profile grades in the case of a regular 13 years school time. The acceleration frequency was reduced in all federal states due to the reorganization of grammar schools into a 12 years period. Enrichment measures are presumably focused on extracurricular activities such as students-colleges or cooperations with universities or even artistic institutions. The BLK expertise of 2004 offers just a few indications of explicit enrichment programs in individual schools such as workshops or promotion courses. The *Revolving Door Model* as a German version of the Renzulli concept has not been registered. It can be assumed, however, that it is implemented in some schools without explicitly being mentioned. Just a few individual federal states have a special school for gifted students, whereas almost every federal state offers profiles for giftedness promotion and promotion for high ability students.

The sign post for Germany in these days is the “promotion strategy for high performance students” (*Förderstrategie für leistungsstarke Schülerinnen und Schüler*) which was introduced by the School Ministers Conference in 2015 (KMK, 2015): Focused on the paradigm of “individualization of learning processes” (p. 3) this strategy’s goal is the promotion of “high ability and potentially high performing students” (p. 3) thus being able to develop individual potentials and performances as well as to promote intellectual giftedness and additional abilities. Extracurricular and school offers should be strengthened and diagnostical promotion and attendance ought to find their way into all phases of teacher training. The recommendations for promotion refer to enrichment, acceleration, grouping, integrated support and complementary extracurricular measures. The second chapter deals with enrichment measures and describes a wide variety of possibilities in schools and also within classroom instruction in the context of internal differentiation within the classes or by establishing temporary learning groups. “Scopes of action for problem solving, research-based and autonomous and creative learning” (p.6) should be established. A glint of Renzulli’s central idea can be realized in these statements.

As far as the development of the subject area promotion of giftedness in Germany is concerned, it becomes evident, that the subject has gathered explosiveness due to the PISA-Study (*Programme for International Student Assessment*), but only when it is focused on higher performance and potential development against the background of a wide comprehension of performance. Enrichment measures have been developed and employed by some individual schools. There are just a few special schools, special classes or promotion concepts of individual schools but hardly any diagnostic concepts that are anchored within the school system and aim at development progress and that may help to organize a systematic promotion within the individual school history of children and young students. Nevertheless the subject area of giftedness gets more and more included into the current school development and has at least the chance to get introduced into the teacher training under the label of individual promotion.

1.4 The way the Revolving Door Model came to Germany

Whereas the concept of the *Revolving Door Model* cannot be found in official publications within the Federal Republic apart from descriptions of enrichment measures the scene in the federal state of North Rhine Westphalia is quite different. In this state the *Revolving Door Model* ranges among the most well-known measures for gifted students and giftedness promotion (Greiten, 2016a). There are hardly any publications on the *Revolving Door Model* in German languages countries (Mönks, 1985; Klingen, 2001; Peters, 2008; Groensmit, 2008; Müller-Oppliger, 2015). The same applies to studies (Greiten, 2016b). Franz Mönks (retired professor at Radboud University Nijmegen) got to know the Renzulli *Three-Ring-Concept*, the *Enrichment Triad Model* and the *Revolving Door Model* on the NAGC-congress (National Association for Gifted Children) in 1982 and he propagated the *Revolving Door Model* in the Netherlands on a congress in 1984 (Greiten, 2016b).

The *Revolving Door Model* was implemented due to a request by the grammar school of the town of Nijmegen concerning the handling of gifted underachievers. Thus the *Revolving Door Model* was adapted to school system conditions as a promotion measure designed as an ‘enlargement project’ (Groensmit, 2008).

The model's central components were diagnostic in the form of test methods, the creation of a talent pool, the autonomous work on subjects and research-based learning. Due to the experiences of this school and the model has been established in the Netherlands as a way of promoting giftedness (Peters, 2008; Greiten, 2016b).

Two ways leading to Germany in the 1990s can be reconstructed. School authority representatives got information on the enlargement projects of Nijmegen grammar school and they converted it into the promotion of individual situations within the *Revolving Door Model*: The concept was focused on the voluntary work of students and self-selected projects in connection with the work on learning strategies and the experience of motivation and perseverance. The second way was opened by Christian Fischer, currently professor at Münster University. He and his staff developed the concept for the *Challenge-Promotion-Projekt* (translated by the author: *Förder-Förder-Projekt*, FFP(Homepage icbf w.y.), a promotion project, and its follow up models based on the theoretical fundaments of Renzulli. In the last few years a third way has been developed due to classroom experience and network arrangements of schools. The connecting element is the model's organizational core to leave the classroom and to work parallel in differentiated ways. Around this core schools have developed a lot of different models (Greiten, 2016b).

When considering the distribution in the whole Federal Republic it becomes quite clear that these three ways chosen by North Rhine Westphalia have been successful. An internet investigation on the first 400 entries under the key word 'Revolving Door' reveals that there are 156 schools in North Rhine Westphalia, 21 in Lower Saxony, 14 in Schleswig Holstein and 32 in the rest of the federal states describing at least one Revolving Door Model procedure on their homepage. Due to the high frequency of the *Revolving Door Model* in North Rhine Westphalia the study on the Revolving Door Model has been confined to this federal state (Greiten, 2016b).

2. Method

So far no studies on the *Revolving Door Model* in Germany have been initiated. Two questions are the focus of this study: How has the model developed in Germany? Which criteria for participation in the model are applied in the German school system? In order to get information on the individual concepts a questionnaire study was carried out offering options for open answers (Porst, 2011) focusing on descriptions and individual school development processes. The standardized questionnaire contained 32 items within 5 clusters and investigated several school development processes: (1) School data and information on the *Revolving Door Model*, (2) contents and organization, (3) exemplary run-through processes, (4) difficulties and success conditions, (5) recommendations. The items were piloted by two expert interviews and two questioning measures in writing (Greiten, 2016a). The questions were evaluated by means of content analysis (Mayring, 2000; Kuckartz & Grunenberg, 2010; Mayring & Bruner, 2010).

The questionnaire was sent to 150 schools, 70 schools are members of an existing giftedness promotion network in North Rhine Westphalia supported by the school ministry and the Karg-Foundation (Karg, (w.y); Bildungsportal NRW). Additionally 80 schools offering a description of the *Revolving Door Model* on their homepages were identified by an internet investigation. Just 42 schools participated, among them 32 grammar schools, 3 common secondary schools and 7 primary schools. The return quote of 28% can be regarded as satisfactory, whereas the representativeness (Uhlendorff & Prengel, 2011) is confined to the extent of the distribution revealed by the internet investigation (Greiten, 2016a).

Results on the description of individual concepts, diagnostic and selection are presented in this article.

3. Results

3.1. Promotion programs within the Revolving Door Model

A type formation was established for classifying the different promotion programs. Types can be reconstructed by specifying and comparing information on the different cases and on the individual *Revolving Door Models* by means of creating inductive categories (Mayring, 2000; Kuckartz & Grunenberg, 2010; Mayring & Bruner, 2001). The type descriptions assignment of the respective model is affected by contrast measures (Fatke, 2010; Bohnsack, 2010).

Its predominant categories are the composition of the learning groups, the school's cooperation, the ways of selection, the contents to be worked on and the organizational elements. 17 types of *Revolving Door Model*, classified into 6 main types could be reconstructed. At least two of these types are offered by all questioned schools (Greiten, 2016b). The types are presented in scheme 1.

Scheme 1: Types of Revolving Door Model in Germany**Type 1: Participation in regular classroom instruction of another age group**

Type1a: Participation in classroom instruction of a higher grade (Revolving Door up)

Type1b: Participation in classroom instruction of a lower grade (Revolving Door down)

Type 2: Participation in classroom instruction of the same age group but in another learning group

2a: Double language learning

2b: Double differentiation courses

Type 3: Targeted selection of contents oriented Revolving Door Programs

3a: Enlargement or deepening projects

3b: Targeted preparation for a project/ a competition

3c: Targeted selection of Revolving Door courses/Revolving Door projects

Type 4: External cooperation

4a: Selection of a university subject or special workshops

4b: Revolving Door music (music school or university)

4c: Cooperation with another school (e.g. secondary common school with grammar school)

4d: cooperation with a company

4e: cooperation with a regional network (course selection)

4f: cooperation with external 'instructors'

Type 5: Variations of the Challenge-Promotion-Project (*Forder-Förder-Projekt*)

5a: supported by students

5b: supported by within school persons (learning assistants, teachers)

5c: just basic support (free working), but including presentations

Type 6: free selection/ autonomous project work/ individual arrangement without specified presentation

Taking part in the regular classroom instruction of another age group is one of the most frequent forms of the *Revolving Door Model* (Type 1). The decision for a higher age group (1a) is taken by more efficient students while less efficient students choose this possibility for additional work on contents (1b).

In the German school system courses with parallelized offers can be selected in some age groups (Type 2). This applies above all to foreign languages and amplified differentiation courses. Due to the parallelization a selection of two courses can be arranged (2a and b) with just half of the instruction time for each course. Correspondingly the challenges for the students are high as they have to refinish the missing contents. Double language learning is ranking far ahead. Some schools offer specified Revolving Door programs (Type 3). Some of these programs are very close to Renzulli's model. On the other hand, there are amplifications and deepening courses providing structured working possibilities in learning groups based on subjects such as German, Mathematics and English. In other courses students prepare competitions or specific projects (3b).

The contents and a time structure of some several weeks are determined by the teachers involved. The composition of the learning groups frequently reaches across the age groups. In addition to instruction contents and mathematical conditions for competitions and projects some schools offer Revolving Door courses or projects involving extracurricular contents projected by teachers (3c). Another type is characterized by school cooperation's (Type 4) offering a great diversity for the students due to these cooperation's. They can be released for attending degree programs at universities (4a), music schools (4b) and other school forms.

Practical courses within a narrow time frame or working on problems involving research-based learning can be realized by cooperating with a company (4d). Additionally some regions have created resource conserving networks while the schools involved offer courses for other schools (4e). Just a few schools are cooperating with external instructors (4f) offering specific subjects and financed by the schools or by participation fees.

There are also variations of the Challenge-Promotion-Project (*Förder-Förder-Projekt*) (Type 5) propagated by ICBF in Münster by means of advanced training measures thus coming close to Renzulli's intention of self-controlled and interest based learning. Students (5a) of a cooperating university or teachers appointed by the school (5b) may accompany the autonomous project organization. Both possibilities are based on the formation of interests, the communication of learning and working strategies for working on a self-selected topic and aiming at a product that can be presented by the students as a thesis paper or lecture, e.g. If schools are not able to organize these staff resources, it is possible to create the conditions for self-controlled working and to offer working times, rooms and possibly connections to teachers as advisors. Students are widely left alone in these cases (5c) and finally they normally have to present the results of the working process. Several offers are subsumed in a less specific *Revolving Door Model* (Type 6). Presentations, documentations of working processes or communications of learning and working strategies are not intended in this type. Students just arrange the times and the rooms with a teacher and they work individually.

It becomes apparent that the organizational component of leaving the room and working in another form the connecting element between these variations of the *Revolving Door Model* and Renzulli's concept. All of these types can be classified into the enrichment, types 1a and 4a even into classical acceleration. An individual access can be realized in all types, whereas just type 5 and proportionally also type 6 offer the access of individualized learning according to Renzulli's concept: the individual choice of topics involving specific project processes in the sense of scientific and profession oriented working. It is just in types 5a and 5b that the individualized learning processes are systematically accompanied by the communication of learning and working strategies and by developing products. Although some schools offer several runs through the respective *Revolving Door Model* a systematic three stage arrangement in analogy to the *Enrichment Triad Model* cannot be found in any of these types.

3.2 Forms and significance of diagnostic within the *Revolving Door Model*

As far as the significance of diagnostic is concerned the questionnaire study investigates the diagnostic measures applied by schools to identify students that according to the school's perspective are suitable for a participation in the *Revolving Door Model*. Six diagnostic accesses have been reconstructed from the data: (1) school performance, (2) tests, (3) subjective assessments by individual teachers concerning abnormalities and peculiarities, (4) team counselling concerning subjective assessments, (5) systemized observations by means of a checklist, and (6) possibly existing additional findings of external diagnostic institutions. In some schools several accesses are implemented.

Above-average performance explicitly expressed by grades is the most frequent diagnostic access (24 grammar schools, 5 secondary common schools, 5 primary schools). The analyzed sheets do not clearly reveal if the above-average performance must be existent for all or just for some particular subjects. Nine schools are applying the results of the test that are mostly carried out externally, such as ability tests (1 grammar school), performance tests (1 grammar school, 1 secondary common school) and intelligence tests (5 grammar schools, 1 secondary common schools). Four grammar schools use giftedness (IQ>130) as a significant diagnostical status. Seven schools (5 grammar schools, 2 secondary common schools) rely on the subjective assessment of individual teachers. Two schools (2 grammar schools) collect observations on students in an age group team session in order to be able to recommend participation. Two schools (1 grammar school, 1 secondary common school) apply check lists designed for the *Revolving Door Model*, which are filled in by teachers. Four schools also apply existing external data (without any tests) of psychologists or other therapeutic institutions. Five schools (5 grammar schools, 1 secondary common school) have a diffuse status of measures to be classified as diagnostical. These results suggest that the diagnostic used by the majority of schools is based on above-average performance. The *Revolving Door Identification Model* compiles *status* and *action information* originating from psychometric, developmental and sociometric data as well as from performance (Renzulli et al., 1981). A systemized collection of data in the sense of a multi-perspective diagnostic which is the basis of Renzulli's concept is not applied in any of the questioned schools.

Although this result is not surprising for the German school system it must be criticized because of the subjectiveness of processes for providing forms of performance effectuation, performance assessment and evaluation (Lüders, 2001). Besides, due to their origin, performance grades have just a limited potential for the selection of giftedness promotion measures (Vock, Preckel & Holling, 2007) and school performance, intelligence and giftedness are correlating on just a medium level (Hesse & Latzko, 2009).

Contrary to the American school system investigations on the Revolving Door Model suggest that there are hardly any psychological-diagnostic accesses in Germany. Psychological diagnostic is not anchored within the German school system as hardly any school offers a psychological school service. Besides the grammar school system doesn't know any tradition concerning the systematic collection of data on cognition and personality criteria that could be effectively used for the promotion of students (Hasselhorn & Gold, 2009). If teachers, parents or students think that diagnostic is necessary they are involving external diagnostic institutions, but frequently without using their results for written recommendations and advises for the school. That is why findings have just a limited effect for the school history of students. On the other hand pedagogical diagnostic is spread more widely within the school system (Hesse & Latzko, 2009) but without being a standard measure. The implementation of different measures depends on the engagement and the knowledge of teachers. Currently a tendency towards pedagogical diagnostic seems to develop due to ministry decrees concerning individual promotion. Thus tasks, competence oriented checklists and counseling forms are being applied more frequency becoming more apparent but without having hardly any effect on the development of the *Revolving Door Model*.

3.3. Selection for participation in the Revolving Door Model

The selection is above all a process drafted individually by schools. The diagnostic accesses mentioned are differently implemented in the selection processes. Five forms of conceptionally by anchored selection can be distinguished based on the information in the questionnaires: (1) counselling within the school team (12 grammar schools, 1 secondary common schools, 3 primary schools), (2) decision by the class teacher (1 grammar school, 1 secondary common school, 1 primary school), (3) counselling with parents and students (2 grammar schools), (4) self-nomination (2 grammar schools) and (5) selection by means of test results (1 grammar school). Additionally there are individual selection processes without any conceptual structure (the rest of the schools).

All selection procedures are based on criteria but they differ as far as the degree of diagnostic structure and communication is concerned. Selection can be effected by means of the mentioned diagnostic accesses and also without them. The extent of structuring and the way of questioning and assessing certain criteria is determined by the diagnostic accesses. If the persons involved just express their estimations the selection will be less structured and remains subjective. Performance is the predominant criterion which was already stated in the remarks on diagnostic. Besides a certain terminology is needed describing the selection criteria that are quite differently applied in schools: performance, interest (6 grammar schools), high engagement (8 grammar schools), subject interest (3 grammar schools, 2 primary schools), learning and working behavior as well as organizational abilities (5 grammar schools), perseverance (2 grammar schools), teamwork abilities (2 grammar schools) and the extent of knowledge (2 primary schools). These criteria are predominantly designed for performance behaviour and structured working processes. Under challenge is another criterion focused on performance abilities. It is determined by the targets and the performance of a class and that is why it may become evident that the respective students are able to perform much more and as consequence should participate in the *Revolving Door Model*.

The selection procedures are based on communication and are comparable to a negotiation process, with the exception of self-nomination, which is not dealt with in detail in the questionnaires, the selection by means of test results and decisions by teachers. In most cases the counselling settings are institutionalized: class teachers, subject teachers or coordinators for giftedness promotion may propose students for participating in the *Revolving Door Model* and their arguments are based on criteria, assessments or concrete diagnostic accesses.

Thus it can be concluded that although the selection processes are based on criteria they frequently have subjective elements. As a consequence students also must "attract attention" in order to be identified by teachers. On the other hand students that are on a medium or lower performance level and do not practice their abilities and interests attract less attention and thus they are not often recommended to participate. An institutionalized counselling for all students and clearly defined structures of diagnostic might result in more comprehensive nominations according to the original intentions of the *Revolving Door Identification Model*: teachers fill in tables and forms for all students based on criteria. This information is complemented by additional diagnostic information. Thus students are selected by means of a counselling processes and a talent pool is created (Renzulli et al., 1981). The performance criterion which is predominant in Germany can only be one selection aspect. In the Renzulli concept action information has a higher value than performance and intelligence data.

4. Conclusion, discussion and outlook

The *Revolving Door Model* in Germany has run through a development history that was dependent on the systemic conditions of each individual school. The organization form of the *Revolving Door* is the predominant factor of success. Nevertheless it is difficult to compare development processes in Germany and in the USA. The basic model of a secondary common school does exist in the USA, but with different profiles and quality requirements (compare Cochran, Mayer, Carr, Cayer, McKenzie & Pech, 2009). Germany has a multi-level school system. The grammar school is the system suitable for higher performance students. That is why this school form offers most of the *Revolving Door Model* concepts in comparison with other school forms. Whereas these concepts can hardly be found in the lower school forms of secondary modern school and junior high school. This result might initiate discussions aiming at including giftedness promotion into these school forms.

Renzulli's *Enrichment Triad Model* and *Revolving Door Model* have a clearly structured multi-stage concept to identify and develop giftedness. These multi-stage concepts can hardly be found in German adaptations of the different *Revolving Door Model* types with the exception of Christian Fischer's *Challenge-Promotion-Project (Förder-Förder-Projekt (FFP) and FFP-Advanced* (Greiten, 2016b). The rest of the models analyzed in the study are confined to the organizational core which is the basis for individual measures. Although intensity and level of students' work can be increased during several runs through the model, this effect may be predominantly due to growing experience of the students with learning and working processes. Explicit work towards more development by means of a systematically designed graduation is lacking. Renzulli's concept is focused on the access of individualized research-based learning. A profession affine access of research is hardly to be found in German adaptations, whereas the tendency to work predominantly on subjects and interests remains the prevailing element in this country. Thus the opportunity of working towards a higher cognitive development including real-world problem work according to Renzulli's intentions in the third stage (Renzulli et al., 1981; Renzulli et al., 2001) is given away.

When having a look at the diagnostic and selection processes reconstructed by means of the questionnaires it becomes apparent that the German models have been insufficiently influenced by a decisive model component: Renzulli and his colleagues assumed that giftedness might be identified and developed by means of the working processes within the *Revolving Door Model*, also known as *Revolving Door Identification Model* (Renzulli, et al., 1981). Due to descriptions and evaluations of these working processes by teachers this development can be the basis for participating in higher enrichment phases (Renzulli, et al., 1981). Thus the development of giftedness is decoupled from pure classroom instruction processes and performance assessments, whereas a repercussion for classroom learning and working is intended although it isn't considered to be a necessity. The aspect of choosing students' learning and working processes in the *Revolving Door Model* as a diagnostic access by means of action information is lacking in most of the German types. This may be the reason why there is a remarkably low participation of underachievers in the German models (Greiten, 2016a).

The *Schoolwide Enrichment Model* (Renzulli & Reis, 1985; Reis & Renzulli, 2003), originating from the *Revolving Door Model* has become more popular in countries like Brazil, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Switzerland (Systema, 2003), in Switzerland also with an extended concept (Müller-Opliger, 2015) and Austria (Renzulli et al., 2001; Rogalla, 2009). So far the model has not been able to assert itself in Germany (Greiten, 2016b), whereas the core idea of the *Revolving Door Model* to leave regular classroom instruction and to participate in different forms of promotion became widely accepted.

Currently the basic conception of the *Revolving Door Model* is being enlarged by an additional facet: the German school system is developing towards an inclusive system.

The *Revolving Door Model*, which originally was designed to promote underachievers and to develop general giftedness, also offers options for schooling children and young students requiring special pedagogic support (Seitz & Scheidt, 2012; Greiten, 2016a) due to its organizational structures and individualized forms of working. Thus the model's way in Germany possibly might also be determined by this new facet.

References

- Baum, S. M., Renzulli, J. S. & Hébert, T. P. (1995). Reversing Underachievement: Creative Productivity as a Systematic Intervention. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39 (4), 224–235.
- Bildungsportal NRW/Themen/ Begabtenförderung/Das Drehtürmodell. Retrieved from http://www.zukunftsschulen-nrw.de/cms/front_content.php?idart=1390
- Bildungsportal NRW/Projekte/Archiv/Netzwerk Hochbegabtenförderung NRW. Retrieved from http://www.zukunftsschulen-nrw.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=342
- Bund-Länder-Kommission für Bildungsplanung und Forschungsförderung (BLK) (2001) (Hrsg.). *Begabtenförderung - ein Beitrag zur Förderung von Chancengleichheit in Schulen – Orientierungsrahmen*. (I. 91). Retrieved from <http://www.blk-bonn.de/papers/heft91.pdf>
- Bohnsack, R.(2010). Gruppendiskussionsverfahren und dokumentarische Methode. In B. Frieberthäuser, A. Langer & A. Prengel (Eds.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft* (3rd ed., completely revised edition, pp. 205-218). Weinheim: Juventa.
- Cochran, C. E., Mayer, L. C., Carr, T. R., Cayer, N. J., McKenzie, M. J. & Peck, L. R. (2009). *American public policy. An introduction*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth.
- Deutscher Bildungsserver. *Aufbau und Struktur des Schulsystems*. Retrieved from <http://www.bildungsserver.de/Aufbau-und-Struktur-des-Schulsystems-554.html>
- EURYDICE. Countries/ Germany Overview. Retrieved from <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/eurydice/index.php/Germany:Overview>
- Fatke, R. (2010). Fallstudien in der Erziehungswissenschaft. In B. Frieberthäuser, A. Langer & A. Prengel (Hrsg.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft* (3rd ed., completely revised edition, pp.159-172). Weinheim: Juventa.
- Fischer, C. (2008). Strategien selbstregulierten Lernens in der Begabtenförderung. *Diskurs Kindheits- und Jugendforschung*, 3 (1), 41–51.
- Greiten, S. (2016a). Das Drehtürmodell im Schulentwicklungsprozess der Begabtenförderung. Studie zum Drehtürmodell in Nordrhein-Westfalen. In S. Greiten (Ed.), *Das Drehtürmodell in der schulischen Begabtenförderung. Studienergebnisse und Praxiseinblicke aus Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Karg Hefte. Beiträge zur Begabtenförderung und Begabungsforschung, (I. 9; pp.30-45). Frankfurt am Main: Karg-Stiftung.
- Greiten, S. (2016b). Typen von Drehtürmodellen in NRW. Rekonstruktionen aus einer Fragebogenstudie. In Greiten (Ed.), *Das Drehtürmodell in der schulischen Begabtenförderung. Studienergebnisse und Praxiseinblicke aus Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Karg Hefte. Beiträge zur Begabtenförderung und Begabungsforschung, (I. 9; pp.8-19). Frankfurt am Main: Karg-Stiftung.
- Groensmit, M. (2008). Das Erweiterungsprojekt am Stedelijk Gymnasium Nijmegen in den Niederlanden. In C. Fischer, F. J. Mönks & U. Westphal (Eds.), *Individuelle Förderung: Begabungen entfalten – Persönlichkeiten entwickeln. Allgemeine Förder- und Förderkonzepte* (pp.111-118). Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Hasselhorn, M. & Gold, A. (2009). *Pädagogische Psychologie. Erfolgreiches Lernen und Lehren* (2nd approved ed.). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Hesse, I. & Latzko, B. (2009). *Diagnostik für Lehrkräfte*. Leverkusen: UTB.
- Holling, H., Preckel, F., Vock, M. & Schulze Willbrenning, B. (2004). *Schulische Begabtenförderung in den Ländern. Maßnahmen und Tendenzen. Gutachten*. BLK. I. 121. Retrieved from <http://www.blk-bonn.de/papers/heft121.pdf>.
- KARG-Stiftung. Fachportal Hochbegabung. Retrieved from <http://www.fachportal-hochbegabung.de/bundeslaender/hintergrund/>
- Kiel, E. & Weiß, S. (2016). Sekundarbereich. In I. Hedderich, G. Biewer, J. Hollenweger & R. Markowetz (Eds.), *Handbuch Inklusion und Sonderpädagogik* (pp.277-287). Regensburg: UTB.
- KMK (2015). *Förderstrategie für leistungsstarke Schülerinnen und Schüler* (Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 11.06.2015). Retrieved from http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/pdf/350-KMK-TOP-011-Fu-Leistungsstarke_-_neu.pdf.
- Klingen, F. J. (2001). Das »Drehtür-Modell« – ein individuelles Konzept der Begabtenförderung. *Labyrinth* 69, 28–32.

- Kuckartz, U. & Grunenberg, H. (2010). Qualitative Daten computergestützt auswerten: Methoden, Techniken, Software. In B. Friebertshäuser, A. Langer & A. Prenzel (Eds.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft* (3rd ed., completely revised edition, pp.501–514). Weinheim: Juventa.
- Lüders, M. (2001). Dispositionsspielräume im Bereich der Schülerbeurteilung. Auch ein Beitrag zur Professions- und Organisationsforschung. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 47 (2), 217-234.
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. Forum: *Qualitative social research. Sozialforschung* 1(2). <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385%3E>.
- Mayring, P. & Brunner, E. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. In B. Friebertshäuser, A. Langer & A. Prenzel (Eds.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft* (3rd ed., completely revised edition, pp.323–333). Weinheim: Juventa.
- Mönks, F. J. (1985). Hochbegabung: Eine Situationsbeschreibung (1985). In K. A. Heller, & F. J. Mönks (Eds.) (2014), *Begabungsforschung und Begabtenförderung: der lange Weg zur Anerkennung. Schlüsseltexte 1916–2013* (pp.123–139). Münster: LIT.
- Müller-Oppliger, V. (2015). Das „Schoolwide Enrichment Model“ (SEM) als Choreografie inklusiver Begabtenförderung. In C. Solzbacher, G. Weigand & P. Schreiber (Eds.), *Begabungsförderung kontrovers?: Konzepte im Spiegel der Inklusion* (pp.38-60). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Peters, W. (2008): Begabtenförderung in den Niederlanden. In C. Fischer, F. J. Mönks & U. Westphal (Eds.), *Individuelle Förderung: Begabungen entfalten – Persönlichkeit entwickeln* (p. 103-110). Münster: LIT.
- Porst, R. (2011). *Fragebogen. Ein Arbeitsbuch* (3rd ed.). Wiesbaden: VS.
- Reis, S. M. & Renzulli, J. S. (2003). Developing High potentials for innovation in young people through the schoolwide enrichment model. In L. V. Shavinina, (Eds.), *The international handbook on innovation* (p. 333–346). Amsterdam: Eslevier Science.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1976). Enrichment triad model – guide for developing defensible programs for gifted and talented. *Gifted child quarterly: official journal of national Association for Gifted Children*, 20(3), 303-326.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1977a). *The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center C.T.: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1977b). Enrichment Triad Model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented: Part II. *Gifted child quarterly: official journal of national Association for Gifted Children*, 21(2), 227-233.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1978): What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 60(3), 180–184.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1986). The three-ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity. In R. J. Sternberg & J. E. Davidson (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness*. (pp.53–92). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1994). Research related to the School wide Enrichment Triad Model. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38, (1), 7–20.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1999). *The definition of high-end learning*. University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT: Neag Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development.
- Renzulli, J. S. (2003). The School wide Enrichment Model: An overview of the theoretical and organizational rationale. *Gifted education international*, 18, 4–15.
- Renzulli, J. S. & Reis, S. M. (1985). *The School wide Enrichment Model. A Comprehensive Plan for Educational Excellence*. Mansfield Centre: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. & Reis, S. M. (2012). A virtual learning application of the school wide enrichment model and high-end learning theory. *Gifted education international*, 28, 19–40.
- Renzulli, J. S., Reis, S. M. & Smith, L. H. (1981). *The Revolving Door Identification Model*. Mansfield Centre: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., Reis, S. M. & Stednitz, U. (2001). *Das Schulische Enrichment Modell SEM*. Aarau: SauerländerVerlag.
- Renzulli, J. S. & Smith, L. H. (1979). *A Guidebook for Developing Individualized Educational Programs for Gifted and Talented Students*. Mansfield Centre: Creative Learning Press.
- Rogalla, M. (2009). Das Schulische Enrichment Modell: Schulentwicklung durch Begabungs- und Begabtenförderung. *Journal für Begabtenförderung*, 9(1), 7–17.
- Seitz, S. & Scheidt, K. (2012). Vom Reichtum inklusiven Unterrichts – Sechs Ressourcen zur Weiterentwicklung. *Zeitschrift für Inklusion* 1-2/12. Retrieved from <http://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/62/62>.
- Systema, R. E. (2003). The school wide enrichment model around the world: an overview of component applications in five Countries. *Gifted Education International*, 18, 58–66.

- Uhlendorff, H. & Prengel, A. (2010). Forschungsperspektiven quantitativer Methoden im Verhältnis zu qualitativen Methoden. In B. Friebertshäuser, A. Langer & A. Prengel (Eds.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft* (3rd ed., completely revised edition, pp. 137–148). Weinheim: Juventa.
- Vock, M., Preckel, F. & Holling, H. (2007). *Förderung Hochbegabter in der Schule. Evaluationsbefunde und Wirksamkeit von Maßnahmen*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.