NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR Gifted Children

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

Newsletter of the Conceptual Foundations Division of the National Association for Gifted Children

Volume 14 Number 2 Fall 2006

G/T ELITISM versus EGALITARIANISM

This lengthy issue is packed full of both controversy and useful information. We invite you to explore it carefully.

Our first article by Regan Clark presents a detailed plea for "real" gifted education instead of the patchwork system that sometimes serves and sometimes misses the needs of gifted students.

Next Echo Wu presents an equally impassioned case for serving gifted students within the regular classroom to avoid charges of elitism.

Our third article by Romey and Romey suggests that participation in Community Problem Solving can help gifted students gain both self-respect and respect from others in the community.

This issue also includes a call for papers by the guest editor for a Roeper Review special edition. If you have something to say about Global Awareness and the Gifted, this is your chance to be heard.

Our outgoing chair, Cheryl Ackerman, has included an open letter which you should read to help you understand the amount of work by so many people that goes into keeping Conceptual Foundations a vital part of NAGC.

Finally we have a listing of all Conceptual Foundations sessions for our upcoming NAGC Annual Convention. Plan ahead in order to catch the ones that interest you most.

We hope you enjoy this issue. See you in Charlotte!

Margaret Leigh, Editor

INDEX OF THIS ISSUE

A Presentation of Parallel Gifted Educations

Regan Clark
University of Virginia

There are two "gifted educations:" the ideal and the real. The ideal gifted education comprises research-supported identification, curriculum and instruction, and programs and services with many benefits and few disadvantages for students, whereas the real gifted education, what actually happens in school systems, is often fraught with disadvantages and, at times, bears little resemblance to the ideal. This paper compares these parallel gifted educations and makes suggestions on how to unite the two.

Identification

The ideal gifted education comprises a variety of valid and reliable measures (Coleman, 2003; Renzulli, 2004; Von Karolyi, Ramos-Ford, & Gardner, 2003; Wechsler, 1991) that not only identify the presence of giftedness, but provide valuable information about each student's individual learning needs so that educators may address them more effectively by providing them individualized services; however, in reality, we often assess students for their fit into pre-existing programs (Callahan, 1996). Not only is fitting students to pre-established programs much less effective at serving gifted students' individual needs and ensuring challenge than tailored services would be, it opens the door for significant criticism, the main one being real gifted education's perpetuation of society's power structure through the exclusion of minority students and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

Researchers have called into question the intent driving, and methods of, gifted identification. Sapon-Shevin (1996) and Oakes (1985), for example, argued that giftedness is not a unique entity endowed by nature, but a social construct

designed to perpetuate the distribution of power and status in our society. With a sufficiently narrow definition of giftedness based on the traits of economically advantaged students, the economic elite will maintain their positions of power while denying those with similar traits, but less power, both the opportunity to express and develop their talents and the opportunity for social ascension. Furthermore, critics assert that gifted education provides chosen students a pedagogy of privilege (Margolin, 1996): curriculum and instruction that grooms the gifted for positions of power in society.

While general education classes teach students obedience and little critical thinking, critics charge that gifted pedagogy focuses on a) enhancing the traits that identify students as gifted and b) teaching students, beyond any academic topic, to question authority and dominate their general education peers because those skills and traits will allow them to more easily assume their roles of power and leadership in society (Margolin, 1996). For these reasons, Sapon-Shevin (1994) noted: "Whether or not the intention of gifted programs is to reproduce existing economic and racial hierarchies or to produce cultural capital held by an elite group of students, these are in fact the consequences of such a system" (p. 192). These arguments are bolstered by the consistent overrepresentation of economically advantaged and the underrepresentation of economically disadvantaged students in gifted education (e.g., Castellano, 2003; Ford, 1998; Maker, 1996; National Research Council, 2002; Robinson & Clinkenbeard, 1998).

Conceptual Foundations is the newsletter of the Conceptual Foundations Division of the National Association for Gifted Children,
1707 L Street NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 785-4268

To submit materials to **Conceptual Foundations** contact:
Dr. Margaret Leigh
225 South 700 East
St. George, UT 84770
(435) 652-7849
LEIGHMA@charter.net or leigh@dixie.edu

Programs and Services

Researchers and theorists suggest that generating custom curriculum and programming options tailored to individual needs is best for gifted learners (Achter, Lubinski, & Benbow, 1996; Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1993; Feldhusen, 1997, 2003; Gagne, 1993) because the ultimate goal is a match between needs and services. They agree that the identification and education process works best when schools assess a variety of abilities that are associated with available services so that schools can match students to appropriate programs (Coleman, 2003). Furthermore, such programs must include both academic and affective support (Hoge & Renzulli, 1991; Neihart, Reis, Robinson, & Moon, 2002; Tomlinson, 2005; Zaffrann & Colangelo, 1979), and be flexible and responsive enough to meet the individual needs of diverse participants. Flexibility equals responsiveness to each individual participant in the other components (i.e., identification, challenge, and support), as well as to the range of services (Coleman, 2003), grouping configurations (Treffinger & Feldhusen, 1996), content (Tomlinson, 2005), and products (Renzulli, 1999). These components should be highly flexible to accommodate the diverse needs and demands of students, be wide enough to provide optimal matches for the maximum amount of students, and allow for talent development and display of talent in a wide range of domains. Entrance and exit criteria for a defensible gifted program should also be flexible enough to identify talent in twice-exceptional students, students with non-traditional talents, and culturally, ethnically, economically, and linguistically diverse students, along with allowing students the freedom to easily exit or modify their services in their own best interests (Renzulli, 1999).

As previously noted, existing gifted education often cannot accommodate the unique learning needs of diverse participants because, if they get in at all, it involves placing students into

services not made for them. An extension of this problem emerges in current gifted education programming and services: loss of flexibility. As evidenced in the ideal gifted education's reliance upon it, flexibility is a critical component of the identification, curriculum and instruction, and programming components of gifted education; without it, significant problems arise.

One of the areas in which inflexibility can wreak havoc is grouping. Grouping students to administer more appropriately challenging curriculum may be socially, emotionally (Adams-Byers, Whitsell, & Moon, 2004; Gross, 1997, 1998; Hollingworth, 1926; Lando & Schneider; 1997; Wright & Leroux, 1997), academically (Kulik & Kulik, 1992), and intellectually (Feldhusen & Saylor, 1990) beneficial for the gifted; however, research has also alluded to social and emotional disadvantages of grouping gifted students, including a temporary drop in self-concept (Feldhusen & Saylor, 1990; Kulik & Kulik, 1992), students not wanting to be singled out or treated differently, feelings of isolation (Adams-Byers, Whitsell, & Moon, 2004; Wright & Leroux, 1997), and rejection by the rest of the school (Coleman & Sanders, 1993; Cross, Coleman, & Stewart, 1993; Manor-Bullock, Look & Dixon, 1995; Schroeder-Davis, 1999; Tannenbaum, 1962). Furthermore, authors such as Oakes (1985) and Sapon-Shevin (1996) have decried ability-grouping because of its purported harmful effects on all students though disruption of the community. Not only do students who leave the home classroom for a portion of the day miss out on whole classroom activities and celebrations, the students who stay may resent the lack of attention and gifted label of those identified students. In addition, separating students may foster feelings of difference among identified students and resentment among those left behind (Adams-Byers, Whitsell, & Moon, 2004; Coleman & Cross, 1988; Cross, Coleman, & Stewart, 1993; Manor-Bullock, Look & Dixon, 1995; Rimm & Rimm-Kaufman, 2000; Rimm, Rimm-Kaufmann, & Rimm, 1999; Schroeder-Davis, 1999; Tannenbaum, 1962; Wright & Leroux, 1997). Finally, along with feelings of difference, critics assert, ability-grouping promotes a sense of elitism in participants that translates into very real achievement and power differences in society. For example, Darling-Hammond (1991) holds ability-grouping responsible for the differences between whites and minority students, as well as between the highest and lowest socioeconomic strata. All of these significant disadvantages, I believe, are related to inflexibility in grouping and thus constitute questionable, and at times inappropriate, administration of services.

Conclusion

While the ideal gifted education promotes using valid and reliable tests to identify students who have unique learning needs and then providing them with services that are appropriately challenging, flexible, supportive, and research-based, the real gifted education often identifies students that fit into pre-established programs and groups them rigidly, which not only increases the damage that grouping can cause for students, classrooms, and school communities, but critics charge could also perpetuate society's power structure through the exclusion of minority students and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Please see *Table 1* for a chart of the issues. In order to unite these two gifted educations, and therefore ameliorate some of the disadvantages of the real gifted education, I suggest the following:

Recommendation 1

My first recommendation is to really consider the criticisms made to the existing real gifted education. Many theorists and researchers have ignored these persistent criticisms (Borland, 1996), which prevents us from improving practice, and society as a whole.

Recommendation 2

Second, we must overtly commit ourselves to identifying and serving the needs of a diverse range of gifted learners because they, like other students, cannot succeed without our help (U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence, 1983; U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1993). The Marland Report (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1972) noted:

> There is an enormous individual and social cost when talent among the nation's children and youth goes undiscovered and undeveloped. These students cannot ordinarily excel without assistance. Gifted and Talented children are, in fact, deprived and can suffer psychological damage and permanent impairment of their abilities to function well which is equal to or greater than the similar deprivations suffered by any other population with special needs served by the Office of Education (p. 3).

Recommendation 3

For these reasons, research suggests gifted students need special services. But in order to identify an ethnically representative group of students for these services, which is an obvious criticism, schools should identify students using the

Table 1. Issue and Recommendation Summary.

Identification:		Recommendation:
Ideal Gifted Education:	Uses valid and reliable measures that provide useful information about students' individual learning needs.	
Real Gifted Education:	Identifies students for placement in pre-existing programs based on narrow conception of giftedness measures. not on the basis of individual learning needs.	Use an inclusive definition of giftedness and multiple
	Can result in charges of elitism, perpetuation of power structure, Pedagogy of Privilege, and underrepresentation of students from diverse ethnic and economic backgrounds.	Consider these criticisms.
Programs and Services:		**Recommendation**
Ideal Gifted Education:	Customizes curriculum and programs in order to make the best match between needs and services.	
	Is flexible in its administration of services and grouping.	
Real Gifted Education:	Fits students into programs not made for them.	Customize services and differentiate curriculum and instruction based on the individual learning needs identified in the assessments.
	Rigidly serves and groups students.	Flexibly group and serve students.
		Use these services and philosophies to improve education in general.

more recent and inclusive definitions of giftedness that recognize the dynamic interaction between genetics and experiences, including educational opportunities and societal values (Renzulli, 2003; Sternberg, 2003; Tannenbaum, 2003). Furthermore, schools should use a variety of assessments in the identification process (Coleman, 2003; Renzulli, 2004; Von Karolyi, Ramos-Ford, & Gardner, 2003; Wechsler, 1991). Employing both ability-based (IQ) and performance-based assessments in the identification process – as well as other standardized measures, interviews, individual case histories, criterion-referenced test scores, inventories, recommendations from parents, teachers, community-members, and peers (Patton, 1997) – not only helps identify talent and interest in a variety of domains, but also aids in identifying non-traditional talent and talent in students with disabilities and from underrepresented groups.

Recommendation 4

Fourth, schools should use the information they garner to tailor the services offered to those students (Achter, Lubinski, & Benbow, 1996; Bloom, 1985; Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde, & Whalen, 1993; Feldhusen, 1997, 2003; Gagne, 1993) because gifted students have unique educational and social/emotional needs that schools should accommodate (Hoge & Renzulli, 1991; Neihart, Reis, Robinson, & Moon, 2002; Zaffrann & Colangelo, 1979). In fact, numerous researchers feel gifted students are as atypical as those receiving special education services through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990) (Winebrenner, 1997).

Recommendation 5

Therefore, my fifth recommendation is to provide differentiated curricula. Researchers suggest that requiring students to cope within a system that ignores their unique needs and abilities, and forcing them to proceed at the pace of the least able student, is detrimental to their development (Colangelo & Davis, 2003). Gifted learners fare best when provided differentiated curricula (e.g. Winebrenner, 2000) because they are appropriately challenged and as Tomlinson (2005) recognized, "Ensuring challenge calibrated to the particular needs of a learner at a particular time is one of the most essential roles of the teacher and appears nonnegotiable for student growth" (p. 163). For better or for worse, one of the most common ways to deliver differentiated curricula is to group by ability. However, Goldberg, Passow, Justman, and Hage (1965), in their study of over 2,000 5th grade students organized into 15 different grouping patterns, found that unless differentiated curriculum accompanies ability grouping, students will fail to show achievement or social/emotional gains. Therefore, providing gifted students (who have been identified because they have special learning needs) with differentiated curricula is not singling out students for a richer, more effective learning experiences, it is providing them with what they need in order to fulfill their potential.

Recommendation 6

Unfortunately, these recommended practices do have disadvantages for both gifted and general education students. One way to counter these is to ensure program flexibility and responsiveness to individual needs, which is my sixth recommendation. Flexibility equals responsiveness to each individual participant in the other components (i.e., identification, challenge, and support), as well as to the range of services (Coleman, 2003), grouping configurations (Treffinger & Feldhusen, 1996), content (Tomlinson, 2005), and products (Renzulli, 1999). These components should be highly flexible to accommodate the diverse needs and demands of its students, be wide enough to provide optimal matches for the maximum number of students, and allow for talent development and display of talent in

a wide range of domains. Entrance and exit criteria for a defensible gifted program should also be flexible enough to identify talent in twice-exceptional students, students with non-traditional talents, and culturally, ethnically, economically, and linguistically diverse students, and should allow students the freedom to easily exit or modify their services in their own best interests (Renzulli, 1999). Defensible gifted programs meet the unique learning needs of gifted students by identifying diverse participants, providing services that are appropriately challenging, offering affective and academic support for participants, and maintaining flexibility and responsiveness to individual needs.

Recommendation 7

Finally, gifted education should strive to use the services, curriculum, and philosophy of serving the individual needs of all students to improve general education, as a whole (Renzulli, 1993; Sapon-Shevin, 1996; Shore, Cornell, Robinson, & Ward, 1991; Tannenbaum, 1998; Tomlinson, 2005; Tomlinson & Callahan, 1992). Shore, Cornell, Robinson, and Ward (1991) noted:

> Gifted education should foster quality education for all, based at least in part on the unique needs of each individual. Providing good programs for the gifted should not merely draw strength from the general program, but also provide it (p. 74).

Therefore, our ultimate goal should be to provide appropriate, differentiated, and flexible services to the gifted and to improve the services offered to all students. Enacting these recommendations should, at least, quell some of the arguments against gifted education, and at the most, benefit the entire educational community.

References

Adams-Byers, J., Whitsell, S. S., & Moon, S. M. (2004). Gifted students perceptions of the academic and social/emotional effects of homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping. Gifted Child Quarterly, 48, 7-20.

Achter, J., Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. (1996). Multipotentiality among the gifted: It was never there in the first place and already it's vanishing. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43(1), 65-76.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). (1985). Developing talent in young people. New York, NY: Ballantine.

Borland, J. H. (1996). Gifted education and the threat of irrelevance. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 129-147.

Callahan, C. M. (1996). A critical study of gifted education: Healthy practice, necessary evil, or sedition? Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 148-163.

Castellano, J. A. (2003). Special populations in gifted education: Working with diverse gifted learners. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Colangelo, N. & Davis, G. A. (2003). Introduction and Overview. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (3rd Edition) (pp. 3-10). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Coleman, M. R. (2003). The identification of students who are gifted (ERIC Digest ED480431 2003-06-00). Arlington, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education.

Coleman, L. J., & Cross, T. L. (1988). Is being gifted a social handicap? Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 11(4), 41-56.

Coleman, L. J., & Sanders, M. D. (1993, Fall). Understanding the needs of gifted students: Social needs, social choices, and masking one's giftedness. The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 22-25.

Cross, T. L., Coleman, L. J., & Stewart, R. A. (1993). The social cognition of gifted adolescents: An exploration of the stigma of giftedness paradigm. Roeper Review, 16, 37-40.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., & Whalen, S. (1993). Talented teenagers. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). The implications of testing policy for policy and equality. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 220-225.

Feldhusen, J. F. (1997). Secondary services, opportunities, and activities for talented youth. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (pp. 547-552). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Feldhusen, J. F. (2003). Beyond general giftedness: New ways to identify and educate gifted, talented, and precocious youth. In J. H. Borland (Ed.), Rethinking gifted education (pp. 34-45). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Feldhusen, J., & Saylor, M. (1990). Special classes for academically gifted youth. Roeper Review, 12, 244-249.

Ford, D. Y. (1998). The underrepresentation of minority students in gifted education: Problems and promises in recruitment and retention. The Journal of Special Education, 32(1), 4-14.

Gagne, F. (1993). Constructs and models pertaining to exceptional human abilities. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Monks, & A. H. Passow (Eds.), International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent (pp. 69-87). New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Goldberg, M. L., Passow, A. H., Justman, J., & Hage, G. (1965). The effects of ability grouping. New York, NY: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University.

Gross, M. (1997). How ability grouping turns big fish into little fish – or does it? Of optical illusions and optimal environments. Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 6(2), 18-30.

Gross, M. (1998). "Fishing" for the facts: A response to Marsh and Craven. Australasian Journal of Gifted Education, 7(1), 16-28.

Hoge, R. D., & Renzulli, J. S. (1991). Self-concept and the gifted child (Research Monograph No. 9104). Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Hollingworth, L. S. (1926). Gifted children. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (1990). 20 U.S.C. §1401 et seq.

Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. C. (1992). Meta-analytic findings on grouping programs. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36, 73-76.

Lando, B. Z., & Schneider, B. H. (1997). Intellectual contributions and mutual support among intellectually advanced children in homogenous and heterogeneous work/discussion groups. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41(2), 44-57.

Maker, C. J. (1996). Identification of minority students: A national problem, needed changes, and a promising solution. Gifted Child Quarterly, 40, 41-50.

Manor-Bullock, R., Look, C., & Dixon, D. N. (1995). Is giftedness socially stigmatizing? The impact of high achievement on social interactions. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18, 319-338.

Margolin, L. (1996). A pedagogy of privilege. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 164-180.

National Research Council (2002). Minority students in special and gifted education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Neihart, M., Reis, S. M., Robinson, N. M., & Moon, S. M. (Eds.). (2002). The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know? Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Oakes, (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Patton, J. M. (1997). Disproportionate representation in gifted programs: Best practices for meeting this challenge. In A. J. Artiles and G. Zamora-Duran (Eds.), Reducing disproportionate representation of culturally diverse students in special and gifted education (pp. 7-25). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Renzulli, J. S. (1993). Schools are places for talent development: New directions for the schoolwide enrichment model. Communicator: The Journal of the California Association for the Gifted, 23(4) 4-13.

Renzulli, J. S. (1999). What is this thing called giftedness, and how do we develop it? A twenty-five year perspective. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 23(1), 3-54.

Renzulli, J. S. (2003). Conception of giftedness and its relationship to the development of social capital. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (3rd Edition) (pp. 75-87). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Renzulli, J. S. (2004). A practical system for identifying gifted and talented students. On line. Retrieved September 21, 2005 from www.gifted.uconn.edu/sem/semart04.html.

Rimm, S. B., & Rimm-Kaufman, S. (2000). How Jane won: Profiles of successful women. New York, NY: Crown.

Rimm, S. B., Rimm-Kaufman, S., & Rimm, I. (1999). See Jane win: The Rimm report on how 1,000 girls became successful women. New York, NY: Crown.

Robinson, A., & Clinkenbeard, P. (1998). Giftedness: An exceptionality examined. Annual Review of Psychology, 49, 117-139.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1994). Playing favorites: Gifted education and the disruption of the community. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1996). Beyond gifted education: Building a shared agenda for school reform. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 194-214.

Schroeder-Davis, S. J. (1999). Brains, brawn, or beauty: Adolescent attitudes toward three superlatives. Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 10, 134-147.

Shore, B. M., Cornell, D. G., Robinson, A., & Ward, V. S. (1991). Recommended Practices in Gifted Education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (2003). Giftedness according to the theory of successful intelligence. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (3rd

Edition) (pp. 75-87). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Tannenbaum, A.J. (1962). Adolescent attitudes toward academic brilliance. Talented Youth Project Monograph. New York Bureau of Publications: Teachers College, Columbia University.
Tannenbaum, A. J. (1998). Programs for the gifted: To be or not to be. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 22(1), 3-36.
Tannenbaum, A. J. (2003). Nature and nurture of giftedness. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (3rd Edition) (pp. 45-59). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Tomlinson, C. (2005). Quality curriculum and instruction for highly able students. Theory Into Practice, 44, 160-166.
Tomlinson, C. A., & Callahan, C. M. (1992). Contributions of gifted education to general education in a time of change. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36(4), 183-189.
Treffinger, D., & Feldhusen, J. (1996). Talent recognition and development: Successor to gifted education. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 181-193.
U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence. (1983). Nation at risk: An imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: Author.
U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1993). National excellence: A case for developing America's talents. Washington, D.C.: Author.
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (1972). The Marland Report. Washington, D. C.: Author.
Von Karolyi, C., Ramos-Ford, V., & Gardner, H. (2003). Multiple Intelligences: A perspective on giftedness. In N. Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (3rd ed.) (pp. 100-112). Needleham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
Weschler, D. (1991). Manual for the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children--Third Edition. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corp.
Winebrenner, S. (1997, Winter). The legal right to be educated. Understanding Our Gifted, 14-15.
Winebrenner, S. (2000). Gifted students need an education, too. *Educational Leadership, 58*, 52-56.
Wright, P. B., & Leroux, J. A. (1997). The self-concept of gifted adolescents in a congregated program. Gifted Child Quarterly, 41, 83-94.
Zaffrann, R. T., & Colangelo, N. (1979). Counseling with gifted and talented students. In J. C. Gowan, J. Khatena, & E. P. Torrance (Eds.), Educating the Ablest (2nd edition) (pp. 167-181). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

A Search for Linkages Between Gifted Education and General Education

Echo Wu
The University of Virginia

Introduction

Two contradictory values, namely, equity versus excellence, that concern the relationship between gifted education and general education, have been competing for predominance in American education (Gallagher, 2003). On the excellence side, gifted education has long been accepted as providing students with a high-quality curriculum; but at the same time, gifted programs have been criticized for the elite populations they serve (Awaya, 2001). However, it should be noted that equity does not mean equal education, but equal opportunities for students to fulfill their potential.

The purpose of this essay is to examine some of the main ideas in the literature concerning the relationship between gifted education and general education. It focuses on three issues: first the balance between equity and excellence; second, a reflective review of issues related to homogeneous and heterogeneous settings for gifted education; and third, the combination or separation of gifted education from general education.

Equity and Excellence

How is it possible to make a balance between equity and excellence? On the one hand, promoting excellence in teaching and learning is the goal of education, and gifted education is the "Flagship" that leads us to achieve such a goal. Researchers (e.g., Tomlinson and Callahan, 1992) suggest that the theoretical perspectives and curriculum practices of gifted education have provided educational leadership in enhancing our understanding of intelligence, differentiated and individualized instruction, and of various models and strategies in teaching. On the other hand, as Awaya (2001) argues, the different notions and understandings of giftedness and the apparent lack of equitable opportunities for entrance into gifted

programs for certain disadvantaged groups have brought charges of elitism.

Some people object to spending more resources on the gifted because they think these students have already come to the education system with many more gifts than other students. "Those who stress equity as a premium value see evil designs in the attempt to provide special help for gifted students…." (Gallagher, 2003, p.20). They think that offering special provisions to gifted children is similar to providing more resources to those who are rich: it is like "a reward for those who have already displayed the desired characteristics" (see Awaya, 2001, p.194). They think the gifted will inherit the earth; they will enjoy privileged access to higher education; and they will occupy the high-earning professions because of their intellectual skills. For all the above reasons, they do not need further help, as opposed to students who have difficulty reading and writing, who have various sorts of disabilities and who need some sort of assistance just to cope with the normal challenges of life.

Nevertheless, there is a considerable amount of theory and research by many leading scholars in the field (e.g., Borland, 1996, 1997; Renzulli, 1977; Renzulli & Reis, 2002; Tomlinson, 1996; 2003) demonstrating that gifted education is vital to the optimal development of gifted and talented students, that it can and should be implemented within the public school system in order to provide as many gifted students as possible with suitable curriculum and instruction. For instance, Renzulli's (1998) Schoolwide Enrichment Model has advocated an extensive program within the school system; Coleman (1995) has suggested that gifted and talented students can be developed and nurtured by immersing them in an enriched social context, one which promotes gifted education within the community and society. Tomlinson's (2003) differentiation model of curriculum and instruction has led those in gifted education to an extensive and broad dimension that provides clear direction and guidance to regular classroom teachers in the practices of gifted education.

In my view, everyone is entitled to develop fully as an individual person, and the gifted should not be excluded from this development. What is more important, gifted and talented children also have special needs, particularly in dealing with the disparity between their intellectual gifts and their age-related social and emotional development. They certainly have curricular, instructional, and learning resource needs if their time at school is not going to be filled with frustration and boredom. Learning at a level that matches their academic abilities, and in a way that is suitable to their learning capacities, is as critical as providing disabled students with specific curriculum and instruction for their needs. Unless a well-designed differentiated curriculum and classroom environment are provided to students, gifted abilities can remain undiscovered and may eventually be wasted. Gifted education has an impact on both the academic and affective development of the gifted population. Therefore, only gifted education can provide opportunities for gifted students to realize their potential. Should this gifted and talented education be offered in homogeneous settings, or should gifted students remain in heterogeneous classrooms with their non-gifted peers? Such an issue concerning values of homogeneous and heterogeneous settings for gifted students has been controversial for many decades.

Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Settings

The dilemma between whether or not to separate the gifted and talented from their peers may stem from the conflict of equity vs. excellence (Passow, 1993). The basic question is whether we should provide services to gifted students within regular classrooms, namely within heterogeneous settings, or offer them opportunities to study in special classes or special schools.

Some researchers believe it is appropriate to group gifted and talented students in special classes and provide them with an advanced curriculum and a speedy instructional pace (Feldhusen, 2003), since they then can not only benefit from the academic challenge and recognition of the same group of peers, they can also interact with others who have comparable intellectual and social characteristics.

Researchers (e.g., Robinson, 2003) suggest that schools, especially those in large enough districts, should offer rigorous special classes to those highly gifted students whose abilities can hardly be challenged, and needs met, within regular classroom settings. With demanding and properly designed curricula, such self-contained classes "are the easiest, least expensive, and most effective way to meet the needs of the brightest students while, at the same time, enabling them to profit from the stimulation and support of other bright students" (p.262).

A study by Hertzog (2003) on the impact of programs as perceived by gifted students themselves reveals that the most significant differences between regular and special classrooms is the behavior of the students and the enthusiasm and characteristics of the teachers. In special classes or schools, students enjoy learning much more and the teachers are considered as more competent and more enthusiastic. Students in this study seem to prefer full-time gifted programs since part-time programs may put them in an awkward situation where they may not be accepted by the same age groups. Besides the pull-out classes, and special schools, some other homogeneous grouping options may include extra-curricular activities, Saturday programs, and summer programs, which can all provide gifted students with challenging learning opportunities (Olszewski-Kubilius & Lee, 2004; Schenkel, 2002).

It seems that homogeneous settings are more beneficial to the development of the gifted. However, such settings also have drawbacks. Although special classes or schools may be suitable for a small percentage of gifted students, "concentrating on them would draw a lot of energy, time and money away from the rest of the gifted" (Heinbokel, 2002, p.178). Thus, to this author, it is preferable to focus more on gifted programs that would meet the needs of the maximum number of children.

An open-ended, flexible learning and teaching environment occurring in regular classrooms can benefit the learning of gifted students, as well as other children in the classrooms (Barone & Schneider, 2003). A strength of such a within-class programs is, as stated by the researchers, that gifted students can take advantage of the available heterogeneity of experience, knowledge, and skills. Wu's (in preparation) observation also suggests that when special classes or schools are not available, strategic teaching and learning within the normal classroom may still facilitate and promote advanced learning outcomes of gifted and talented students.

Other research (Kulik & Kulik, 1992; Slavin, 1993) indicates that, besides the positive outcomes of within-class programs in elementary and middle schools, within-class grouping has proven to be popular with classroom teachers (Robinson, 2003). In situations where homogeneous programming cannot be provided to gifted students, namely, in a heterogeneous setting where there is a wide range of ability and interests, ability grouping can be of great value in challenging students at appropriate levels (Kettler & Curliss, 2003; Reed, 2004). However, to the highly gifted students who need more deliberate accelerated programs, such grouping programs may not be adequately challenging (Rogers, 2002).

While advocating special classes or schools for exceptionally gifted students, Robinson (2003) suggests that, in order to meet the needs of those moderately gifted students who do not meet the criteria for special classes/schools, expanding efforts should be put into regular classrooms. In such a heterogeneous setting, the gifted may have more opportunities to learn to appreciate the diversity in their midst (Rogers, 2002). In this case, a special coordinator or a master teacher can be of help to identify cluster groups of gifted students.

According to the above research, various grouping options have been found beneficial for

different individuals in different ways and the options can be varied from full-time placement in special enriched or accelerated gifted programs, to part-time enriched instruction in specific subjects, or to pull-out grouping and within-class ability grouping (Rogers, 2002). Each of these programs possesses both strengths and weaknesses which should be taken into account in designing programs for individual students.

The relationship between gifted education and mainstream education is therefore quite complex, not only because there are concerns over the aforementioned issues of equity and excellence, but also because of other concerns, such as to what extent should gifted education be a part of general education. This has been a controversial issue in the past.

Combination of Gifted Education and General Education

Some people (e.g., Bernal, 2003; Delisle, 2005) may argue that gifted education cannot be a part of general education, and gifted and talented students cannot be taught within regular classrooms; rather, they all need to be in pull-out or self-contained programs or special schools so as to develop properly. Some even believe (e.g., Awaya, 2001) that the movement advocating heterogeneous classrooms has engendered concern that classrooms will focus on students only in the middle of the ability spectrum or, worse, on students with the lowest level of skills.

However, it seems to be a hypothetical Utopia that all the gifted and talented students can be identified, and then happily grow up within self-contained academic and environmental settings. One may not help wondering to what extent such a hypothesis is substantiated. First of all, how can we make sure that all the gifted and talented students can be appropriately identified, given that many of them are underachievers, or part of an underserved gifted population (e.g., minority groups, twice-exceptional gifted, students in poverty or those from rural places)? Or suppose we leave many of the truly gifted students behind, and have some smart but non-gifted students within contrived exclusive settings? Narrow and exclusive concepts of giftedness and inappropriate identification procedures can create various problems which will not be discussed here.

Second, assuming that all the gifted and talented can all be identified somehow, how can we ensure that these students would be provided with a suitable academic curriculum and social-psychological environment for them to develop to the best? It is apparently unrealistic and naïve to believe that all gifted students, including those from urban schools, rural counties, or those living in developing countries, will all have the chance to be offered appropriate learning experiences in self-contained settings. Gallagher (2003) says: “gifted education is a small boat on a huge educational ocean and will be moved around depending on the other societal or professional forces at work.” (p.21) There are numerous issues that need to be considered: state or government policy, funding, budgets, various resources, teacher training, parents and community support, and many others.

Third, how can we effectively avoid the potential problems and disadvantages that accompany distinctively separated education for the gifted and talented? The claim in this paper is not that pull-out programs or special schools should not be supported. Instead, while endorsing the notion of pull-out programs, especially for the highly or exceptionally gifted students, it is claimed that at many places or in many circumstances, such as in developing countries like China and India, it is simply impossible for gifted and talented students to be all put into such homogeneous settings for schooling, and that gifted education can hardly have a clear partition from general education.

In traditional education, the focus in regular or mixed-ability classrooms is on students with

average ability, or, for schools to put more effort on students with lower ability. But gifted education, with various implementations, such as the differentiated curriculum, can provide a chance for all students, including gifted and talented students, to achieve academic excellence. Meanwhile, it may solve the problem that exclusive settings of learning cannot: it can be available for a large number of gifted students.

On the other hand, it may be true that the current status of gifted education in regular classrooms is not optimal. Gifted students' needs are commonly neglected and teachers even use these students to help their peers, rather than individualizing and differentiating their learning (Ray, as cited in Bernal, 2003).

Archambault, Westberg, Brown, Hallmark, Zhang, and Emmons (1993) argue that gifted children are not actually served in inclusive settings because their teachers hardly make any modifications of instructions to help them, and very rarely incorporate differentiated or individualized instruction within the teaching process. Multiple observations by Reis and her colleagues (2004) also reveal that despite the existing advances in technology and increasing knowledge about differentiation of instruction and curriculum, there is often little that some educators do in classrooms to meet the needs of gifted and talented students.

Clearly, no matter what type of gifted education is adopted – inclusive or exclusive – neither occurs within a vacuum and neither is much easier than the other. However, it can be argued that one is more plausible than another in terms of its practicality, its effectiveness, and its appropriateness to a holistic conception of gifted education – namely inclusive gifted education. That means gifted education should and must be a part of general education, probably in a significant degree, while necessary special pull-out programs or special schools should be sought to provide those exceptionally gifted and talented students with more advanced developmental opportunities when conditions allow.

Some researchers note that it is a challenge for educators to implement inclusive talent development programs based upon the philosophy that all human beings are valuable and have the potential to make significant contributions to society (Buchanan, Woerner, Bigam, & Cascade, 1997). However, it is indeed a challenge that educators must take up for the benefit of gifted and talented students who will be leaders of the society in the future.

Summary

There have been many critiques and debates on different aspects of gifted education. Some of the major arguments include the balance between equity and excellence, the advantages and disadvantages of homogeneous and heterogeneous settings, and the combining or separation of gifted education from general education.

It is a challenge for educators to provide not only authentic, equitable education to all children, but at the same time to maintain excellence in providing gifted and talented students what they deserve. While homogeneous settings may provide a challenging opportunity for highly gifted and talented students to develop their potential, heterogeneous settings may be more practical and feasible for the education of a great number of gifted students in many circumstances. It should be noted that, in such a heterogeneous setting, educators need to support individualization and differentiation as much as possible, and the development of challenging classroom experiences for the gifted and talented students. Consequently, as a part of general education, gifted education can then have a deeper root and a wider basis so as to provide more students with more opportunities to achieve at highest level they can.

In an interview conducted by Henshon (2005), Rena Subotnik mentioned that her perception of the gifted field is that "academics tend to analyze problems and do not always get around to solving them" (p.198). It is now time for action: action to face the existing problems; action to solve the problems; and action to move forward to new directions.

References

Archambault, F. X., Westberg, K. L., Brown, S. W., Hallmark, B. W., Zhang, W., & Emmons, C. L. (1993). Classroom practices used with gifted third and fourth grade students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16*, 103-119.

Awaya, A. (2001). Equitable access to excellence: Opportunities for gifted education to an underrepresented population through open enrollment. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 25*, 177-197.

Barone, D., & Schneider, R. (2003). Turning the looking glass inside out: A gifted student in an at-risk setting. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47*(4), 259-271.

Bernal, E. M. (2003). To no longer educate the gifted: Programming for gifted students beyond the era of inclusionism. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47*, 183-191.

Borland, J. H. (1996). Gifted education and the threat of irrelevance. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19*, 129-147.

Borland, J. H. (1997). *Rethinking curriculum, instruction, and assessment in gifted education at the end of the millennium.* Keynote address at the Second National Curriculum Network Conference, 1997. Retrieved Oct. 30th, 2005, from http://cfge.wm.edu/documents/RethinkingCurriculum.pdf

Coleman, L. J. (1995). The power of specialized educational environments in the development of giftedness: The need for research on social context. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 39*, 171-176.

Delisle, J. R. (2005). The gifted garage sale – revisited. Notes from the annual conference of the National Association of Gifted Education.

Feldhusen. J.F. (2003). Precocity and acceleration. *Gifted Education International*, 17(1), 55-58.

Gallagher, J. J. (2003). Issues and challenges in the education of gifted students. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 11-23). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Heinbokel, A. (2002). Acceleration: Still an option for the gifted. *Gifted Education International*, 16(2), 170-178.

Henshon, S. E. (2005). Reflections on an evolving view of giftedness and talent: An interview with Rena Subotnik. *Roeper Review*, 27, 197-199.

Hertzog, N. B. (2003). Impact of gifted programs: From the students' perspectives. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47*(3), 131-143.

Kettler, T., & Curliss, M. (2003). Mathematical acceleration in a mixed-ability classroom: Applying a tiered objective model. *Gifted Child Today, 26*(1), 52-55, 65.

Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. L. C. (1992). Meta-analysis findings on grouping programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36,* 73-77.

Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Lee, S-Y. (204). The role of participation in in-school and outside-of-school activities in the talent development of gifted students. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 15*(3), 107-123.

Passow, A. H. et al. (1993). Research and education of the gifted in the year 2000 and beyond. In Heller, K. A. et al. (Eds.), *International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent* (pp.883-903). Oxford: Pergamon.

Reed, C. F. (2004). Mathematically gifted in the heterogeneously grouped mathematics classroom: What is a teacher to do? *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 15*(3), 89-95.

Reis, S. M., Gubbins, E. J., Briggs, C. J., Schreiber, F. J., Richards, S., Jacobs, J. K., Eckert, R. D., & Renzulli, J. S. (2004). Reading instruction for talented readers: Case studies documenting few opportunities for continuous progress. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 48,* 315-338.

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented.* Mansfield Center, Connecticut: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. (1998). A rising tide lifts all ships: Developing the gifts of all students. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*, 104-111.

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (2002). What is Schoolwide Enrichment: How gifted programs relate to total school improvement. *Gifted Child Today, 25*, 18-25, 64.

Robinson, N, M. (2003). Two wrongs so not make a right: sacrificing the needs of gifted students does not solve society's unsolved problems. ? *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 26*(4), 251-273.

Rogers, K. B. (2002). *Re-forming gifted education: Matching the program to the child*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.

Schenkel, L. A. (2002). Hands on and feet first: Linking high-ability students to marine scientists. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 13*(4), 173-191.

Slavin, W. T. (1993). Ability grouping in the middle grades: Achievement effects and alternatives. *The Elementary School Journal, 93*, 535-552.

Tomlinson, C. A. (1996). Good teaching for one and all: Does gifted education have an instructional identity? *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 20*, 155-174.

Tomlinson, C., (2003). *Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom: Strategies and Tools for Responsive Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Quality curriculum and instruction for highly able students. *Theory into Practice, 44*(2), 160-167.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Callahan, C. M. (1992). Contributions of gifted education to general education in a time of change. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*, 183-189.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (2003). What matters in curriculum for gifted learners: Reflections on theory, research, and practice. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 174-183). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wu, E. H. (In preparation). Practical instructional strategies for teachers of the gifted in regular classroom.

R-E-S-P-E-C-T: The Role of Community Problem Solving in Empowering Gifted Students

Elizabeth A. Romey, University of South Alabama
Barbara A. Romey, Phenix City Schools, Alabama

Respect: it's something we all want – and students, especially gifted students, often find themselves in situations, both in school and in the wider community, where respect is in short supply. If they do well in school, it's "no more than we expect"; if they fail, then they are mocked for their failures – and regardless, they're still "just kids". Yet this basic concept – respect and the need that gifted students have to earn it from the wider community – is one that can provide a foundational framework for developing programming for gifted students, using their desire for respect for their abilities as the guiding principle behind the development of concrete programming options. The Community Problem Solving component of the Future Problem Solving Program is such a program, giving gifted students the opportunity to attain respect in the larger community outside their school environment by working to solve real-world problems they consider significant.

Community Problem Solving (CmPS), developed from the Future Problem Solving (FPS) model designed by E. Paul Torrance and others, provides a framework for the development of specific problem solving skills. A CmPS project shares the concept of a "real-world" audience with Renzulli's Type IIIs – except that the "product" created is an improved community. Included among the affective goals of the CmPS program are "To develop a positive self-image, to develop confidence in their ability to effect change, to feel a sense of belonging, to know the feeling of contributing positively to society." (Alcock & Jensen, 1998, p. 7). This type of real world application is strongly encouraged for gifted students (Coleman, 1995; Renzulli, 1986). Research indicates that gifted students respond positively when given an opportunity to present their successes to a real world audience (Renzulli, 1994). However, the CmPS process also addresses other affective needs: Torrance's creation of the FPS model was originally spurred by his finding that gifted students tend to worry and feel helpless about the future [Torrance, personal communication, fall 1999]. FPS gives students a chance to address tomorrow's problems today – CmPS gives them an opportunity to address today's problems *now*.

Buescher (1985) devised a developmental framework for identifying the social and emotional concerns of gifted students.
These include:

Ownership – who says I'm gifted?

Dissonance – recurrent tension between performance and personal expectation.

Risk-taking – should I be taking new risks or seeking secure situations?

Others' expectations – being pushed by others' expectations and pulled by my own.

Impatience – I have to know the answer right now.

Identity – What counts is who I am.

Cited in Cross, 1994, p. 10

CmPS provides ownership – "who says I'm gifted?" – because as students identify specific positive outcomes through the implementation of a structured problem solving process, they develop an understanding that their giftedness is recognizable in settings other than the classroom and that it has value in the larger world. They have an opportunity to validate their own self-worth through achieving goals that their communities recognize as valuable – a win-win opportunity, and one that also grants them the respect of adults in the wider community. They are able to use their giftedness in a way that gains them respect without being the central "target" if the results are not completely realized.

In terms of dissonance – the recurring tension between performance and personal expectation – in the classroom, the personal expectation of perfection is both intrinsic and extrinsic. In a service learning setting, the student has identified a problem that exists in the real world. If they can make any improvement they have accomplished more than the community at large has previously achieved. They complete their efforts as part of a team, sharing the responsibility for the project as a whole. Although personal expectations are still extremely high, gifted students can reduce their perfectionist tendencies in this setting.

This leads to the third concept, risk-taking. Making a guess on a question posed by a teacher in a classroom setting is a high risk situation for gifted students. They feel internally that they should know the answer and their teacher and peers often also expect them to know. In CmPS they draw comfort from the notion that they cannot be expected to know the answers to questions that their communities as a whole cannot resolve. Even a partial solution is an improvement over what has been accomplished so far.

With regard to expectations, CmPS provides a framework for determining what others' expectations in a situation are – and more: the CmPS process includes a section on defining what the problem itself is, which implicitly indicates that there are no predefined expectations from others: no one else knows what needs doing either! The process offers the students an opportunity to consider the needs of others and provide for them in a way that satisfies their own expectations of what is possible.

Impatience often causes stress in the gifted student. CmPS is a concrete opportunity to temper impatience based on the specific demands of the project. Students learn that waiting for the answer from a funding source or a city council provides time to consider alternatives and develop back-up plans that may also achieve the desired results. They also learn to pace themselves and break problems down into manageable components while taking satisfaction as each stage of a project is completed.

The issue of identity – what counts is who I am – can also be addressed through the CmPS process. Students learn a great deal about who they are as they explore their own talents in terms of a community problem. They learn the value of what they can do and the value of the efforts of others. Not only do they clarify their own identity but they come to appreciate the gifts of others and to see the skills of others as useful to them rather than as a threat to their own worth. They begin to recognize individual differences as positive resources that can achieve a common goal.

Finally, what about respect? Romey (2000) found that while both identified gifted and non-gifted students who participated in volunteer work through a CmPS project reported higher levels of self-esteem than students in either population who did not, the gifted students who participated stated that one of the benefits they received from the program was a sense of respect <u>from adults</u> in the community. They stated that young people were often looked down on or dismissed by the adults in their community, and that their participation in the

volunteer program had given them status in the larger community, something which they valued having. This finding not only provides support for the CmPS process, but also offers a wider insight into a serious affective need of gifted students – the respect of the wider community – and how that can be achieved.

References

Alcock, S., & Jensen, B. (1998). Philosophy of community problem solving. In *Community problem solving handbook.* Ann Arbor, MI: Future Problem Solving Program.

Buescher, T.M. (1985). A framework for understanding the social and emotional development of gifted and talented adolescents. *Roeper Review, 8,* 10-15.

Coleman, M.R. (1995). Problem-based learning: A new approach for teaching gifted students. *Gifted Child Today,* 18-19.

Cross, T. (1994). Determining the needs of gifted children. *Gifted Child Today,* 10-11.

Renzulli, J.S. (Ed.) (1986). *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J.S. (1994). New directions for the Schoolwide Enrichment Model. *Gifted Education International, 10,* 33-36.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Special Issue: GLOBAL AWARENESS AND THE GIFTED
Guest Editor: Dr. Catya von Károlyi

Researchers, practitioners, biographers, and theorists are invited to submit papers relating to global awareness and the gifted. Specifically, we are looking for articles about gifted individuals' interests, concerns, responses to, and concepts of global interdependence, environmental, social, political, philosophic, spiritual, and multicultural issues as they manifest in the classroom, lab, and the world. In view of these topics, we are particularly interested in:

- Research about global awareness employing gifted individuals or groups;
- Case studies or biographies of gifted individuals for whom some aspect of global awareness is (or was) a defining characteristic;
- Pedagogic methods or curricular materials designed to respond to or increase gifted student's global awareness;
- Psychological, counseling, and spiritual issues, and responses to gifted individuals' global awareness, beliefs, fears, and concerns;
- Theoretical pieces about global awareness that delineate conceptual frameworks or research agendas; and
- Theoretical pieces about the nature of global issues that may influence the development of gifted individuals.

Submission deadline: November 1st, 2006
Submission guidelines for manuscripts appear in the back of each issue of Roeper Review. Alternatively, you can get them by contacting the editor at <ambrose@rider.edu>

At the time of submission, please indicate that your article is intended for the Global Awareness Special Issue.

For more information contact:

Catya von Károlyi, Ph.D., Guest Editor
Department of Psychology
University of Wisconsin--Eau Claire
Eau Claire, WI 54702
715-836-5377
<vonkarc@uwec.edu>

Dear Division Members,

I can't believe I am at the end of my time as a Conceptual Foundations Division Officer. It has been about 10 years since I became the division secretary when I was still a graduate student. I have seen so much happen during this time at the division. We are small, but we are essential to the growth of the field.

For the division, there have been some wonderful conference events that have highlighted the work of our organization. A few years ago Abbey pulled together an excellent evening program called, "The Ghosts of Gifted Past" which was quite a memorable event. For two years I organized special sessions to highlight developing theories and offer their authors the opportunity to receive formal feedback from others in the field. Both Sydney Moon and Don Ambrose enjoyed the chance to present their theory in progress and hear how others might move it forward. Another division highlight unrelated to the conference, was the special issue of Roeper Review that blossomed into three special issues on conceptual foundations in the field. This was an amazing testimony to the interest in the work of our division.

To tell all, these accomplishments have been hard work. Leading a division requires a commitment of time and energy throughout the year and there are things I had hoped to bring to fruition that I was unable to. I had hopes of creating a strategic plan for the organization to help guide it over the coming years. This is still something that may be valuable; however, with some discussion of restructuring the divisions, it seems prudent to hold off on this until we know what we will look like in the future. Other challenges that are ongoing include soliciting articles for our newsletter. Margaret has been doing a wonderful job editing it for several years. But as someone who was a newsletter editor once, I know how difficult it is to play the nag in order to get adequate material for publication. This newsletter is so important because it is one of the only ways our division can reach members who do not attend the conference.

Finally, I am excited to hand over the Chair position to Abbey Block Cash who has been working with me for the past several years as assistant program chair and then program chair. She, too, has dedicated herself to the work of our division and I have seen her work tirelessly to move things forward. Abbey and the division are very fortunate that Nora Cohen is taking over as program chair. If you are new, you may not know that Nora was one of the founding members of the division. I am sure she can tell some stories about "how things used to be" and will be serving the division's current interests as adamantly as ever. I am so pleased to move over for these capable leaders. I thank them for their willingness to serve. I encourage you to thank them yourselves.

Wishing you all the best,
Cheryl

Cheryl M. Ackerman, Chair

Presentation Title Presenters Category/Topic Session Type Level of Session Date/Time Location

Wedded Bliss: The Marriage of Regular and Gifted Education
Mary Hargett
Art Costa
Bena Kallick Conceptual Foundations Individual session Advanced 11/3/2006 11:45 AM - 12:45 PM

Hollingworth's "Emotional Education": Historical Precursor to Contemporary Curriculum
Kathi Kearney
Robert A. Schultz Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/3/2006 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Unified-Insular-Firmly Policed or Fractured-Contested-Porous Gifted Education?
Don Ambrose
Joyce VanTassel-Baska
Laurence J Coleman
Tracy Cross Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/3/2006 2:45 PM - 3:45 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Adding Personality to Gifted Identification
Carol A. Carman Conceptual Foundations Poster Session Intermediate 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

From Conceptual Foundations to Classroom Foundations: Developing Practical Theory
Christy Tabert Folsom Conceptual Foundations Poster Session Intermediate 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Gifted and Grateful: The Theoretical Underpinnings of Purpose
Razel E. Solow Conceptual Foundations Poster Session Intermediate 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Is It Soup Yet? When Does a Specialty Become a Talent/Gift?
Reva Friedman-Nimz
Brenna O'Brien Conceptual Foundations Individual session Advanced 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Mastery Model of Giftedness: Answers to Educators' Questions
Dona Matthews
Joanne Foster Conceptual Foundations Poster Session Intermediate 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Policy and Practice: A Case Study of Gifted Education Policy Implementation
Julie Dingle Swanson Conceptual Foundations Poster Session Advanced 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

The New Taxonomies: Moving from the Knowledge Age to the Conceptual Age
Mary Hargett Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/3/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 209A

AAPFAS: A Rational Alternative to NCLB
Margaret Leigh Conceptual Foundations Combined session Intermediate 11/4/2006 7:45 AM - 8:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 213D; Capacity: 120

Frasier Talent Assessment Profile for Gifted Identification
Geoffrey Moon Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 7:45 AM - 8:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 216A; Capacity: 40

Highly Gifted, Barely Served: The Sad Legacy of Inclusionary Practices on Gifted Children
James R Delisle Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 7:45 AM - 8:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 217BC; Capacity: 144

No Child Left Behind: Neglecting Excellence
Marcia Gentry Conceptual Foundations Combined session Intermediate 11/4/2006 7:45 AM - 8:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 213D; Capacity: 120

Towards a Theory of Optimal Development: World Views, Spirals, Imbalances, and an Arrow
LeoNora M. Cohen Conceptual Foundations Individual session Advanced 11/4/2006 7:45 AM - 8:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Acceleration: Research, Policy, and Practice
Eric Calvert
Lisa Huelskamp Conceptual Foundations Individual session Novice 11/4/2006 10:45 AM - 11:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 216B; Capacity: 40

Resiliency and Giftedness: Precursor or Product?
Olha Skyba
Reva Friedman-Nimz Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 10:45 AM - 11:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Gifted Kids: In Their Own Words
Robert A. Schultz
James R. Delisle Conceptual Foundations Individual session Novice 11/4/2006 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 219A; Capacity: 70

I Think Therefore I Am: Understanding Teacher Cognition
Erin Morris Miller Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

The Concept of Giftedness: Making a Case for Teacher/Parent Mutual Understanding
Robin M. Schader
Christine J. Briggs Conceptual Foundations Individual session Novice 11/4/2006 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 216A; Capacity: 40

Conceptions of Giftedness Revisited: Deja Vu All Over Again?
Michael C. Pyryt Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 2:45 PM - 3:45 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 216B; Capacity: 40

The Ethics of Leadership: Philosophical Foundations for Gifted Education
Todd Kettler
Julie Lenner McDonald Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 2:45 PM - 3:45 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Epigenesis: Is it another way to say nurture?
Angela M. Housand Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Perfectionism and Goal Orientation: Is There a Correlation Within Academically Talented Students?
Victoria C. Stewart
Toni A. Sondergeld Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM Charlotte Convention Center - 216B; Capacity: 40

Sociological Theories of Delinquency: Can they Explain Delinquency Among the Gifted?
Sherry Pamelia Bovey Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/4/2006 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Designing Instruction for the Gifted: Applying Lessons Learned from the Expertise Research
Fred Estes Conceptual Foundations Individual session Novice 11/5/2006 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

"Aesthetic Literacy, Gargoyles and the Gifted Field Trip"
Kathryn LaFever Conceptual Foundations Individual session Novice 11/5/2006 8:45 AM - 9:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 204; Capacity: 50

Aesthetics of the Heart
LeoNora M. Cohen
Gail N. Herman
Sally D. Stephenson Conceptual Foundations Individual session Intermediate 11/5/2006 8:45 AM - 9:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 201A; Capacity: 65

Integral Development and Care of the Gifted: Where Body, Mind, Soul and Spirit Merge
P. Susan Jackson
Vicky Frankfourth Moyle Conceptual Foundations Individual session Advanced 11/5/2006 8:45 AM - 9:45 AM Charlotte Convention Center - 205; Capacity: 50

CONVENIENT LINKS TO CONVENTION INFORMATION -

Convention at-a-glance: http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=1056
Division page: http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=1443
Convention information and schedule: http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=1381

DIVISION OFFICERS

Chair:
Cheryl Ackerman
University of Delaware
107 Pearson Hall
Newark, DE 19716
cmackerman@excite.com

Chair-Elect (Program Chair):
Abbey Block Cash
47 Broad Street
Kinderhook, New York 12106
Acash@berk.com

Acting Assistant Program Chair:
Nora Cohen
School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
cohen1@orst.edu

Past Chair:
Bob Schultz
College of Education
University of Toledo
Robert.Schultz@utoledo.edu

Newsletter Editor:
Margaret Leigh
Dixie State College of Utah
225 South 700 East
St. George, UT 84770-3876
leigh@dixie.edu or
leighma@charter.net

Assistant Newsletter Editor:
Erin Morris Miller
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, VA 22801
millerem@jmu.edu

Acting Secretary-Treasurer:
Darla Gail Bohn
darlagbohn@aol.com

Publications & Annotated Bibliography:
Don Ambrose
849 Sandy Run Road
Yardley, PA 19067
ambrose@rider.edu
and
Nora Cohen
School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
cohen1@orst.edu

Archivist/Historian:
Volunteer needed

Website Coordinator:
Volunteer needed

HAVE AN ARTICLE YOU'D LIKE PUBLISHED?

We are always interested in articles about the conceptual foundations of gifted education. We particularly enjoy theoretical, innovative, and reflective articles which promote deep and fresh ideas, but any article of interest to Division members will be considered. Please submit by 2/15/07.

To submit materials to **Conceptual Foundations** contact:

Dr. Margaret Leigh
225 South 700 East
St. George, UT 84770
(435) 652-7849
leigh@dixie.edu or
leighma@charter.net

or
Dr. Erin Morris Miller
millerem@jmu.edu