INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/5196

8404564

Koonvisal, Dararat

SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS: A GIFTED CURRICULUM PROBLEM

The University of Oklahoma PH.D. 1983

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages _____
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Other Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received.

University
Microfilms
International

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS: A GIFTED CURRICULUM PROBLEM

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DARARAT KOONVISAL

Norman, Oklahoma

1983

SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS:

A GIFTED CURRICULUM PROBLEM

APPROVED BY

Michael Langenbach

Betty Myers

Jay C. Smith

John D. Cattini

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation for the support and guidance so generously provided by my chairman, Dr. Michael Langenbach. Not only during the period of working on this dissertation, but throughout my graduate studies, he has been an admirable model of what a scholar should be. His incisive critiques of the several drafts of this paper and his unfailing patience enabled me to complete this project.

I am indebted to Dr. Thomas Wiggins and Dr. Jay Smith for their inspiration and suggestions regarding the method and report of this study. I am grateful to Dr. Betty Myers for her caring advice and helpful queries; and I am appreciative of Dr. John Catlin for his support and assistance during this undertaking.

My heartfelt thanks goes to Dr. Pamela Milchrist, California State at Sacramento, for her friendship and editing; and to Dr. Anthony Stigliano, U.C. Berkeley, for his professional advice on the concept of equality.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and my husband, Chaiyouth Yongpravat, whose support has always been there.

SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS:

A GIFTED CURRICULUM PROBLEM

BY DARARAT KOONVISAL

MAJOR PROFESSOR: MICHAEL LANGENBACH, Ph.D.

One of the commonly found curriculum problems is slippage or inconsistencies between those ideas of a planning group and the implementation of such ideas. This study attempted to provide a better perspective for understanding slippage that might occur in selected gifted programs.

The study used the Goodlad Conceptual System as a guide to trace slippage between the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs. These domains are among the five domains of a curriculum that are identified by the Conceptual System. The ideological domain contains the ideas of an educational planning group while the formal domain contains the written curriculum.

According to Goodlad, slippage is likely to occur in the transaction of an idea from the ideological domain to the other domains and the only way to trace slippage is by comparing each domain's commonplaces. Commonplaces are substantive elements that are common to curriculum development. Three of these commonplaces relative to a curriculum for gifted education are: statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, and identification and selection methods. The first commonplace is usually contained in the ideological domain while the second and third

ones are in the formal domain.

The major question was: What are the patterns of slippage between the value positions of equality of educational opportunity underlying the two domains of the sample programs?

Three minor questions needed to be answered before the study could answer the major question. The first one concerned the development of a framework for analysis. The second and third ones concerned the analysis of the two domains of each sample program.

The sample consisted of the eighteen programs from the Educational Research Service,1979, and additional information from their school districts and state guidelines.

A descriptive procedure was employed in the study. The design permitted the analysis of slippage between egalitarian and elitist positions embraced in the two domains of each sample program.

The inferential value position(s) underlying the ideological domain was revealed by an analysis of the statements of philosophy of the program. The inferential value position(s) underlying the formal domain was revealed by an analysis of its definition of giftedness and the identification and selection methods used. Slippage between the two domains, if any, was revealed by an assessment of the inconsistencies between these inferential value positions.

The study provided two main conclusions. First, the study found a way to analyze slippage between the two domains of a gifted program regarding the concept of equality of educational opportunity. Second, some slippage was found, thus making more credible Goodlad's conception of curriculum domains.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF GIFTED EDUCATION IN THE U.S.	17
	The Emergence of the Gifted Child Movement (1910-1930)	18
	The Gifted Child in Depression and War (1930-1945)	27
	The Gifted Child in the Cold War (1945-1960)	30
	The Gifted Child in the 1960s	38
	Conclusion	42
III.	CONCEPTIONS OF EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY	44
	A Conceptual Clarification	45
	A Classification of Values	74
	Philosophical Issues Related to Equality	86
	Conclusion	91
IV.	A CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM	93
	Statements of Philosophy	95
	Definitions of Giftedness	100
	Identification and Selection Methods	110
	Conclusion	124
V.	THE RESULTS	126
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	139

Chapter Page

Appendix A: The Data for Analysis 145

Appendix B: The Classification System and The Analysis of the Sample Programs. 168

Bibliography 188

SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS:

A GIFTED CURRICULUM PROBLEM

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Currently, there has been a renewed interest in gifted education. Programs or curricular responses to the needs of this group of children have taken many forms. Inherent in establishing such programs are: statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, and the identification and selection of students who will benefit from the programs. Decisions made about these programs and their components are value-based.

Values are involved in all decision-making in curriculum development. According to the Goodlad Conceptual System, every curriculum consists of five domains of curriculum decision-making.[1] These domains are the ideological, formal, perceived, operational, and experiential curricula.

The ideological curricula are those that are proposed as desirable by some planning group. Such curricula oftentimes are the preface to the formal curricula as those that are written in the statements of

---

[1]Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, N.Y., McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979, pp. 58-64

philosophy of a program or in other "This we believe" statements. The formal curricula are those that have been prescribed by some controlling agency in a written form and have gained official approval by a state or a local school board. The perceived curricula are those that various interested persons perceive in their minds to be the curricula. The operational curricula are those that can be observed at the instructional level. The last ones, the experiential curricula, are those that are experienced by students. In making curriculum decisions, there should be consistency among the values underlying all of these domains.[1]

Slippage, a phenomenon which is one of the commonly found curriculum problems,[2] may arise when there is inconsistency of values between and among domains.[3] This phenomenon occurs when an idea from the ideological domain is put into practice. Some of its elements may be modified through the sociopolitical and personal interpretative processes involved in the transaction.[4]

The only way to trace slippage is by examining the inconsistency of the values underlying each domain's commonplaces.[5] According to

---

[1]Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p. 59

[2]Tanner, D. and Tanner, L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, N.Y., Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975, p. 65; A study of schooling by Goodlad and associates also found serious discrepancies between curricula of intentions and practices. (Goodlad, J.I. et al., Looking Behind the Classroom Door, Belmont, CA., Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1974, pp. 39-94; Goodlad, J.I. "What Goes on in Our Schools?" Educational Researcher, 6, 3, March 1977, p. 4)

[3]Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit., p. 59

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., pp. 64-5

Goodlad, commonplaces are areas of ground constituting the focus of discourse in regard to which each discussant must take a position.[1] Three of these commonplaces are: statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, identification and selection methods. The first is in the ideological domain while the second and third are in the formal domain.

Although there may be slippage regarding the commonplaces among all of the five domains, it is extremely difficult to sort out and relate these commonplaces. Goodlad warns that it is not easy to investigate "what the student is learning, what the teacher is teaching, and what the curriculum maker intended for both."[2] It is, however, feasible to investigate the inconsistencies of the values underlying the ideological and formal domains because their products are usually in a written form, permitting an objective analysis.

The conceptions of 'equality of educational opportunity' were selected for the study because they are associated with the allocation of scarce resources,[3] a philosophical issue in developing gifted programs.[4] Such an issue occurs because the application of the concept required one's value judgements.[5] One analysis of the concept in the curriculum context

---

[1]Goodlad, J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,pp. 40-1

[2]Ibid., p. 65

[3]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development, San Francisco, Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1980, p. 284

[4]Sisk, D.A. "Issues and Future Directions in Gifted Education" Gifted Child Quarterly, 24, 1, Winter 1980, p. 31

[5]The point that the application of the concept requires one's value judgements has been made by several philosophers. (see, Ennis, R.H. "Equality of Educational Opportunity" Educational Theory, 26, 1, Winter 1976, p. 4)

showed that these judgements involve two value positions, an egalitarian and an elitist.[1] Whether to include and/or exclude students must be decided.

As one of the values held by American schools and society,[2] conception(s) of equality of educational opportunity may be included in the ideological domain of a gifted program. By analyzing the statements of philosophy of that program or of its state guideline, it is possible to infer the value position(s) underlying the ideological domain. The previous analysis of the concept implies that one or two value position(s), i.e., an elitist and/or an egalitarian, appeared to be the value(s) underlying such statements.

At the same time, it is possible to infer the value position(s) of the concept underlying the formal domain of a gifted program by analyzing the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection methods that appear in the program description. A review of the literature revealed that these commonplaces in the formal domain of some gifted programs seemed to indicate an elitist position in three ways.

First, definitions of giftedness typically restrict the number of the school-age population whom to be served as gifted children and the areas of performance that are to be considered gifted. A survey of state guidelines indicated that in the academic year of 1978-80, only 1.92% of the school-age population have been served as gifted children.

---

[1]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit., pp. 268-77

[2]Getzels, J.W. "The Acquisition of Values in School and Society" in Chase,F.S. and Anderson,H.A.(eds.) The High School in a New Era, Chicago, The U. of Chicago Press, 1958,pp. 146-61

The same study also showed that forty-four states have current policy statements indicating their strong belief that individuals possessing high potential in intellectual ability should be designated as gifted.[1]

Second, the identification methods used to select students into the program are usually based on a cut-off IQ score. Renzulli's informal survey of gifted programs and state guidelines showed that high IQ scores are almost always the "bottom line" to admit students into the programs.[2]

Third, a review of a survey of gifted program descriptions indicated that the program prototypes typically used are in the form of special classes or other forms that select students in the beginning of the year and keep classes intact all year.[3]

The above practices of the commonplaces, i.e., definitions of giftedness, identification and selection methods, in the formal domain may be inferred to be elitist since they seemed to exclude students who might have special needs from gifted programs.[4] Such an inference is based on recent research findings that suggest limitations of the IQ tests. Guilford's Structure of Intellect Model (SOI), for example, has empirically

---

[1]Zettel, J.S. Gifted and Talented Education from a Nationwide Perspective, Reston, VA., The Council for Exceptional Children, December 1980, p. 20, 22

[2]Renzulli, J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?" Gifted Child Quarterly, 24,1, 1980, p. 4; Renzulli, J.S. et al. "Book Reviews: Response by the Authors" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25, 4, 1981, p. 188

[3]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, Arlington, VA., ERS Information Aid, 1975, pp. 9-54

[4]Callahan, C.M. "Myth: There must be 'Winner' and 'Losers' in Identification and Programming!" Gifted Child Quarterly, 26, 1, Winter 1982. p. 17

demonstrated that there are potentially 120 discreet and independent intellectual abilities.[1] In this connection, Taylor claims that IQ tests tap no more than eight of the 120 abilities delineated in the Guilford Model.[2]

An alternative model to the common practices of the two commonplaces in the formal domain may increase one's confidence in making an assumption that such practices are elitist. The model is the Revolving Door Identification Medel (RDIM) developed by Renzulli. It defines giftedness as a set of behaviors including above average abilities, task commitment, and creativity.[3] Since Renzulli recognizes that these gifted behaviors are both topical and temporal in nature; he suggests the use of identification methods as an on-going treatment that permits talent to emerge and allows students to flow in and out of a gifted program.[4] That is, the two commonplaces in Renzulli's model are designed to include a large number of students in the program.

In summary, despite the two value positions regarding the concept 'equality of educational opportunity' available in the idelogical domain, the value underlying the formal domain of some gifted programs appeared to indicate only an elitist position. Thus, there may be a basis for assuming that there is the possibility of finding slippage

---

[1]Guilford, J.P. The Nature of Human Intelligence, N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967

[2]Taylor, C.W. "Multi-Talent Potential" in Project Implode, Igniting Creative Potential, Salt Lake City, Project Implode, Bella Vista-IBRIC, 1971,p.9

[3]Renzulli, J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60, 3, pp.180-4, 261

[4]Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?",op. cit.,p.5

between the two domains of some of these programs.

Slippage may involve bias or carelessness. The right to include or exclude children in or from special programs can give curriculum developers a sense of power and may result in decisions that are arbitrary, paternalistic, or ideologically motivated.[1]

The amount of slippage or nonrationality can be reduced if curriculum decision makers are aware of their own values as well as other alternative value positions available and continue to check the compatibility of values underlying the ideological and formal domains.[2] There is a need, therefore, to investigate how the selected programs respond to the needs of these children by analyzing slippage between the two domains vis-à-vis the conceptions of equality of educational opportunity they embrace.

Statement of the Problem

The major question is: What are the patterns of slippage between the value positions of equality of educational opportunity underlying the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs? More specifically, the answers to the following questions are sought:

1. Can a framework be derived by dichotomously categorizing the thoughts of the egalitarians and the elitists regarding the inclusive and exclusive criteria? Maybe one of the categories can be borrowed and applied to analyze gifted programs by answering the following questions:

---

[1]Pratt, D. Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit.,pp. 268-77

[2]Jordan, J.A. "Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker" in Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,pp.303-42

1.1 What would be the ideal of each position regarding the statements of philosophy in the ideological domain of a gifted program?

1.2 What would be the ideal of each position regarding the two commonplaces in the formal domain of a gifted program:

1.2.1 the definition of giftedness,

1.2.2 the identification and selection method?

2. What is (are) the inferential value position(s) underlying the ideological domain of each sample program? More specifically, can the statements of philosophy of each sample program be analyzed and classified to reveal its inferential value position(s) by using the developed framework in 1?

3. What is (are) the inferential value position(s) underlying the formal domain of each sample program? More specifically, can the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection method of each sample program be analyzed and classified by using the framework developed in 1?

Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the study will increase the understanding of 'slippage' by explicitly acknowledging what value choices of the concept 'equality of educational opportunity' exist and comparing them to the actual commonplaces of the selected program descriptions. It is also hoped that such an understanding can lead to hypotheses and generalization for further study. The developed criteria can be used as a data source to check the amount of slippage that may occur in one's own program. It may be that some slippage is inevitable, but maybe some could be eliminated or prevented by establishing such criteria.

Design of the Study

Because little is known about 'slippage'[1], a descriptive method will be used in the study.[2] The questions of the study will be pursued through the following procedures:

1. Slippage between the ideological and formal domains will be described and illustrated by analyzing the eighteen sample gifted program descriptions that are obtained from the ERS Information Aid.[3] The ERS selected these sample from 370 school districts on the basis of length and variety.[4] It is purported by the ERS that the sample is representative of the variety of gifted programs. To ensure their current practice and obtain additional information, personal inquiries accompanied with the copies of program descriptions of the sample will be sent to those school districts for updating the information.

The study will compare the inconsistencies of the value positions underlying the commonplaces (i.e., the statements of philosophy, the definition of giftedness, and the identification and selection method) of the two domains that are contained in the formal curricula of a sample program in view of eighteen separate analyses. Such comparisons will be done by using the framework that will be developed in the next

---

[1] Goodlad, J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p.65

[2] Smith and Meux suggested that if little is known about a phenomenon, the way to begin an investigation of it is to observe, analyze, and classify the phenomenon. (Smith,B.O. and Meux,M. A Study of the Logic of Teaching, Research Project 258(7257), USOE, Urbana, Ill., University of Illinois, 1958, p.8)

[3] Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,pp.9-54

[4] Ibid.,p.8

step to analyze the statements of philosophy of each program to reveal the inferential value position(s) underlying the ideological domain and to analyze its definition of giftedness as well as its identification and selection method to reveal the inferential value position(s) underlying the formal domain of that program.

2. The development of the framework for analysis, at the outset, will involve two major steps. First, the study will develop a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction regarding the inclusive and exclusive criteria. Second, the study will borrow and apply these categories to the review of the literature on opinions and practices regarding those commonplaces in the ideological and formal domains (i.e., statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, and identification and selection methods) to form each position's constellation of commonplaces.

2.1 The data for developing the categories of the concept of equality of educational opportunity on an egalitarian-elitist distinction will be explored by reviewing the literature in the following areas:

2.1.1 A conceptual clarification of the concept including analyses on the concepts 'equality' and 'educational opportunity' and the applications of the inclusive and exclusive theses[1] in the context of gifted education.

---

[1]Two studies on this concept showed that the majority of philosophers seemed to agree that there are two kinds of equality, the inclusive and the exclusive theses. That is, to treat people in the same way, or to treat them in a different way. (DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity" Doctoral Dissertation, UC Berkeley, 1972, pp. 8-54; Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping" Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana U., 1970, p. 60)

2.1.2 The thought of each position regarding the application of the inclusive and exclusive theses for the development of a gifted program.

2.1.3 Philosophical issues in the development of gifted programs.

2.2 The ideal of each position regarding the commonplaces (i.e., the statements of philosophy, the definition of giftedness, and the identification and selection method) of a gifted program will be explored by borrowing and applying the categories in 2.1 to the review of the literature on gifted education. The data will be obtained from the following sources:

2.2.1 An overview of opinions and practices regarding the above commonplaces.

2.2.2 The eighteen sample program descriptions from the ERS and their updated information.

3. The value position(s) on the concept underlying the statements of philosophy of each sample program will be inferred by using the criteria developed in the second step. The sample for analysis will be the eighteen sample programs from the ERS, their updated information, and their state guidelines. The analysis in this step will reveal the inferential value position(s) underlying the ideological domain of each of the sample programs.

4. The value position(s) on the concept underlying the two commonplaces in the formal domain (i.e., the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection method) of each sample program will be revealed by using the criteria developed in the second step. The sample for analysis will be the same as those in the third step. The analysis in

this step will reveal the inferential value position(s) underlying the formal domain of each of the sample programs.

5. Once the value position(s) underlying the ideological and the formal domains of each of the sample programs is identified, the next concern will be to assess the inconsistencies of these positions, if any, and find commonalities among them. The result will describe the patterns of slippage between the two domains of the eighteen sample programs.

In summary, the study will investigate the patterns of slippage between the ideological and formal domains of selected programs by using the framework that will be developed in Chapter IV to analyze each of the eighteen sample programs.

Definition of Terms

Curriculum is conceived as a written document.[1]

'Components' and 'commonplaces' are used synonymously to mean substantive elements that are common to any curriculum discourse, analysis, and development.[2] In this study, 'commonplaces' refers to : statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, and identification and selection methods.

A 'concept' and a 'conception': A concept is commonality among different conceptions; and, a conception is the idea on how to achieve and implement a particular concept.[3] For example, American educators

---

[1]Beauchamp, G.A. Curriculum Theory, Wilmette, Ill., The Kagg Press, 1975, p. 199

[2]Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit., p. 66

[3]Rawls, J. A Theory of Justice, Cambridge, Mass., The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 5-6

are generally agreed that the concept of equality should be implemented, but they are often disagreed upon the conception or how to achieve and implement such a concept.[1]

A conceptual system: "A framework designed to identify and reveal relationships among complex, related, interacting phenomena in the field of curriculum."[2] Since it is more general than a theory, it suggests realms for hypothesizing; but, does not itself mandate a specific hypothesis.

A dichotomy: One way of formulating a set of categories to classify a concept which permits only two mutually exclusive applications of that concept, e.g., Protestant or Catholic, Democratic or Republican.[3]

A 'domain of curriculum' and a 'level' are used synonymously. It means the human processes and products of curriculum making.

The 'formal' domain contains those curricula that have been prescribed by some controlling agency in a written form and gain official approval by a state or a local school board.

'Gifted' and 'talented' are used synonymously. This usage results from the belief that 'giftedness' consists of an interaction among three clusters of human traits: above average ability, task com-

---

[1]Ennis, R.H. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.4

[2]Goodlad, J.I. and Richter, M.N.,Jr., The Development of a Conceptual System for Dealing with Problems of Curriculum and Instruction, U. of California,Los Angeles, 1966, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 010 064, p. 3

[3]Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Barton, A.H. "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification, Typologies, and Indices" in Lerner, D. and Lasswell, H.D. (eds.) The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method, CA., Stanford U. Press, 1951, pp. 169-70

mitment, and creativity.[1]

The 'ideological' domain contains those curricula that are proposed as desirable by some planning group. Such curricula oftentimes are the preface to the formal curricula as those that are written in the statements of philosophy of a program or in other "This we believe" statements. According to Goodlad, these statements usually serve rhetorical more than curriculum ends.[2]

Slippage: A curriculum phenomenon of domain-to-domain discrepancy. This phenomenon is a result from the sociopolitical and personal interpretative processes involved in the adoption and implementation.[3]

Value: A belief that something is good or bad, desirable, or undesirable. Values are basic to the determination of all educational decisions.

Limitations of the Study

Because of the difficulty in sorting out and relating commonplaces among the five curricular domains, the study is limited to the investigation of slippage between the ideological and the formal domains.

The sample used in the study is limited to those that are provided by the ERS.[4] Since the sample was not selected randomly, the

---

[1]Renzulli, J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" op. cit., p. 216

[2]Goodlad, J.I. (ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit., p. 346

[3]Ibid., p. 59

[4]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit., pp. 9-54

findings will not be generalizable. Rather, it will provide curriculum workers with "intellectual instrumentalities"[1] to guide them in observation and interpretations of slippage in their own and other programs.

The analysis of values underlying the ideological domain of the sample programs is limited to the conceptions of 'equality of educational opportunity' contained in the philosophical statements of these programs or of their state guidelines.

The study is also limited to the bias from the author's hidden values. Some curriculum researchers have suggested that such values which influenced the author's perceptions of school practices and the data secured should be made explicit.[2] It is the belief of the author that giftedness is a situational conception that can be developed if students have the opportunity to engage in a wide range of activities, and they should not be arbitrary excluded from this opportunity on a relatively permanent basis.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into six chapters. Chapter I includes: the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the design of the study, difinitions of terms, and limitations of the study.

Chapters II and III contain reviews of related literature. Chap-

---

[1]Bellack, A.A. "Contrasting Approaches to Research on Teaching" in Tabachnik, B.R. et al. (eds.) Studying Teaching and Learning: Trends in Soviet and American Research, N.Y., Praeger Publishers, 1981,pp.62-9

[2]For example, Tanner, D. and Tanner, L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, op. cit.,p.71; Macdonald, J.B. "Values Bases and Issues for Curriculum" in Molnar,A. and Zohorik, J.A. (eds.) Curriculum Theory, Washington, D.C.,ASCD,1977,pp.16-21; Goodlad, J.I. et al. Looking Behind the Classroom Door, op. cit., p.11

ter II is a historical overview of gifted education in the U.S. Chapter III is a review of analyses on the conceptions of equality of educational opportunity.

Chapter IV provides a framework for analysis. In Chapter V, the results of the analysis of the data are furnished. Chapter VI consists of a summary of the study, conclusions based on data obtained, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF GIFTED EDUCATION IN THE U.S.

A common feature of gifted education found among its historical analyses was its cyclical nature. The wanning and the rising of public interest fluctuated according to the elitist and egalitarian social periods.[1]

The major purpose of this chapter is to reveal the cyclical nature of the gifted child movement. Such a historical overview will be an aid to the development of a dichotomous category[2] of an egalitarian-elitist distinction in the next two chapters. It will also help develop an understanding of the past movements on the present situation.[3]

---

[1]Tannenbaum,A.J. "A Backward and Forward Glance at the Gifted" The National Elementary Principal,51,5,pp 14-23; Idem, "History of Interest in the Gifted" in Hanry, N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE,Part II, Chicago, Ill.,U. of Chicago Press,1958,pp.3-38; Idem,"Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate: Concern about the Gifted" in Passow,A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development,The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE,Part I,Chicago, Ill., U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.5-27

[2]Kolb,W.L."Values,Determinism and Abstraction" in Barrett,D.N. (ed.)Values in America,Notre Dame,Indiana,U. of Notre Dame Press,1961,p.53

[3]Bellack,A.A."History of Curriculum Thought and Practice" Review of Educational Research,39,3,pp.283-91; Kliebard,H."The Curriculum Field in Retrospect" in Witt,P.W.F.(ed.) Technology and the Curriculum,N.Y., Teacher College Press,1968,pp.69-84; Nash,Paul History and Education:The Educational Uses of the Past,N.Y.,Random House,1970,pp.20-1

The cyclical nature of gifted education will be examined in four different periods: 1910-1930, 1930-1945, 1945-1960, and 1960s. During the first and the third periods, gifted education was receiving the national interest. Such an interest, however, declined during the second and the fourth periods.

Each period will be examined by using a three part approach. Part one will overview major events and contributions. Parts two and three will overview opinions and practices regarding definitions of giftedness and identification and selection methods, especially in term of an egalitarian-elitist distinction. In order to reveal such a distinction, the making of inferences in this chapter will be based on the criteria that the egalitarians would include many children in a program while the elitists would exclude many children from the program.[1]

The Emergence of the Gifted Child Movement (1910-1930)

The context in this period was marked by an expansion of American business, the belief that reforms were failing, and that there was a decline in general mental ability due to the poor heredity of immigrants.[2] The shortage of mental ability ideology, therefore, became a major concern, and heredity was seen as the basic problem underlying this ideology. As a result of such a concern, schools during this period

---

[1]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development, op.cit.,pp. 268-84

[2]Hildenbrand, Susan "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1978, p.205

searched for new forms of organization and classification of students.[1]

Major Events and Contributions

Interest in the field was fostered by Galton's book Hereditary Genius which concluded that heredity was the prime determinant of intellectual ability.[2] Extensive investigations of the gifted, however, were not undertaken then because of the prevailing political philosophy of democratic sentiment that "All men were created equal," and the beliefs that the gifted were products of supernatural causes and often pathological.[3] Examples of the myths commonly found in this period were: "early ripe, early rot" and that the gifted were emotionally unstable, physically weak, and/or undersized.[4]

With the concern that the myths about the gifted were injuring their development,[5] Terman and his associates conducted a longitudinal study of these children after he had completed his American revision of the Binet-Simon Scale, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test.[6] The study

---

[1]Hildenbrand,S."Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960",op. cit.,p.204

[2]Galton,Francis Hereditary Genius, London,1869,cited in Tannenbaum, A.J."History of Interest in the Gifted",op. cit.,p.26

[3]Terman,L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius,vol. 1: Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children,CA.,Stanford U. Press, 1925, preface

[4]Sears,P.S."The Terman Genetic Studies of Genius,1922-1972" in Passow,A.H.(ed.)The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, op. cit.,p.75

[5]Terman,L.M. et al.Genetic Studies of Genius,vol. 1:Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children,op. cit.,preface

[6]Terman,L.M. The Measurement of Intelligence,Boston,Houghton Mufflin, 1961

reflected his interest in children who scored at the extremely high end of the scale. He was confident that they were a very able and potentially productive part of the population.[1]

Terman's sample was a group of 1,000 California children who scored in the top one percent of the Stanford-Binet or had an IQ of 140 or higher.[2] He then measured them on a host of physical, intellectual, and social qualities. Terman compared the means of these measures with similar measures from samples of children who had not been selected for high IQ. Neither of the samples was a random sample of the American population.[3]

The findings from Terman's study have been summarized by Gowan[4] and Hildenbrand.[5] The major finding of this study was that the gifted group was different from the average in degree of general intelligence which could be measured by IQ tests.[6] The study also showed that children from the gifted group were superior to the average in the other sample

---

[1]Terman, L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius,vol.1: Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children, op. cit.,preface

[2]Terman, L.M."The Physical and Mental Traits of Gifted Children" in Whipple, G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington, Ill.,Public School Publishing Co.,1924,pp.115-67 (The standard in Terman's study was actually lower for children over eleven years of age. At the age of fourteen, the IQ of 132 was the lowest score for inclusion in the study. Terman, L.M.et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol.1:Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children,op.cit.,p.26)

[3]Ibid., p.156

[4]Gowan, J.C. "Background and History of the Gifted Child Movement" in Stanley, J.C. et al.(eds.) The Gifted and the Creatives: A Fifty-Year Perspective, Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press, 1977,pp.13-4

[5]Hildenbrand, S. "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America,1910-1960", op. cit.,p.206

[6]Tannenbaum, A.J."History of Interest in the Gifted", op. cit.,p.25

in all areas of growth and development.[1]

Terman's major study, Genetic Studies of Genius, was begun in 1921 and is still in progress, tended to establish a model of giftedness that became the closest thing to a theoretical framework in the movement of gifted education. The study has survived, with minor modifications, to the present.[2] Contemporary researchers, such as Julian Stanley,[3] still consider his study of major importance.

Terman's work leaned toward an elitist position[4] because it emphasized genetic factors and the differences in racial and socioeconomic intelligence. His study, therefore, identified only a small number of children as being gifted. The use of high and middle socioeconomic status children from which he chose his sample showed a bias in sample selection. Such a bias could account for the "superiority" of socioeconomic status more than high IQ.[5]

The elitist value showed not only in Terman's selection of the sample, but also in his findings. He found that the percentage of intelligent children was high among those who had English, Scotch, and Jewish origins, but was low among those who had Mexican, Spanish, Italian, Por-

---

[1]Terman, L.M. "The Physical and Mental Traits of Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.167

[2]Sears, P.S. "The Terman Genetic Studies of Genius, 1922-1972", op. cit., pp.75-96

[3]Stanley, J.C. et al. (eds.) The Gifted and the Creatives: A Fifty Year Perspective, op. cit.

[4]Hildenbrand, S. "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", op. cit.,p.207

[5]Roedell, W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, N.Y.,Teacher College Columbia U., 1980, p. 64

tuguese and Negro origins.[1] Such a finding supported the belief that high IQ was a hereditary characteristic that could not be developed among those who lacked it. In addition, Terman also found that superior intelligence was five times as common among children of superior social status as it was among children of inferior status.[2]

Definitions of Giftedness

In practice, giftedness was generally defined as intellectual or academically superior which was indicated by the IQ scores of 125 and above.[3] The majority of scholars in the two early Yearbooks of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) on the gifted,[4] excepted Baldwin, Rugg, and Townsend, also defined giftedness in term of academically superior.

Baldwin, Rugg, and Townsend were among the earliest advocates for broadening the definition of giftedness. While Baldwin proposed the inclusion of both aesthetic and physical abilities;[5] Rugg called attention to four kinds of giftedness: verbal, social, mechanical, and esthetic.

---

[1] Terman,L.M. "The Physical and Mental Traits of Gifted Children" op. cit.,p.164

[2] Terman,L.M. The Measurement of Intelligence, op. cit.,pp.95-104

[3] Rugg,H.O. "The Curriculum for Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M. (ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, op. cit.,p.91

[4] Henry,T.S.(ed.) Classroom Problems in the Education of Gifted Children, The Nineteenth Yearbook of the NSSE,Part II,Bloomington,Ill., Public School Publishing Co.,1920; Whipple,G.M.(ed.)Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, the Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, op. cit.

[5] Baldwin,B.T."Methods of Selecting Superior or Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, op. cit.,p.39

Rugg further pointed out the graduation in ability from the level of true genius (perhaps one in a million) down to those of less conspicuous ability (perhaps one in a hundred) and suggested that the actual number depended on one's definition of "giftedness".[1] Townsend warned that the development of gifted programs would be undemocratic if individual differences meant "that some individuals are worth more than others or that some are to use and others to be used."[2] His warning implied that he concerned about the needs of every individual and he would include many abilities in his definition of giftedness.

Giftedness was also compared to the handicapped. According to Hildenbrand, it was often said in this period that the gifted deserved special treatment, similar to the treatment of the handicapped. Her analysis showed that the use of tests and the normal curve made the above argument sound rational and "scientific".[3]

Identification and Selection Methods

Before the IQ tests were developed in 1916, teachers' judgements were used as a selection method in schools that offered flexible gifted programs, or promotion of gifted students to the grade level above them.[4]

Several sources seemed to indicate that the most popular method

---

[1] Rugg,H.O."The Curriculum for Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.93

[2] Townsend,H.G."The Democratic Idea and the Education of Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, op. cit.,p.154

[3] Hildenbrand, Susan "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", op. cit.,p.22

[4] Whipple,G.M. "Historical and Introductory" in Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, op. cit.,p.9

for identification used during the 1920s was intelligence tests. One study showed that teachers' judgements, tests, and school marks were the popular methods used in elementary schools.[1] Studies by Omans and Jensen found that intelligence tests were generally used.[2] A survey conducted by the NSSE also showed that intelligence examinations were used more often than teachers' judgements.[3]

In regard to the commonly found criteria for admission to gifted programs, IQ scores ranging from 110 to 140 or more were used.[4] According to Rugg, these criteria, would include the top third of the class as the gifted, or the so-called X-Y-Z Method which divided each grade into three sections.[5] Such criteria were lower than those of 125 and above in the typical definition of giftedness and those used in Terman's study.

Opinions in the field, which appeared in the Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, showed that scholars seemed to recognize IQ tests as one instrument among other methods. Townsend, for example, criticized equally those who made claims for the tests as if intelligence difference had been the only significant difference, and those who saw democracy as sameness for all. He took a middle position by reducing the impor-

---

[1]Freeman,F.N. "Provision in the Elementary School for Superior Children" Elementary School Journal,21, Oct. 1920,pp.117-31

[2]Omans,A.C."Provisions for Ability Grouping in Junior and Senior High School"American School Board Journal,45,Oct.1922,pp.55-8; Jensen,D. "The Gifted Child: Present Practices in Special Classes for the Gifted" Journal of Educational Research,15, March 1927,p.202

[3]Baldwin,B.T. "Methods of Selecting Superior or Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.28

[4]Rugg,H.O. "The Curriculum for Gifted Children", op. cit., pp.93-5

[5]Ibid.

tance of IQ tests and recognizing that it was the teacher who would know about the background of the children, not the testers.[1]

Baldwin, in the above Yearbook, warned that selection methods, perhaps conducted only once a year, provided only a single datum of the child and could be misleading and misrepresentative of the gifted. He proposed the consideration of several factors, i.e., physical growth and psychological age, intelligence and achievement tests, and teachers' judgements in the selection of the gifted.[2] Such a suggestion seemed to base on Terman's finding that the gifted were superior in all areas of growth and development when compared with average children.

In contrast to the above opinions which suggested the use of teacher's judgement as a method to identify the gifted, Terman's study found that the best method was to "consult the record book of the child and not ask the teacher."[3]

Summary

During the 1910-1930 era there was an intense interest in the gifted. The major social concern of the period was the shortage of mental ability. It was believed that the solution for this concern was to find high IQ children and train them for leadership.[4] Such a belief

---

[1]Townsend,H.G."The Democratic Idea and the Education of Gifted Children", op. cit.,pp.145-54

[2]Baldwin,B.T."Methods of Selecting Superior or Gifted Children", op. cit.,pp.25-6,38,42-3

[3]Terman,L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius,vol.1:Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children, op. cit.,p.33

[4]Hildenbrand,Susan "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America,1910-1960", op. cit.,p.207

led Terman to develop the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test and conducted a longitudinal study of intellectually gifted children.

As a spin-off from Terman's study, it was thought that mental giftedness was a hereditary and stable characteristic that could be measured by IQ tests, and that the gifted were deserving of special consideration in schools since they were potentially of great worth to the society. Such an assumption meant only specially selected children could receive the optimum opportunities, therefore, it could be inferred to be relatively elitist. Such a value challenged the traditional roles of American public schools as opportunity brokers.

In practice, schools modified Terman's position to support its role as opportunity brokers by using lower standards to admit students into the program which included the top third of the population as the gifted. Thus, schools found many more children to be gifted than would have been the case under rigorous application of Terman's standards. The value underlying the practice of some gifted programs, however, could be inferred to be relatively elitist. Such an inference was based on the reports of common components employed by those programs in this period: giftedness was generally defined as intellectually gifted, and IQ tests were the most widely used method to identify the gifted.

The major concern of most scholars in the development of gifted programs seemed to be associated with the problems of locating and programming for the academically gifted. Far less interest was given to the nonacademically gifted. IQ tests were recognized as one kind of instruments that needed to be used with other methods.

The Gifted Child in Depression and War (1930-1945)

The context of this period was marked by the great depression and World War II which produced poverty and social discontent.[1] The earlier national concern that mental ability was in short supply declined; and there was the new concern for unity.[2] The Progressive Education movement which began soon after World War I gained popularity with the American public. Cremin summarized the basic characteristics of the movement that featured support practices for diversifying opportunity in various ways and thereby fostering social unity.[3] Special programs for the gifted diminished.[4] Because of inadequate statistics, it was difficult to determine the actual practices regarding the definitions and the selection methods of those programs that survived. Only opinions regarding the two commonplaces, therefore, will be discussed.

Major Events and Contributions

Interest in the gifted ebbed during this period.[5] Some works in psychology during this period represented a shift away from Terman's unitary view of intelligence[6] and toward the idea of mental ability as

---

[1] Hildenbrand, S. "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", op. cit.,p.119

[2] Ibid.,pp.119-20

[3] Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957, N.Y.,Alfred A. Knopf, 1961,pp.vii-ix

[4] Tannenbaum, A.J."History of Interest in the Gifted", op. cit.,p.34

[5] Witty, P. "Nature and Extent of Educational Provisions for the Gifted Pupil" Educational Administration and Supervision,37,Feb.1951,p.65

[6] A characteristic that is general, pervasive, and all-of-a-piece. (Roedell, W.C. et al.,Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.3)

consisting of several separate components. The work of Louis Thurstone, Primary Mental Abilities (1937), for example, suggested the limitations of the use of IQ tests to measure intelligence.[1]

Definitions of Giftedness

To respond to the national concern for unity, Witty contributed a new definition of giftedness. He defined a gifted child as the child whose performance was consistently remarkable in any potentially valuable area.[2] Giftedness, according to this definition, was a successful performance at something useful rather than something that depended entirely on genetic factors and IQ scores. Witty's definition, therefore, seemed to promote unity by encouraging diversification of success.

Identification and Selection Methods

Some opinions on this subject showed a diminution of the importance of IQ tests. Witty[3] and Stoddard[4], for example, agreed that mental tests should be reserved for research and clinical purposes. Such opinions were probably influenced by the progressive ideas for diversifying of opportunity which required the recognition of many kinds of ability.

As another spin-off from the progressive ideas, the selection of the gifted for homogeneous grouping on a relatively permanent basis was

---

[1]Hildenbrand, S. "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", op. cit., p.124

[2]Witty, P. "Some Considerations in the Education of Gifted Children" Educational Administration and Supervision,26,Oct. 1940,pp.512-3

[3]Witty, P. "Evaluation of the Nature-Nurture Controversy" School and Society, 53, Sept. 6,1941, p.156

[4]Stoddard, G. "Intellectual Development of the Child" School and Society, 51, April 27,1940, p.536

perceived by some educators as encouraging the development of class education which rewarded fortunate social heritage and penalized the less fortunate.[1] Enrichment in regular classroom was commonly suggested[2] since it would furnish the best opportunities for all children.[3]

Terman's study, published in 1930, however, contradicted the progressive position of social unity and free choice. He suggested that only the children in the 130 to 140 IQ range were eligible for special programs. He further recommended that schools should concentrate their effort on this group of children, usually consisting of the ten or twenty top-scoring students in a group of one thousand.[4]

Summary

Except for Terman's 1930 publication, interest in gifted education declined during the period 1930-1945. Schools tried to play a major role in the promotion of social unity. Progressivism became the dominant pedagogical ideology and was translated by educators into individualization and guidance to replace the method of ability grouping used in the 1920s. The progressive thought and the social concern for egalitarianism seemed to influence opinions of scholars on the design of gifted programs. Some of these opinions included a broadened definition of giftedness and the

---

[1]For example, Witty,P. "Some Considerations in the Education of Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.519

[2]Tannenbaum, A.J. "History of Interest in the Gifted", op. cit., p.33

[3]Witty,P. "Some Considerations in the Education of Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.519

[4]Terman,L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol.3: The Promise of Youth: Follow-Up Studies of a Thousand Gifted Children,CA.,Stanford U. Press, 1930, p.469

decrease of the importance of IQ tests. The actual practices of these programs, however, were not available for overviewing.

The Gifted Child in the Cold War (1945-1960)

A heightened concern for the gifted reappeared in the early 1950s. This concern was ascribed to the Cold War struggle for scientific and technological leadership, the shortage of resources in high-level manpower, and the critical reappraisals of public school programs.[1] The interest in the gifted was intensified by the launching of Sputnik in 1957.[2]

Major Events and Contributions

Post-war needs had been inadequately met in many areas of high-level specialization. Confronted with the demands of manpower, some educators re-examined the general aims of education and/or prescribed solutions for such demands. The Harvard report in 1945, for example, stressed that equality of opportunity did not mean identical education for all; rather it meant access to the education that matched gifts and interests of students.[3] The report also criticized American public schools for not providing appropriate programs to meet the needs of the fast as well as the slow learners.[4]

---

[1] Tannenbaum, A.J. "History of Interest in the Gifted", op. cit. pp. 35-7

[2] Dodson, D.W. "Factors Influencing Curriculum Development" Review of Educational Research,27,3, June 1957, p.264; Tannenbaum,A.J."Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate Concern About the Gifted", op. cit.,p. 9

[3] Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society, General Education in a Free Society, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard U. Press, 1945, p.86

[4] Ibid.,pp. 7-9

A solution for the above concern was also expressed in a progressive educational document,[1] Education for All American Youth (1944), which was revised in 1952 under the title Education for All American Youth-A Further Look, by the Educational Policies Commission. The document envisioned the fostering of democratic unity through an integrated core curriculum, whereby pervading social problems could be addressed by all the youth of all the people.[2] Conant who served as the chairman of this group of educators declared that this work along with the Harvard Report had armed him to answer all critics of the future of American schools.[3]

The Educational Policies Commission showed their concern not only with the fostering of unity but also with the shortage of manpower. In 1950, they published another document which pointed out that the negligence of mentally superior children in this country had led to the shrinkage of personnel in the sciences, arts, and professions.[4]

The concern for the manpower shortage was heightened by the launching of Sputnik in 1957. The year following Sputnik, both public and private funds were poured into special programs to develop excellence, especially in the field of science and mathematics, with the expectation

---

[1]Cremin, L.A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957, op. cit.,p.332

[2]Educational Policies Commission Education for All American Youth, Washington, D.C.,National Education Association, 1944

[3]Conant, J.B. Public Education and the Structure of American Society, N.Y.,Teacher College Press, 1945, p.33

[4]Educational Policies Commission Education of the Gifted, Washington, D.C.,National Education Association, 1950,p.14

that the gifted would utilize their talents to help the country.[1] There also were movements toward differentiated education for students of varying abilities.[2] Conant, for example, appeared to change his position in curriculum rationale from the fostering of unity in his 1944 publication[3] to the pursuit of academic excellence to meet the dominant sociopolitical forces of the Cold War and space race.

Conant's new position was expressed in his 1959 report on the American high school. Although his report defended the comprehensive high school, it called for the pursuit of academic excellence through ability grouping, special counseling and testing programs.[4] It attracted great attention and exerted considerable influence on educational policy and practice,[5] particularly with regard to the adoption of ability grouping through standardized testing; and the priority given to the academically talented pupils in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.[6]

---

[1]Martin,,D.W. "American Education as Seen in Periodical Literature,1956-1958"Doctor's Thesis,Columbus, Ohio State U.,1959(Dissertation Abstracts 20:2102-103, No. 6,1959); Ford,B.G. and Jenkins,R.C."Changing Perspectives in the Education of the Gifted" in Mann, L.(ed.) The Fourth Review of Special Education,N.Y.,Grune & Stratton, 1980, p.153

[2]Breslow, Alice et al. "Forces Influencing Curriculum" Review of Educational Research, 30,3, June 1960, p.202

[3]Educational Policies Commission Education for All American Youth, op. cit.

[4]Conant, J.B. The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens, N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959

[5]Sand, Ole et al. "Components of the Curriculum" Review of Educational Research, 30,3, June 1960, p.234

[6]Tanner,D. and Tanner,L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, op. cit., p.400

Another group of educators, the National Academy of Science, also gave their priority to the development of the academically gifted. The report of their conference, The Process of Education, authored by the conference chairman, Jerome Bruner, declared: "The top quarter of public school students from which we must draw intellectual leadership in the next generation, is perhaps the group most neglected by our schools in the recent past."[1]

Conant and Bruner's recommendations for the education of the gifted appeared to be less extreme compared with those of some other educators found during this period. Rickover[2] and Bestor[3], for example, sought the abandonment of the comprehensive high school in favor of the dual European system of education.

In regard to scholarly contributions to the field, Guilford wrote a paper on creativity in the early 1950s.[4] His paper suggested the limitations of the assumption that tests of general intelligence, such as those developed by Terman, could be used to identify the gifted. Guilford's work brought attention of psychometrists to measure multiple aptitudes, including divergent production or "creativity".[5]

Guilford's model, the Structure of Intellect (SOI), later embodied

---

[1]Bruner, J.S. The Process of Education, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard U. Press, 1960,p.10

[2]Rickover, H.G. Education and Freedom, N.Y., E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1959

[3]Bestor, Arthur "What Went Wrong with U.S. Schools?" U.S. News & World Report, v. 44, Jan 24,1958, pp.68-77

[4]Guilford, J.P. "Creativity" American Psychologist, 5, 1950,pp. 444-54

[5]Tannenbaum, A.J. "Pre-Sputnik to Post Watergate Concern about the Gifted", op. cit.,p.8

the illustration that there were potentially 120 discreet and independent intellectual abilities.[1] That is, high or low ability in one area was demonstrated to have little or no relation to high or low ability in other areas.[2]

Definitions of Giftedness

Different definitions of giftedness were found among writings in the post war era. The Educational Policies Commission, for example, defined giftedness in term of academics. According to this definition, there were two levels of gifted children, the top one percent, and the top 10 percent. These levels were determined by IQ tests. Only the children in the first level would be advised to pursue the traditional academic program including mathematics and foreign languages.[3]

A broadening definition was adopted by the writers in the Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, which was the first Yearbook of the Society on the gifted since 1924. Their definition included multiple kinds of talents: academics, music, graphic arts, creative writing, dramatics, mechanical skills, and social leadership;[4] and identified 20 percent of the population as the gifted.[5] They also agreed that all children must

---

[1] Guilford, J.P. "Structure of Intellect" Psychological Bulletin, 1956,53, pp.263-93

[2] Roedell, W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.3

[3] Eucational Policies Commission, Education of the Gifted, op. cit., p. 12

[4] Havighurst, R.J. et al. "The Importance of Education for the Gifted" in Henry, N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, op. cit.,p.19

[5] Ibid.

receive individual attention to develop different kinds of talent.[1] Such a definition could be inferred to be relatively egalitarian because it provided a wider variety of opportunities to more children than that of Terman.

Despite the adoption of an egalitarian definition by the above Yearbook of the NSSE, two of its writers, Tannenbaum and Witty, seemed to think that gifted programs were developed for an elite group. They stated their concern on the national issue of the manpower shortage, and saw that this problem could be solved if the gifted were given special training to become the leaders of the society in the future. They pointed out that only specially selected children deserved special kind of education.[2]

In contrast to those who treated giftedness and leadership as fixed traits, were some educators who saw leadership as a situational concept, and therefore opposed the relatively permanent ability grouping. Caswell and Foshay, for example, argued that, "If the democratic process is considered one in which real respect for the personality of every person is basic, with leadership resting on the participation of all and shifting from situation to situation, ability grouping will not be accepted."[3] Such a point seemed to perceive giftedness as a situational concept since leadership was one of the abilities mentioned in the NSSE

---

[1]Havighurst,R.J. et al. "The Importance of Education for the Gifted", op. cit.,p.13

[2]Tannenbaum,A.J. "History of Interest in the Gifted", op. cit., p. 38; Witty,Paul "Who are the Gifted?" in Henry, N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, op. cit.,p.62

[3]Caswell, H.L. and Foshay, A.W. Education in the Elementary School, N.Y.,American Book Co.,1957,pp.339-40

Definition. This conception of giftedness appeared to be unrecognized before in the field of gifted education.

In practice, giftedness was generally defined as academically gifted.[1] Only few school systems adopted the broad conception of giftedness.[2] The Ford Foundation-sponsored program for the gifted in the Portland Public Schools, for example, identified the upper 10 percent of their children who were gifted in different areas stated in the NSSE Definition.[3]

Identification and Selection Methods

The actual practice of gifted programs appeared to use several methods to identify the gifted, but based their final judgement on the cutoff IQ scores of 120-130.[4]

Opinions on the subject seemed to support the use of a combination of several methods to identify the gifted. Witty, for example, pointed out some limitations of IQ tests but recognized these tests as the most effective single instrument. He further recommended that high IQ should be regarded as one of the indicators of possible accomplishment

---

[1] Passow,A.H. "The Nature of Giftedness and Talent" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,1, 1981,p.7

[2] Ibid.

[3] Portland Public Schools, The Gifted Child in Portland, Portland, Oregon, Portland Public Schools, 1959,p.13

[4] De Hann,R.F. and Wilson,R.C. "Identification of the Gifted" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education of the Gifted, op. cit.,pp.190-2; Norris, D.E."Programs in the Elementary Schools" in Henry, N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, op. cit.,pp.223-57; Caswell, H.L. and Foshay,A.W. Education in the Elementary School, op. cit.,pp.339-40

among other methods.[1] De Hann and Wilson also suggested educators to use both standardized tests and observation to identify the gifted.[2] They further noted the merit of self selection, but thought that this method was impossible to use because they assumed that the program was limited to only a very small group of children on a relatively permanent basis.[3]

Some scholars showed a concern for providing equality of educational opportunity in the selection process. Such a concern was stated by De Hann and Wilson, and Strang on the ground that "superior intelligence" children who deserved special educational opportunities could be found among various races and socioeconomic levels.[4] These authors' position, however, appeared to be relatively elitiest since they based giftedness on the genetic assumption that it was possessed by only a small number of children.

Summary

During the period of 1945 to 1960, there was a renewed interest in the gifted. It was a period of a search for talented young people to provide technical and scientific leadership. New monies were put into gifted programs as a result of Sputnik effect Maybe as an influence from Guilford's work which suggested the limitation of IQ tests, rhetoric on the use of multiple definitions of giftedness and identification

---

[1]Witty, Paul "Who are the Gifted?", op. cit.,p.62

[2]De Hann,R.F. and Wilson,R.C. "Identification of the Gifted", op. cit.,p.171

[3]Ibid.,p. 168

[4]Ibid.,p.190; Strang, R. "The Nature of Giftedness" in Henry,N.B. (ed.) Education for the Gifted, op. cit.,p.69

methods was commonly found.

Despite the above rhetoric, some programs appeared to base their final decisions of selecting the gifted on a cut-off IQ score. Moreover, some scholars also stated that the purpose of these programs was to find the intellectually gifted, and give them special education to become leaders in the future. They expected schools to promote national survival by finding and nurturing this special group of children. Such opinions and practices seemed to be relatively elitist because these programs were accessible to only a small number of children.

The Gifted Child in the 1960s

At the end of the 1950s, the social climate shifted to an egalitarian concern and the educational priority was given to the low achievers or the disadvantaged learners.[1] The manpower crisis gradually calmed down, but the supply of scientific talent did not slow down in accordance with the reduced demand.[2] The unrest on campus showed a rejection in excellence and the new spirit of selfhood and individuality became predominant.[3] As in the period of depression and War in the 1930s, there was no available statistics on the actual practices regarding the definitions and selection methods of the programs in the 1960s.

Major Events and Contributions

Gifted education was not perceived as the educational priority

---

[1]Tanner,D. and Tanner, L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, op. cit.,p.407

[2]Tannenbaum,A.J. "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate: Concern about the Gifted", op. cit.,p.21

[3]Ibid.,pp.19-20

in this era. Bruner, for example, changed his priority, which was given to the gifted after the launching of Sputnik, to the low achievers. He criticized the public schools for concentrating on "the more intelligent kids" and neglecting "the children at the bottom."[1]

Tannenbaum attributed the decline of interest to several factors. One of them was the 1954 Supreme Court's decision that separate could never be equal.[2] In his view, the idea of gifted education "never really entered the bloodstream of American education", rather these programs were considered as a luxury that neglected the underprivileged children.[3] In order to keep the field alive, the attention in this period was given to the gifted-disadvantaged children.[4]

At the end of the 1960s, there was a trend toward a renewed interest in the gifted. Such a trend was shown in the passage of the addition to the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 which became Public Law 91-230 in 1970. The law indicated a federal commitment to assist the development and implementation of gifted programs through categorical funding. It also mandated a study by the U.S. Commissioner of Education on the gifted to determine the extent

---

[1]Hall, Elizabeth "Bad Education - A Conversation with Jerome Bruner" Psychology Today, v. 4, December 1970, p.51

[2]Tannenbaum,A.J. "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate: Concern about the Gifted", op. cit.,p. 15

[3]Tannenbaum, A.J. "A Backward and Forward Glance at the Gifted" op. cit.,p.18

[4]Feldman,D. "Toward a Nonelitist Conception of Giftedness" Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 9, May 1979, p.661

to which the needs of these children were being met.[1] This study has been known as the Marland Report. The report stated that the study had shown inadequate educational provisions for these students.[2]

Definitions of Giftedness

A review of textbooks published during the 1960s showed that several definitions were used. Lucito noted the confusion of the term and presented five kinds of definitions: the ex post facto definitions (i.e., the gifted were those who had achieved outstanding stature in one of the professions), the IQ definitions, the percentage definitions, the broadening definitions, and the creativity definitions.[3] Hildreth also noted these definitions and concluded that the trend was toward the broader ones which included the creatively gifted.[4]

In addition, Gardner suggested the use of a broader definition that recognized variety of degree and kinds of ability that were socially accepted. By doing so, he believed that every individual could be enabled to achieve the best, rather than limited excellence for a small group of the ablest.[5] Gardner saw the possibility to cultivate the

---

[1]Marland,S.P. Education for the Gifted and Talented, Report to the Congress by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and Background Papers Submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.,U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972,p.2

[2]Ibid.,p.ix

[3]Lucito,L.J. "Gifted Children" in Dunn,L.M.(ed.) Exceptional Children in Schools, N.Y.,Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1963,pp.183-4

[4]Hildreth,G.H. Introduction to the Gifted, N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co.,1966,p.20

[5]Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too? N.Y.,Harper & Rows Publishers, 1961,pp.128-36

ideal of excellence while retaining the moral value of equality.

Identification and Selection Methods

Intelligence tests, a major instrument for identifying the gifted, came under attack for being biased against some racial minorities and the socioeconomically depressed.[1] Opinions in the field seemed to advocate the use of multiple methods to identify the gifted.[2] Even Conant, who supported the use of standardized tests for ability grouping in his 1959 report, called for a moratorium on testing in favor of school records.[3]

Summary

Interest in the gifted declined during the 1960s. The social context during this period was marked by the concern for the civil rights movement. Equality of opportunity was often perceived as sameness.[4] Schools shifted their priorities from hunting for the gifted to the disadvantaged. At the end of this period, however, there was a sign of a revival of interest as a result of the congressional attention in 1969.

Suggestions on the design of gifted programs were on the use of multiple definitions of giftedness and identification methods. These suggestions could be inferred to be relatively egalitarian because they gave a greater variety of opportunities to more students than

---

[1]For example, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, v.1, Washington, D.C.,U.S. Government Printing Office. 1967,pp.161-2; Schwebel, Milton Who can be Educated? N.Y. Grove Press Inc.,1969,p.68

[2]Hildreth, G.H. Introduction to the Gifted,op. cit.,pp.147,160-71

[3]The New York Times, November 3,1967, p.50

[4]Tannenbaum,A.J. "A Backward and Forward Glance at the Gifted" op. cit.,p.16

Terman's suggestion. Maybe because of the decline in interest, the actual practice of gifted programs during this period was not available for this overview.

Conclusion

A cyclical nature was found to be a common feature of gifted education. This feature was attributed to the alternations of social climates between the opposed ideas of elitism and egalitarianism during different periods.

Because the value underlying definitions of giftedness and selection methods of some gifted programs appeared to be relatively elitist, these programs could not survive during the egalitarian reform periods in the 1930s and 1960s. Such an inference was based on their common practices that giftedness was typically defined as intellectual gifted and that IQ tests were the most widely used method to identify these children. These practices were the carryover of Terman's study which limited access to the programs for only a small number of high IQ children on a relatively permanent basis.

The programs, however, received the nation's interest during the 1920s and 1950s which were marked by the manpower shortage crisis. During these periods, there was a large volume of literature on the gifted, as well as many programs for them. It appeared to be a common practice that the focus of these attentions was given to the description of educational provisions for gifted children, with little consideration given to their philosophical grounding.

Moreover, the new sign of interest at the end of the 1960s was a result of the congressional attention. It seemed that the basis for

the development of these programs was to respond to the national crises and specific legislative mandates rather than the concern for the needs of the learners or philosophical bases of these programs. Because the cyclical nature was attributed to different conceptions of equality of educational opportunity, the study will examine these conceptions in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTIONS OF EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Because there are several conceptions of equality of educational opportunity,[1] it seems that educators are unable to achieve any common understanding of what is meant by 'equality'.[2] In a democratic society like the U.S., it is reasonable to assume that curriculum decision makers believe that they have 'general sense' of what it means to treat students equally, whether or not they can state what that sense is.

The confusion that results from not having a common understanding of equality may lead to slippage between the ideological and formal domains of gifted programs. Until such conceptions are clarified, little light can be shed on program implications. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a conceptual clarification of the concept of equality of educational opportunity and to examine its varied conceptions, especially the thoughts of the elitists and the egalitarians.

In addition to examining conceptions of equality of educational

---

[1]Blackstone, W.T."The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity" in Greene, M.(ed.) Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Lawrence, Kansas, The University of Kansas, 1965, p.69

[2]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping", op. cit.,p.2

opportunity, the focus of this chapter will also be on philosophical issues related to the concept. Knowledge about philosophical choices[1] alone may not reduce the amount of slippage between the two domains since decisions are often made on hidden values.[2] It is necessary to examine philosophical issues that will bring hidden value decisions for the development of gifted programs into the open.

A Conceptual Clarification

Equality of educational opportunity is an ambiguous concept with different definitions. Wise and Coleman, for example, report several ways in which the concept has been defined.[3] While some of these definitions are radically different from each other, others are disguised recommendations and provide incomplete meanings of the concept.

Despite the ambiguities of the concept, there are points at which a determinate meaning can be given to the concept only if certain related variables are accurately described and certain moral judgements are made.[4] Such points will be examined by overviewing the literature using a three part approach. Part one will review the claim that equality is of two kinds: the inclusive and exclusive theses. Part two will review the con-

---

[1]Since there are several agree upon and consistent theories of value, there is no definite answer for the question of what value position is better than another. It is the job of a curriculum worker to make a rational decision among these choices.(Jordan, J.A."Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker", op. cit.,p.317)

[2]Ibid.,p.313

[3]Wise,A.E.Rich Schools,Poor Schools: The Promise of Equality of Educational Opportunity,Chicago, U. of Chicago Press,1968,pp.146-58; Coleman, James "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity" Harvard Educational Review, 38,1, Winter 1968, p.11

[4]DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.6

cept of educational opportunity. Part three will review the applications of the two theses in the concept of equality of educational opportunity in terms of reasons or criteria for inclusive and exclusive treatments. In the discussion of the inclusive criteria, the study will examine the reasons for offering all students gifted programs. In the discussion of the exclusive criteria, the study will describe philosophical suggestions on what reasons can be given to justify when gifted programs are offered not to everyone, but only to those who display certain characteristics.

The Claim That Equality is of Two Kinds

In general, philosophers seem to agree to the claim that there are two kinds of equality, the inclusive and exclusive theses.[1] A discussion of equality requires not only the knowledge about the kind of equality provided, but also the reference group in the discussion.[2] The inclusive thesis means not only the same treatment, but also a certain minimum level of a treatment that no one should be allowed to fall below.[3] It is based on the belief that everyone is created equal and, therefore,each person is entitled to a certain kind of treatment.[4] The exclusive thesis,

---

[1]Collins, Clinton"The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op. cit.,p.60

[2]Several authors suggest that this knowledge is imperative in a discussion of the concept. For example, Lucus,J.R."Equality in Education" in Wilson,B.(ed.) Education,Equality and Society,N.Y.,Harper & Row Publisher,1975,p.44; Dittami,P.J."An Analysis of Selected Concept of Equality and Equal Opportunity as Reflected in Special Educational Issues" Ed.D. Dissertation, Boston U.,1973,p.5; Ennis, R.H. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.5

[3]DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.126 (He calls this thesis, the identity thesis.)

[4]Ibid.,p.11

on the other hand, means differentiated treatments according to one's merit.[1] It is based on the claim that only some people exhibit particular characteristics which are considered as relevant criteria for a different treatment.[2] In general, an appeal to equality usually invokes both theses.[3]

The two kinds of equality were recognized as far back as Plato and Aristotle. In the Laws, Plato said there were two equalities under one name with contrary results: equality of number, weight, and measure; and equality that assigned more to the greater and less to the lesser.[4] Aristotle made the point directly: "Equality is of two kinds." Then he assigned names and described them:

> One sort is numerical equality; the other sort is equality proportionate to desert. "Numerical equality" means being treated equally, or identically, in the number and volume of things which you get; "equality proportionate to desert" means being treated on the basis of equality of ratios.[5]

Many contemporary philosophers are influenced by the thoughts of Plato and Aristotle and agree that there are two kinds of equality. Williams, for example, claims that the concept has two meanings: equal and unequal. He further explains that the first meaning is applied in

---

[1] DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.5 (He calls this thesis, the proportionality thesis.)

[2] Ibid.,p.11

[3] Ibid.,p.15

[4] Plato, Laws, 6.757,translated by Taylor,A.E. cited in DeFaveri, I., Ibid.,p.9

[5] Aristotle, Politics, translated by Barker,Ernest The Politics of Aristotle, Book V, Ch.1:112, Oxford,Clarendon Press,1952, Copyright 1946,p.205

the situation where individuals are claimed in some sense all to be equal; while the second meaning is applied in the situation where they are agreed to be unequal. Inherent in the latter meaning, according to Williams, is the question of distribution of, or access to, certain goods to which their inequalities are relevant.[1]

Some philosophers seem to agree with the above claim, but assign different names to the two kinds of equality and take one of them as their position on how to achieve equality. Collins, for instance, appears to take the inclusive thesis as his position. He calls the two kinds of equality the inclusive and the exclusive equalities. To him, the first kind is a moral ideal that requires an attempt to state criteria of cultural membership which draw all people into a single community, while the second kind is a value sanctioning criteria which specify who is to be assigned to which social categories.[2] In his work, he repeatedly contends that equality means similar treatment or the inclusive equality.[3] At one point, however, he admits that both kinds of equality are complementary.[4]

Dewey also seems to take the inclusive thesis as his position.

---

[1]Williams, Bernard A.O. "The Idea of Equality" in Bedau,H.A.(ed.) Justice and Equality, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,Prentice Hall Inc.,1971, p.126

[2]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping", op. cit., p.102

[3]Ibid.,p.22,296,366; and Idem, "Equality,Justice, and Desegregation" in Greene,M. (ed.) Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, op. cit.,p.103

[4]Idem, "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping", op. cit.,p.39

He distinguishes the two kinds of equality as the qualitative and quantitative equalities.[1] According to him, the first kind of equality is concerned with equality of values measured in terms of the fullness and richness of the life and growth of each recipient. The latter kind, Deway says, is concerned with equality in terms of possession of materials or quantities.

Dewey holds that it is futile to seek an external measure of equality. He believes that an individual has a unique set of strengths and weaknesses that can be considered equal only when each has as much opportunity as every other person to realize one's possibilities of growth.[2] He does not support an extreme form of the inclusive thesis that everyone should be treated in the same way, but he seems to take a middle position that individuals must be treated according to their unique needs.

Komisar and Coombs take a different position from those of Collins and Dewey. Their linguistic analysis of the concept revealed two kinds of equality: the sameness and the fittingness. According to them, the sameness concept has a determinate meaning and a descriptive use, while the fittingness concept has an indeterminate meaning and an ascriptive use.[3] In their opinions, the descriptive use of the sameness concept is applicable for reporting the same result based on the same crite-

---

[1]Dewey, John and Tufts,J.H. Ethics,N.Y.,Holt,Rinehart,and Winston,1936,pp.384-5

[2]Ibid.,p.385

[3]Komisar,B.P. and Coombs,J.R. "The Equality Principle in Education" in Levit,Martin(ed.) Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society,Lawrence,Kansas,U.of Kansas,1963, pp.112-3

ria, such as a score on an intelligence test, or a color of hair. On the other hand, they see that the ascriptive use of the fittingness concept is applicable for making judgements in terms of equal and unequal treatments, therefore, it depends upon one's ethical decisions and moral commitments.[1]

Komisar and Coombs contend that equality is defined as "fitting" and that "sameness" may evolve in the concept as a matter of fact, not as a definition.[2] They take the exclusive thesis as their position and do not accept the inclusive thesis as an application of the concept of equality.

In general, the claim that equality is of one kind can take one of the two forms.[3] The first form suggests that the only kind of equality is the inclusive thesis. The second form suggests that the only kind of equality is the exclusive thesis and the inclusive thesis is a special case of the exclusive thesis.[4]

The positions taken by Collins, Komisar and Coombs are somewhat different from the above forms. Although Collins does not accept the exclusive thesis as the provision of equality, he accepts it as the provision of justice.[5] The concept of justice, however, is related to the

---

[1]Komisar,B.P. and Cooms,J.R. "The Equality Principle in Education", op. cit ,pp.112-3

[2]Idem, "The Concept of Equality in Education" Studies in Philosophy and Education,3, Fall 1964,p.239

[3]DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.30

[4]Ibid.

[5]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op.cit.,p.22

concept of equality.[1] His position, therefore, does not imply the first form. Komisar and Coombs' position, on the other hand, does not imply the second form since they think that the inclusive thesis is a fact that has nothing to do with the application of the concept.[2]

Few philosophers have supported the first form which is an extreme form of the inclusive thesis that everyone must receive the same treatment , even those who take an egalitarian position.[3] Egalitarians usually appeal to both the inclusive and exclusive theses, but they are less concerned with differences than sameness.[4]

Two egalitarians, Tawney and Laski, for example, state that they do not believe that the provision of equal opportunities means the provision of same opportunities. Tawney makes the point explicitly when he says that "equality of provision is not identity of provision." He further explains that equality of provision

> is to be achieved, not be treating different needs in the same way, but by devoting equal care to ensuring that they are met in the different ways appropriate to them, as is done by a doctor who prescribes different regimens for different constitutions, or a teacher who develops different types of intelligence by different curricula.[5]

---

[1]Bedau,H.A. "Egalitarianism and the Idea of Equality" in Pennock, J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.) Nomos IX: Equality, N.Y.,Atherton Press,1967, p.18 (The relationship between 'equality' and 'justice' will be further examined in the discussion of the exclusive thesis.)

[2]Komisar,B.P. and Coombs,J.R. "The Concept of Equality in Education",op. cit.,p.239

[3]Blackstone,W.T."The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity", op.cit.,p.70

[4]Lucus,J.R. "Against Equality" in Bedau,H.A.(ed.) Justice and Equality, Englewood Cliff,N.J.,Prentice Hall Inc ,1971,p.139

[5]Tawney,R.H. Equality,London,George Allen and Unwin Ltd.,1964 Fifth Edition,pp.49-50

Tawney also suggests that equality of educational opportunity can be achieved if there is an adequate balance between the inclusive and the exclusive theses.[1]

Laski wishes to avoid some of the confusion of the concept "equality of opportunity" by substituting the expression, "adequate opportunities". He notes that the provision of adequate opportunity is one of the basic conditions of equality.[2] He further explains that equality does not mean identity of treatment, and that there can be no ultimate identity of treatment because individuals are different in capacity and need.[3] According to him, the provision of identical treatment for all would violate the principle of equality he is advocating.[4] Both Tawney and Laski support the claim that equality is of two kinds.

The second form of the claim that equality is of one kind is that the only kind of equality is the exclusive thesis and the inclusive thesis is a special case of the exclusive thesis. This claim is implied when all people in the reference group possess the same degree of relevant characteristics. It suggests that although equality cannot be reduced to sameness, sameness is a necessary part of the concept.[5]

Several philosophers support the above claim that the inclusive thesis is a special case of the exclusive thesis. Macmillan, for example,

---

[1] Tawney,R.H. Equality, op. cit.,p.108

[2] Laski,H.J. A Game of Politics, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd.,1967 (Copyright 1925),p.156

[3] Ibid.,p.152

[4] Ibid.,p.156

[5] DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.30

states that equality in the fittingness sense implies sameness. He asserts that sameness is the ideal that parties contesting over equality invoke.[1] Even Collins, who proposes that equality means the inclusive thesis, notes that in most cases "people prefer to identify with groups of those with whom they believe themselves to be similar on exclusive criteria."[2] He seems to admit that the inclusive thesis is a special case of the exclusive thesis.

In this connection, Lucus explains the two kinds of equality in comparative terms: an equivalent relation and an ordering relation. The equivalent relations according to him, are often expressed by some pharse using the word "same", while the ordering ones are expressed by the form 'er' than. He further takes a position that equality of opportunity tends to be applicable only in a competitive context, or the ordering relations, where a number of people are competing for the same goal in accordance with rules.[3] He, however, points out that the sameness concept is a part of equality.[4] His argument implies that there is an appeal to the inclusive thesis even in a competitive context. For example, everyone is treated by the same rule.

Some philosophers take a middle position and support that equality can be achieved by applying both the inclusive and exclusive theses. DeFaveri, for example, attempts to show that it is often the case that

---

[1]Macmillan,C.J.B. "Equality and Sameness" Studies in Philosophy and Education, 3, Winter 1964,pp.320-32

[2]Collins,Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op. cit.,p.30

[3]Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education", op. cit.,pp.42-5

[4]Idem "Against Equality", op. cit.,p.139

one must appeal to both theses, which he names the identity and proportionality theses, in order to achieve equality.[1]

In summary, there is a claim that equality is of two kinds: the inclusive and exclusive theses. The first thesis is invoked when all people fall into the same category. The second thesis is invoked whenever it is one's advantage to judge individuals in comparison with others or against some impersonal standards.

There seems to be an interplay of the inclusive and exclusive theses in an appeal to equality. The review of analyses of the concept, however, showed that some philosophers appear to take only one of these theses as their position to achieve equality. Such a practice yields to the temptation that is pointed out by Williams. He warns that the concept of equality has many elements pulling in various directions and many people have a strong temptation to abandon some of its elements.[2] It may be that such a temptation creates the existing confusion in the discussion of the concept of equality of educational opportunity.[3]

The Concept of Educational Opportunity

In addition to the confusion in the concept of equality, another source of confusion is also found in the concept of educational opportunity. Such a confusion is inherent in the concept of opportunity which is concerned with the notion of freedom.[4] The confusion in the notion

---

[1] DeFaveri, I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op.cit.,p.12

[2] Williams, Bernard A.O. "The Idea of Equality", op. cit.,p.136

[3] DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.6

[4] Ibid.,pp.85-7

of freedom can be resolved if one specifies the nature of the opportunity in question and the reference group to be provided that opportunity by answering the questions of "Opportunity for what? and for whom?"[1]

In this section, the study will examine the notion of freedom and the answers that have been given to the question of "Opportunity for what?" The answers given to the question of "Opportunity for whom?" will be examined later in the discussion of inclusive and exclusive criteria.

The Notion of Freedom

Built into the concept of opportunity is a concern about an individual choice.[2] To have an opportunity to do something is not to be able to do it, but to be able to try without any certainty of success.[3] Success cannot be guaranteed in advance because it is a personal choice. An individual may either take advantage of or refuse a given opportunity. The concept of opportunity, therefore, is appropriate only if there is more than one direction open to each person who then decides on the direction to go.[4]

Schools frequently seem to function more as a socializing device for selecting students[5] into roles in the economic arrangements in the

---

[1]DeFaveri, I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.88

[2]Ibid.,p.87

[3]Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education",op.cit.,p.45

[4]DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.67

[5]Parsons, Talcott "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society" Harvard Educational Review, 29, 4, Fall 1959,pp.297-318

society rather than as an institution for developing the capacities of the population for their own choices and benefit.[1] Some philosophers support such a practice as an application of the concept equality of educational opportunity and seem to ignore its inherent notion of freedom.

Plamenatz, for example believes that the concept of equality of educational opportunity sometimes makes no reference to freedom.[2] According to him, the concept can mean either "equality of freedom" or "equality of service". He points out that the application of the latter meaning does not entail freedom but it can be achieved in an authoritarian society where people's station and duties are assigned. He suggests that those in authority should select children and decide the appropriate training for them without taking their wishes into account.[3] Plamenatz has in mind an application of the concept in a situation that everyone would accept the priorities in regard to talents assigned by the rulers

Kazamias takes the same position as Plamenatz that the gifted should be given priority in education in order to be prepared for the functional division of labor within society.[4] He believes that there are two competing conceptions of equality of educational opportunity:

---

[1]Katz,Michael Class, Bureaucracy and Schools, N.Y.,Praeger Publishers,1971; Bowles, Samuel and Gintist, Herbert Schooling in Capitalist America, N.Y.,Basic Books Publishers Inc.,1976

[2]Plamenatz,John "Diversity of Rights and Kinds of Equality" in in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.)Nomos IX: Equality,op. cit.,pp.86-9

[3]Ibid ,p.89

[4]Kazamias, Andreas "Meritocracy and Isocracy in American Education: Retrospect and Prospect"Educational Forum,25,March 1961,pp.345-54

"meritocracy" and "isocracy". The first conception, according to Kazamias, means that a status in a society is granted according to one's achievement in a fair competition, and the second one means the same treatment for all. He criticizes American public schools for having emphasized only the latter meaning and having failed to develop adequately the capacities of talented students. To correct this situation, he recommends that school officials select the gifted for special programs at the earliest possible age.[1]

Plamenatz and Kazamias emphasize the preparation of an individual for function in the future without considering the individual's own preference in their applications of the concept. Because the capacity for developing one's preference is very closely related to the degree to which an individual is capable of enjoying the objects of experience,[2] the issue of freedom may be resolved if an opportunity to enjoy something is given as one of the answers to the question of "Opportunity for what?"[3]

Opportunity for What?

Answers given to this question can be grouped under two categories: opportunities for acquiring, and opportunities for enjoyment.[4]

---

[1]Kazamias, Andreas "Meritocracy and Isocracy in American Education: Retrospect and Prospect", op. cit.,pp 345-54

[2]Fellman,P.V."Some Aspects of the Distribution of the Capacity for Developed Preferences or If I like it so much, how come it's not good?" in Macmillan,J.C.B.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1980, Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Normal,Ill.,1981,p.158

[3]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.88

[4]Honore,A.M."Social Justice" in Summers,R.S.(ed.) Essays in Legal Philosophy, Berkeley,U. of California Press, 1968,p.90

Such a distinction may be somewhat arbitrary. Oftentimes, an opportunity to enjoy something comes into existence only if something else has been acquired. At other times, an opportunity to enjoy something can be given with little emphasis on the opportunity to acquire anything, e.g., one can enjoy music without acquiring much knowledge about it. Nevertheless, the distinction between the two kinds of opportunities may help point out the relationship that exists between various opportunities.[1]

Educators may suggest either one of the two kinds of opportunities or a combination of them as a provision of equality of educational opportunity. This assumption is made from Gowin's approaches to define equality as it is reflected in educational opportunities. Gowin provides three analogous meanings of the concept: the contest, the hospital, and the feast analogies.[2]

In the contest analogy, according to Gowin, everyone is eligible to enter a race for the same prize under the same rule, but only some individuals will be expected to win.[3] The opportunity provided by this definition is an opportunity for acquiring something one does not have by winning a race.

Furthermore, Gowin points out that the hospital analogy implies that individuals are not necessarily expected to have the same quality of health, but they are expected to overcome their diseases by receiving

---

[1] DeFaveri,I "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit ,p.151

[2] Gowin,D.B."Equality: Three Analogies" Educational Forum,34,2, January 1970,pp.177-9

[3] Ibid.

different treatments.[1] This definition seems to suggest an opportunity to win different races. Such an opportunity seems to provide an individual with the opportunities for acquiring and for enjoyment since one is able to choose to acquire something that one is enjoying.

Gowin describes the last definition, the feast analogy, that everyone is invited to a feast as an equal and is allowed to choose one's own table. Comparison and formalized competition are not encouraged because each person is regarded as unique.[2] This analogy seems to suggest an opportunity to enjoy something that the individual now has. The study will examine Gowin's suggested opportunities in the context of gifted education.

Opportunities for Acquiring

The historical overview of gifted education demonstrated that the opportunity for acquisition of gifted programs has been limited to only a small number of homogeneous children. It appears then from a historical perspective, Gowin's contest analogy is supported. Philosophers who advocate such a practice base their argument on the assumption that equality of educational opportunity in a competitive context, such as gifted education, can be achieved only by the provision of an opportunity to win a race.[3]

Lucus, for example, sees that the concept of equality of educational opportunity is applicable only in the competitive context where

---

[1] Gowin,D.B. "Equality: Three Analogies", op. cit.

[2] Ibid.

[3] DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op.cit.,p.79

a number of people are competing for the same goal in accordance with rules, which can be assessed as being equal or unequal.[1]

In this connection, Schaar criticizes the principle of equality of opportunity because it is often invoked in an attempt to make people accept differences in well-being which would otherwise be recognized as unjust. Schaar's general argument is that educators should abandon the principle of equality of opportunity and embrace the principle of democratic equality. "Democratic equality", as Schaar develops it, is fundamentally an egalitarian notion. It is based on a philosophy of equal human worth which affirms the equality of being and belonging.[2]

The principle of equality of opportunity, as Schaar sees, encourages competition where there is no gain which is not someone else's loss. To him, this principle only guarantees equal opportunity for all to enter the race, not to win it.[3] To support his criticism of the principle, he asks educators to imagine a footrace in which ten people compete. The rules are the same for all, but "three of the competitors are forty years old, five are overweight, one has weak ankles, and the tenth is Roger Bannister."[4]

Schaar's point is that although each competitors has an equal opportunity in a purely formal sense to enter the race and to be judged by the same rule, they do not have an equal opportunity to win the race

---

[1]Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education", op. cit.,p.46

[2]Schaar,J.H. "Equality of Opportunity and Beyond" in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W. (eds.) Nomos IX: Equality, op. cit.,p.229,248

[3]Ibid.,pp.231-41

[4]Ibid.,p.234

in any actual sense because the result of the race is predetermined by nature. What makes his imagined contest unfair is that a society has offered individuals limited opportunities to develop a narrow range of talents despite the fact that they may have a wide range of talents.[1]

Furthermore, Schaar notes that the cruelty of the principle is intensified with the use of ability tests to measure traits and talents at an early age. The very best training that the society can afford, according to him, would go to those in the superior group in order to assure equality of opportunity for the development of talents.[2]

Schaar limits legitimate scope of the concept of equality of opportunity when he assumes that its application means a race where all compete for the same prize and the majority of participants are destined never to win.

Some philosophers offer a broader scope of the application of the concept equality of educational opportunity than that in Schaar's criticism. They suggest that the opportunity for acquiring gifted education can be offered in the form of opportunities to win educational prizes suited to one's particular talents, or Gowin's hospital analogy. This kind of opportunities seems to provide both the opportunities for acquiring and for enjoyment.

Tawney, for example, has said of equality of opportunity that it

> obtains in so far as, and only in so far as,

---

[1] Schaar, J.H. "Equality of Opportunity and Beyond", op. cit., p.230

[2] Ibid., p.233

> each member of the community... possesses in fact, and not merely in form, equal chances of using to the full his natural endowments of physique, of character and of intelligence.[1]

To him, equality of opportunity is provided when every individual is given different opportunities to fulfill each personal differences. He also gives an example of "the nightingale that was placed in the fourth class at the fowls show"[2]; by which Tawney means that if one cannot succeed in one contest, that person might succeed in another. He then suggests schools provide a variety of curricula to meet different talents of each student.[3]

Gardner seems to agree with Tawney and proposes "the principle of multiple chance". The principle states that an individual should have many opportunities to discover one's self.[4] He also seems to agree with Schaar that not every kind of talent is valued in a given society and differences in educational opportunity will never be completely eradicated.[5] He, however, does not accepted these differences as an unchangable fact as Schaar does. Gardner contends that such differences must be reduced in scope and significance by providing opportunities and rewards for individuals of every degree of ability.[6]

---

[1]Tawney, R.H. Equality, op. cit.,pp.103-4

[2]Ibid.,p.49

[3]Ibid.,p.109

[4]Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too? op. cit.,p.69

[5]Ibid.,p.41

[6]Ibid.,p.115

Dewey's position seems to be similar to those of Tawney and Gardner. He expresses a sentiment: "A violet and an oak tree are equal when one has the opportunity to develop to the full as a violet which the other has as an oak."[1] These philosophers seem to agree that individuals are to be given whatever educational opportunities they need to become the best of which they are capable. That is, each is to have both opportunities to acquire and to enjoy by winning different races.

Other opportunities for acquiring gifted education, such as opportunities for acquiring life-long learning and self perfection, may not necessarily to be provided in a way that resemble the analogies of race winners. There might very well be areas of life in which contests are inappropriate.[2] These opportunities may be sometimes provided as opportunities for the enjoyment of an education.[3]

Opportunities for Enjoyment

Some philosophers stress the notion of enjoyment rather than acquisition. For example, the position of Tawney, Gardner, and Dewey support the provision of various opportunities for one to acquire something and also to enjoy the result of an optimum fulfillment of individual potentialities.

The above view of human enjoyment is also recently suggested as a principle of motivation by Rawls. He describes this principle as

---

[1]Dewey,John and Tufts,J.H. Ethics,op. cit.,p.385

[2]Tunnell,D.R. "Equality Opportunity Revisted" in Fenstermacher, G.R.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1978,Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, The Philosophy of Education Society,Champaign,Ill., U. of Ill.,1979, p.108

[3]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op.cit.,p.84,154

"The Aristotelian Principle", which he states as:

> Other things equal, human beings enjoy the excercise of their realized capacities(their innate of trained abilities), and this enjoyment increases the more the capacity is realized, or the greater its complexity. The intuitive idea here is that human beings take more pleasure in doing something as they become more proficient at it, and of two activities they do equally well, they prefer the one calling on a larger repertoire of more intricate and subtle discriminations.[1]

Rawls' Aristotelian Principle seems to suggest that everyone should have an opportunity to enjoy the enrichment of each person's life. According to him, individuals should be given opportunities to acquire various educational trainings that will enable them to enjoy their culture and to develop a sense of their own worth.[2]

Wilson also appears to favor the provision of opportunities to enjoy an individual's own fulfillment since he advocates the provision of intrinsic equality. Intrinsic equality, according to Wilson, is based on the claim that all human beings come into a particular category or mode of being and that their varying abilities do not constitute the major issue. Wilson notes that the key point of the intrinsic equality is the equality which derives from powers of choice, of creating one's own values, and of having purposes.[3]

Philosophers who support the intrinsic equality appeal to both the inclusive and exclusive theses. They appeal to the inclusive thesis

---

[1]Rawls, John A Theory of Justice, op. cit.,p. 426

[2]Ibid.,p.101

[3]Wilson, John Equality London, Hutchinson of London,1966,p.103

in the sense that individuals are given the freedom of choice to enjoy their own uniqueness, as well as that of others, and to receive equal respect for what they are.[1] Such an opportunity is similar to Gowin's feast analogy. At the same time, these philosophers appeal to the exclusive thesis in a sense that individuals receive different treatments according to their needs. Such an opportunity is similar to Gowin's hospital analogy. The concern for the intrinsic equality may be an alternative to the contest analogy in the development of a gifted program.[2]

In summary, the concept of equality of educational opportunity is a hybrid concept that respects both equality and freedom In a discussion about the concept, one needs to answer the questions of "Opportunity for what? and for whom?" Such a requirement implies that the concept is not something that exists once and for all. It is depending, in part, on what it is that one is supposed to have an opportunity for. The following section will examine inclusive and exclusive criteria that are intended to provide the answers to the question of "Opportunity for whom?"

Inclusive Criteria

As it is necessary to know the nature of opportunity in question, so is it necessary to know to whom it is being offered. In general, the reference group in the concept of equality of educational opportunity is referred to everybody.[3] The concept demands that people should be treated

---

[1] DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.140

[2] Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too? op. cit.,p.115,134

[3] DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.72

the same in a given situation unless there are differences between them that constitute relevant reasons or criteria for treating them differently.[1]

The above demand involves Aristotle's principle of justice, i.e., to treat equals equally and unequals unequally.[2] The claim for equality of educational opportunity, therefore, involves the attempt to cite relevant and sufficient reasons for similarities or differences in treatment.[3] These relevant reasons are inclusive and exclusive criteria. In this section, the study will examine the forms of inclusive criteria that can be given in the context of gifted education and in the following section the corresponding forms of exclusive criteria.

Inclusive criteria are those which lay claim to universality, i.e., that are used to assert some forms of similarity which characterizes all people.[4] They are, therefore, applicable in the situation where all people necessarily fall into the same category, despite their differences,[5] such as the claim that "All men are created equal," and the claim that "All

---

[1]Several analyses of the concept reveal this demand: DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p. 89; Woods, R.G. and Barrow,R.St.C. An Introduction to Philosophy of Education, London, Methuen & Co. Ltd,1975, p. 165; Schaar, J.H."Equality of Opportunity and Beyond", op. cit.,p.242; Blackstone, W.T."The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.70; Williams, B.A.O."The Idea of Equality", op. cit.,p. 126

[2]Blackstone, W.T."The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.70

[3]Ibid.

[4]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op.cit.,p.25

[5]DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.146

men deserve equal respect."[1] Tawney, for example, recognizes that some things that are true about one person are necessarily true about all, and that something given to one ought to be given to all, simply because all are human.[2]

Forms of Inclusive Criteria

There are several forms of inclusive criteria, ranging from the ones that appeal to an extreme form of the inclusive thesis to the ones that appeal to some degree of the exclusive thesis.[3]

The extreme forms of inclusive criteria are based on the claims that everyone ought to be the same in every respect, or to have certain minimum level of education.[4] Those who support any one of these claims would support the unrestricted access doctrine.[5] They would argue that gifted programs are unjustified because they tend to increase differences among children.[6] The opponents of these forms would see that such practice will lower the standard of an institution.[7] They would argue that the extreme form of the inclusive criteria is unacceptable because it implies the same treatment for all; such a practice is violating many

---

[1]Williams, Bernard A.O."The Idea of Equality",op. cit.,p.135

[2]Tawney,R.H.Equality, op. cit.,pp.105-6

[3]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity"op. cit.,pp.127-43

[4]Ibid.

[5]Pratt,D. Curriculum:Design & Development, op. cit.,p.277

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid.

conceptions of justice, and may introduce conformity.[1]

The less extreme forms of inclusive criteria are based on two claims. The first claim is that everyone should attain as much good of which he is capable while the second claim views equality as uniqueness.[2] These claims may be applied as criteria for admission to a gifted program. The preceding discussion of these claims as intrinsic equality has shown the relationship between these claims and their appeals to both the inclusive and exclusive theses.

In the context of gifted education, the first claim implies the idea that a person's worthwhile potentialities should be developed to the fullest. Such an idea has been voiced by many writers. Maslow speaks about "self actualization" which includes both realization of potential and engagement in activities that an individual finds directly fulfilling.[3] Tawney wishes for a state of affairs wherein "common men should be free to make the most of their common humanity".[4] Pratt proposes the adoption of "human development" as a pattern of curriculum management that will allow all students to develop their talents to the fullest extent.[5] Gardner suggests "the principle of multiple chance".[6] Rawls' Aristotelian principle implies that 'excellence' should be developed in

---

[1]Thayer,V.T. and Levit,Martin The Role of the School in American Society,N.Y.,Dodd,Mead & Co., 1966, p.78

[2]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op.cit.,p.136,140

[3]Maslow,A.H.Motivation and Personality,N.Y.,Harper & Row Publishers,1954,p.91

[4]Tawney,R.H. Equality, op. cit.,p.108

[5]Pratt, D. Curriculum:Design & Development, op. cit.,p.347

[6]Gardner,J.W.Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too?, op. cit.,p.69

every individual as it relates to two aspects of 'self respect': the sense of one's own worth and a confidence in one's ability to fulfill one's intention.[1] Bloom suggests the development of "peak experience" for the majority of students.[2] For the purpose of this discussion, these writers can all be said to be making the same point: that a function of schools is to help every child discover those activities at which each can excel and those experiences that each finds most intrinsically valuable.

The second claim of equality as uniqueness[3] implies the idea that an individual is accepted for what each person is.[4] That is, each is to be allowed to take advantage of whatever educational opportunities one wishes.[5] Schaar supports a similar claim which he calls "equality of being and belonging".[6] According to him, this claim stresses the greatest possible participation in and sharing of the common life and culture while striving to assure that no one will be judged by others. This form of inclusive criteria would lead to the opportunity to enjoy the result of optimum development of an individual.

In summary, inclusive criteria are applicable in the situation where all people are entitled to a certain kind of treatment. There are

---

[1]Rawls, John A Theory of Justice, op. cit.,pp.440-3

[2]Bloom,B.S. All Our Children Learning,N.Y.,McGraw-Hill,1981,p. 125, 193

[3]Phenix,Philip "Equality as Uniqueness" Studies in Philosophy and Education, Winter, 1964-65,pp.332-5

[4]Lee,Dorothy "Equality of Opportunity as a Culture Value" in Bryson,Lyman(ed.) Aspects of Human Equality,N.Y.,Harper,1956,p.258

[5]Phenix,Philip "Equality as Uniqueness", op. cit.,p. 334

[6]Schaar, J.H."Equality of Opportunity and Beyond", op.cit.,p.248

several forms of these criteria. They may be applications of the extreme form of the inclusive thesis or they may allow some degree of the exclusive thesis. The extreme forms of these criteria imply that every child should have access to the same program, while the less extreme forms imply that individuals should have access to a variety of gifted programs whenever they show their needs for such programs in order to develop their worthwhile potentialities to the fullest.

Exclusive Criteria

Exclusive criteria are relevant characteristics which people possess in different degree.[1] These criteria are employed to select people for different treatment.[2] Since there is no formula for determining what characteristics are relevant, the justification[3] of these characteristics depends on one's moral decision.[4]

Gifted programs typically employ exclusive criteria for selecting students because the number of students who want to take advantage of these programs is larger than they are able to accommodate.[5] This section of the study will examine forms of these criteria and characteristics of students that have been suggested as relevant criteria and the moral principles that can be used to justify these criteria.

---

[1]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op. cit.,p.25

[2]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity",op.cit.,p.92

[3]Coombs,J.R."Justice and Equal Opportunity" in Macmillan,C.J.B. (ed.) Philosophy of Education 1980, op. cit.,p.131

[4]Benn,S.I. and Peter,R.S. The Principles of Political Thought, N.Y., Collier Books, 1964, p.125

[5]DeFaveri,I."Equality of Educational Opportunity", op.cit.,p.90

Forms of Exclusive Criteria

An extreme form of these criteria usually sets high prerequisites to exclude as many students[1] from a gifted program as possible. The single race model and Terman's definition of the gifted as children in the top one percent of the population[2] are examples of the extreme form. Opponents of this form would criticize that it ignores important moral considerations and may not do justice to the variety of talents in the population.[3]

A less extreme form of exclusive criteria than that used by Terman has been suggested by Bloom. He sees that almost every child is gifted if they are selected on the criteria based on several characteristics. He,however, does not identify these characteristics.[4]

Relevant Criteria

The principle of equality of educational opportunity requires that the characteristics selected for the distribution of gifted programs should not produce an exclusion which does not correlate with relevant characteristics of the gifted.[5] Several characteristics that may be thought as relevant criteria for selecting these children have been

---

[1]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit.,p.277

[2]Terman, Lewis et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol.1: Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children, op. cit.

[3]Tawney, R.H. Equality, op. cit.,pp.105-6

[4]Bloom, Benjamin "Letter to the Editor" Harvard Educational Review, 39, 2, Spring 1969,pp.419-21

[5]Griffin,E.K. "The Coleman Report's 'Fifth Conception' of Equal Educational Opportunity: A Reconsideration" in Steinberg,I.S.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1977, Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting, Urbana, Ill., Educational Theory, U. of Ill, 1977,p.107

offered by Green, as well as other philosophers.[1] These criteria are: choice, achievement, intelligence, promise of future success, need, and effort.

The moral principle used to justify the criterion of choice may be that individual choice must be respected.[2] In this connection, Havighurst proposes the provision of free choice to individuals as a relevant criterion for achieving equality of educational opportunity. According to him, a just society is one in which people get what they want out of life, as long as their wants do not interfere with those of others.[3]

The historical overview of gifted education showed that achievement, intelligence, and promise of future success have been the criteria used for selecting the gifted. The moral principle used to justify these criteria may be the utilitarian principle which states that the right act is the one which produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people.[4] For example, after the Russian launched Sputnik in 1957, an argument used to justify the granting of unequal

---

[1]Green,T.F. "The Systemic Dynamics of Two Principles: 'Best' and 'Equal' in Fenstermacher,G.R.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1978, Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, op. cit.,p.135; Coombs, J.R. "Justice and Equal Opportunity", op. cit.,p.132; Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education",op. cit.,p.54; DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.70; Blackstone,W.T. "The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.70

[2]DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit., p. 95,114

[3]Havighurst,R.J. "Opportunity,Equity or Equality" in Kopan, Andrew and Walberg,Herbert (eds.) Rethinking Educational Equality, Berkeley,CA., McGutchan Publishing Co.,1974,p.102

[4]Newsome,G.L.,Jr. Philosophical Prospectives: Basic Issues of Man, v. 6, Athens, The University of Georgia Press, 1961,p.94

opportunities for academically gifted was that these children were more likely to promote the country's success in foreign competition in science[1] and, therefore, they should be given greater opportunities to develop their talent than those in, say the arts. Such an argument would try to justify the granting of unequal educational opportunities on the basis of utility.

The moral principle that can be used to justify the criterion of need and effort is Rawl's conception of justice. Rawls says that different treatment is justified if it enriches everyone's life and has the greatest benefit for the least advantaged.[2] According to Rawls, resources for education "are not to be allotted solely or necessarily mainly according to their return as estimated in productive trained abilities, but also according to their worth in enriching the personal and social life of citizens, including the less favored."[3] It may be implied by Rawls' conception of justice that the criteria of individual need[4] and effort can be justified if individuals including the least advantaged have opportunities to enrich their life.

There are several other moral principles and conceptions of justice other than those mentioned.[5] It is, however, not within the

---

[1] Rickover,H.G. Education and Freedom,op. cit.

[2] Rawls, John A Theory of Justice, op cit.,p.107

[3] Ibid.

[4] Griffin notes the difference between individual need and social need. The latter notion is justified by the utilitarian principle. (Griffin,E.K. "The Coleman Report's 'Fifth Conception' of Equal Educational Opportunity: A Reconsideration", op. cit.,p.107)

[5] Newsome,G.L.,Jr. Philosophical Prospectives:Basic Issues of Man op. cit.

scope of this paper to elaborate on all of these principles used to justify exclusive criteria. The point to be made here is that an adoption of exclusive criteria is dependent on an individual's moral priority or the emphasis that one places on the scale of relevant criteria or reasons for differential treatment.[1]

Pratt, for example, gives priority to the criteria of individual need and effort. To him, a justified exclusive criterion is better seen as a basis for advising students rather than prohibiting them from a particular course. His suggestion implies that highly motivated and persistent students should be allowed to have access to a gifted program eventhough they do not meet the standard IQ score required by the program.[2]

In summary, exclusive criteria are applicable in the situation where different treatments are given to certain people. These treatments must be based on relevant and sufficient reasons or criteria. Justification of relevant criteria involves one's moral decision.

A Classification of Value

In analyzing the concept of equality of educational opportunity, there seems to be an agreement among philosophers on the common use of the inclusive and exclusive theses.[3] There is, however, disagreement on

---

[1]Blackstone,W.T. "Human Right, Equality, and Education" in Steiner, Elizabeth et al.(eds.) Education and American Culture,N.Y.,Macmillan Publishing Co.,Inc.,1980,p.201

[2]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development,op. cit.,p.284

[3]Collins,Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op.cit.,p.72; DeFaveri,I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.5

the degree to which the two theses should be applied[1] to achieve equality in the development of a gifted program.

In the following sections the study will briefly examine the thoughts of various philosophical positions on the concept of equality. Among these positions, the study will select to elaborate the thoughts of the egalitarians and the elitists since there seems to be some degrees of distinction between them regarding the application of the inclusive and exclusive theses for the development of commonplaces for a gifted program.

An Overview of Philosophical Positions

Analyses on the ideological positions of 'equality' have revealed several positions on the concept. Lakoff, for example, argues that there are three positions or unit-ideas which he calls the liberals, the socialists, and the conservatives.[2] He believes that these three positions have been made explicit and propounded in opposition to each other in his study of modern history of Western culture. Lakoff defines the liberals as those who believe in individualism and competitive equality, while the socialists are those who emphasize material goods and labors. The last group, the conservatives, according to Lakoff, are those who call for social-class distinctions.[3] Furthermore, he compares the socialists and the conservatives as the left and the right, while

---

[1]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping",op. cit.,p.80; DeFaveri, I. "Equality of Educational Opportunity",op. cit.,p.139

[2]Lakoff,S.A. Equality in Political Philosophy,Cambridge,Mass., Harvard U. Press, 1964,p.9

[3]Ibid.,pp.8-9

the liberals take the middle position of the first two.[1]

Another analysis of the conceptions of equality by McCord and McCord revealed four positions: the elitists, the liberals, the libertarians, and the egalitarians. They briefly identified these positions as:

> the elitists are those who believe that inequality is just and necessary for the preservation of a good society, the liberals are those who wish to protect individual freedom and provide equality of opportunity, the libertarians are those who regard liberty as their foremost goal and are willing to tolerate inequalities as long as people are "entitled" to their privileges, and the egalitarians are those who wish to see all people share alike in the goods and resources....[2]

Two conceptions of equality, the egalitarians and the elitists, are often discussed in other analyses.[3] These analyses seem to agree that the egalitarians would emphasize the inclusive thesis while the elitists would stress the exclusive thesis in their applications of the concept.

In this connection, Brookover et al. identified two ideal types of educational systems which they called: the Type A or the differentia-

---

[1]Lakoff,S.A. Equality in Political Philosophy, op. cit.,p.9

[2]McCord,W. and McCord,A. Power and Equality: An Introduction to Social Stratification, N.Y.,Praeger Publishers, 1977,p.ix

[3]Lipset,S.M. "The Value Patterns of Democracy: A Case Study in Comparative Analysis" American Sociological Review, 28, 4, August 1963, p. 516; Parsons, Talcott "Equality and Inequality in Modern Society or Social Stratification Revisited" Sociological Inquiry, 40, Spring 1968, p.14; Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too?",op. cit.; Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education", op. cit.,pp.51-2; Pratt,David Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit.,p.274

tion oriented, and the Type B or the equality oriented.[1] The ideas of these two ideal types outlined by these authors resemble the ideas of the elitists and the egalitarians. For example, schools that take the Type A approach would homogeneously group and track students while those that take the type B would offer common achievement norms for all students.[2] Brookover et al. and Gardner are agreed that the application of the concept of equality generally exhibits a mixture of various degrees of the two positions.[3] Although schools exhibit various degrees of an elitist position, according to Brookover et al., many educators do not perceive their schools as consistently applying such a position.[4]

In summary, the above cursory examinations of philosophical positions of 'equality' has revealed that the positions of the socialists and the libertarians are not the applications of this concept in the United States.[5] Since the liberals are concerned with both individualism and competition, their position implies the middle position between an egalitarian and an elitist positions.

The study chose to develop a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction by further investigating the thoughts of these

---

[1]Brookover,W.B. et al. "Quality of Educational Attainment,Standardized Testing, Assessment, and Accountability" in Gordon,C.W.(ed.) Uses of the Sociology of Education, The Seventy-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press, 1974,p.162

[2]Ibid.,p.163

[3]Ibid.; Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too?,op. cit.,p.6

[4]Brookover,W.B. et al. "Quality of Educational Attainment, Standardized Testing, Assessment, and Accountability",op. cit.,pp.162-3

[5]McCord,W. and McCord,A. Power and Equality: An Introduction to Social Stratification,op. cit.,p.227,233

positions because they are involved in curriculum decisions associated with resource allocation,[1] such as gifted programs. These positions are not separate in an absolute sense.[2] Some degrees of simplification of these positions regarding the inclusive and exclusive theses, however, may be enough to develop criteria to analyze slippage in a gifted program.

The Egalitarians

Egalitarians based their conception of equality on the inclusive thesis.[3] They maintain that there may be something to which all members of a society have an equal claim for their common membership.[4]

Egalitarian institutions tend to set low prerequisites to include as many students as possible. The intention underlying such a practice is to minimize the probability of excluding any student who might subsequently succeed.[5] This conception in its extreme form would lead to the doctrine of unrestricted access to all educational programs.

By ignoring prerequisites and declaring curriculum open to all, those who take the extreme form fail to recognize the need of many students for guidance and remediation.[6] To them, equal treatment implies

---

[1]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development,op. cit.,p.284

[2]McCord,W. and McCord,A. Power and Equality: An Introduction to Social Stratification, op. cit.,p.226

[3]Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping", op. cit.,p.98

[4]Benn,S.I. "Egalitarianism and the Equal Consideration of Interest" in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.)Nomos IX: Equality,op. cit.,p.63

[5]Pratt,David Curriculum: Design & Development,op. cit.,p.277

[6]Ibid.

the same treatment for all.[1] Only few egalitarians, however, would take this extreme position.[2] Since gifted programs always involve the selection of students from a large pool,[3] the extreme position is not appropriate for the examination in this study.

Those who do not take the extreme form would base their definitions of giftedness on the nature assumption that all children have adequate innate ability to learn and they would design a learning environment to meet the needs of each child.[4] Broudy, for example, proposes that gifted programs should be accessible to many 'average' children rather than only few children.[5]

Different criteria for admitting students into a gifted program have been suggested by some egalitarians. In general, they are less interested in differences than sameness.[6] In the situation that they are forced to allow competition, such as the development of a gifted program, they would adopt the criteria for admission that favor capacities

---

[1]For example, Berlin takes an extreme position by proposing that dissimilarity should be reduced to a minimum. (Berlin, Sir Isaiah "Equality" Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series, V. 56, 1955-56, London, 1956,p.312)

[2]Blackstone,W.T. "The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.70

[3]Roedell, W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.64

[4]Gordon,E.W. "The Political Economics of Effective Schooling" in Miller,L.P. and Gordon,E.W.(eds.) Equality of Educational Opportunity, N.Y.,AMS Press, p. 447

[5]Broudy,H.S. Paradox and Promise: Essays on American Life and Education, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,Prentice-Hall Inc.,1961,p.175

[6]Lucus,J.R. "Against Equality",op. cit.,p.139

of all children.[1] Their criteria would not be attached to any one particular set of talents,[2] such as intellignece tests.

Wilson, for example, considers choice and effort as relevant criteria.[3] Rawls' concern for the benefit of the least advantage and everyone's self-worth permits the inference that he would propose individual need as a relevant criterion.[4] Tawney allows the use of intelligence tests for the purpose of adapting educational method to individual needs, but not for the purpose of selecting and labeling children as gifted.[5] Because of their concern for sameness, egalitarians would place their moral priority[6] on non-competitive criteria.[7]

The egalitarian idea for programming the gifted would be that equal treatment does not necessarily aim at same treatment.[8] They would provide different programs to develop different kinds of talent.[9]

In summary, egalitarians are those who adopt the inclusive thesis. Curriculum workers who hold this position would base their

---

[1]Wilson, John Equality, op. cit.,p.185

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.,p.63,70

[4]Rawls, John A Theory of Justice, op. cit.,p. 83, 107

[5]Tawney,R.H. Equality,op. cit.,p. 49,109

[6]Blackstone, W.T. "The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity", op. cit.,p.70

[7]Tunnell, D.R. "Equal Opportunity Revisted", op. cit.,p.311

[8]Benn, S.I. "Egalitarianism and the Equal Consideration of Interests", op. cit.,p.64

[9]Wilson, John Equality, op. cit.,p.185

assumption of giftedness on a developmental position that giftedness can be developed by designing environments.[1] They would place their moral priority on the use of non-competitive criteria for selecting the gifted. They would also be concerned with the education of all children by developing different programs to meet different needs of students.

The Elitists

The elitists are those who adopt the exclusive thesis as their application of 'equality'. They attempt to identify the gifted, segregate them and give them superior educational resources,[2] because these children may benefit more from such resources and later may contribute more to social quality and equality than other children.[3] They would support the use of competitive criteria for selecting the gifted. Their moral priority, therefore, would be attached to the achievement[4] of few children or to "let the best man win."[5]

Those who take the extreme position would set high prerequisites to exclude as many children from a gifted program as possible. They would support the slogan "more means worse" to justify their exclusive

---

[1]Zais,R.S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations, N.Y.,Thomas Y. Crowell Co.,1976,p.206

[2]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit.,p.347

[3]Walberg,H.J. and Bargan, Mark "Equality: Operational Definitions and Empirical Tests" in Kopan, Andrew and Walberg,H.J.(eds.) Rethinking Educational Equality, op. cit.,p.12

[4]Parsons, Talcott "Equality and Inequality in Modern Society or Social Stratification Revisited", op. cit.,p.14

[5]Gardner,J.W. Excellence:Can We be Equal and Excellent too?, op. cit.,p.6

criteria in the interest of "maintaining academic standards"[1] The logic of such a practice is seen as being flawed by those who oppose the extreme position since they see that the academic standards of an institution are reflected in the qualities of students as they leave, not as they enter a program.[2]

Those who take a less extreme position identify themselves as a "choice" group who support the provision of different choices for developing a sense of excellence and satisfaction of belonging and of having persisted to mastery to every student.[3] Wood and Barrow's analysis, for example, shows that it is unconvincing and inadequate to object to an elitist position as an unfavorable conception of equality.[4] Their analysis also points out that such an objection usually involves the opponant's moral judgement that the exclusive criteria adopted for a particular treatment are based on irrelevant reasons.[5] Zais, for instance, objects to those programs that base their exclusive criteria of intelligence on a genetic assumption as being elitist because such an assumption is irrelevance.[6]

In general, the elitists believe that intelligence is a fixed,

---

[1]Pratt, David Curriculum: Design & Development,op. cit.,p.277

[2]Ibid.

[3]Jarrett,J.L. "Toward Elitist Schools" Phi Delta Kappan, 60,9, May 1979,pp. 647-9

[4]Woods, R.G. and Barrow, R.St.C. An Introduction to Philosophy of Education, op. cit.,pp.166-9

[5]Ibid.,p.168

[6]Zais, R.S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations, op. cit., p. 205

genetic trait.[1] Such a belief leads to the selection of a few intellectually gifted students for an intellectually rigorous curriculum in order to prepare them for their leadership functions in the future. This belief can be traced to Plato's idea of natural inequality.

Plato stated in The Republic that there was natural inequality of intellectual abilities among human beings.[2] According to Plato, education was to be differential depending upon the quality of the person, whether it be gold, silver, brass, or iron.[3] The educational program that Plato envisioned was designed to produce an intellectual meritocracy which demanded that selection became a vital educational function.[4] Nash's analysis of The Republic showed that Plato's central concern was the quest for justice. He implied that Plato would ask for the development of a method to justify the selection of the gifted.[5]

Plato's idea has influenced American education. Jefferson's view of equal social opportunity had some mark of being an application of the social organization of Plato's republic to democratic society.[6] His plan for public education in Virginia was to provide free elementary schooling for all students in that state but only the superior of them

---

[1]Zais,R.S. Curriculum:Principles and Foundations, op. cit.,p.205

[2]Dittami,P.J. "An Analysis of Selected Concept of Equality and Equal Opportunity as Reflected in Specific Educational Issues",op. cit., p. 87

[3]Plato The Republic, translated by Cornford,F.M.,N.Y.,Oxford University Press, 1967,p.107

[4]Nash, Paul Models of Man,N.Y.,John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,1968,p.6

[5]Ibid.,p.10

[6]Heslep, R.D. "Thomas Jefferson's View of Equal Social Opportunity" Educational Theory,13,2, April 1963,p.148

would be provided with free secondary and university education.[1]

Jefferson's idea of equal social opportunity did not require that every student should have a chance to obtain the same education, but one "should receive an education proportioned to the condition and pursuits of his life."[2] It was an educational system that separated the ablest, who would become a leader, from the masses.

The Platonic ideology also influenced the thinking of social Darwinists who believe in the slogans of "struggle for existence" and "survival of the fittest".[3] They suggest that nature would provide that the best competitors in a competitive situation would win, and that this process would lead to a continuing improvement of the society and equality.[4] Galton, for example, introduced the theory of normal curve distribution assuming that nature has set the distribution of intelligence with most person of average ability and few of very high or very low intelligence.[5]

---

[1]Jefferson, Thomas "Crusade Against Ignorance" in Rippa,S.A. (ed.) Educational Ideas in America: A Documentary History,N.Y.,David McKay Co.,Inc.,1969,p.41

[2]Jefferson, Thomas "A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" in Boyd,J.P. et al.(eds.) The Collected Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton,N.J., The University of Princeton Press,1952,V.2, pp. 526-33

[3]Hofstadter, Richard Social Darwinism in American Thought, Boston, The Beacon Press, 1955, p.6

[4]For example, Sumner,W.G. The Challenge of Facts quoted in Myers, H.A. Are Men Equal?: An Inquiry into the Meaning of American Democracy, Ithaca,N.Y.,Cornell University Press, 1955 (Copyright 1945) pp. 139-40

[5]Galton, Francis Hereditary Genius, London, 1869, cited in Tannenbaum, A.J. "History of Interest in the Gifted Education", op. cit., p.26

Plato's quest for the method to justify the selection of the gifted has been answered by Terman's development of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test. Terman believed that intelligence is a genetic trait that can be identified by the test and that psychologists can improve the society by identifying the gifted and the dull.[1]

Terman's belief has been supported by other elitists. Eliot, for example, proposes that it is imperative to provide an excellent education for the minority who are to be the guardians of the culture.[2] Eysenck, Herrnstein, and Jensen also believe that genetic factors largely determine intelligence and one's social position.[3]

In summary, the elitists are those who attempt to identify and nurture only a small group of gifted children by using the exclusive thesis. Their definitions of giftedness would be based on the genetic assumption of intelligence. They would want to adopt a competitive approach to identify the gifted. Their ideas on programming for this group of children would be to select few children with high IQ scores for superior curriculum.

The positions of the egalitarians and the elitists have deep roots in the thoughts of Western culture[4] and may be consciously or

---

[1]Terman,Lewis "The American Psychological Corporation" Science, 59, June 20, 1924,p. 548

[2]Eliot, T.S. Notes Towards the Definition of Culture, London, Faber, rev. ed.,1962,p.37

[3]Eysenck,H.J. The Inequality of Man, London,Temple/Smith,1973; Herrnstein,R. IQ in the Meritocracy, London, Penguin,1973; Jensen,A.R. Educability and Group Differences, London, Methuen, 1973

[4]Dittami, Peter James "An Analysis of Selected Concept of Equality and Equal Opportunity as Reflected in Specific Educational Issues", op. cit.,pp.15-46

unconsciously adopted by educators as their hidden value positions. In the next section, the study will examine philosophical issues related to the conceptions of equality in the development of gifted programs in order to bring these hidden value positions into the open.

Philosophical Issues Related to Equality

A major issue on program implications of the concept of equality is: How much the inclusive and exclusive theses should be applied in a gifted program?"[1] The debate over this issue is found between the elitists and the egalitarians. Program developers need to choose one of these positions as a basis for the development of the program.[2]

Curriculum practices of some gifted programs seem to indicate a relative elitist position by preselecting the gifted on the basis of high IQ scores and allowing these children to stay in the programs for at least a year.[3]

The commonly found reason to justify the above practices is that "The right to differentiated curriculum of the gifted cannot be denied."[4] Such an argument seems completely rational, to those who

---

[1]Kaplan,S.N. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook, Reston, Va.,Council for Exceptional Children, 1975,p.26

[2]Jordan,J.A. "Dialouge between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker",op. cit.,pp.303-42

[3]Renzulli,J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Revolving Door: A Truer Turn for the Gifted" Learning, 9, 3, October 1980,p.91

[4]For example, Marland,S.P.,Jr. Education for the Gifted and Talented, op. cit.,p.88; Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.1; Clendening,C.P. and Davies, R.A.Creating Programs for the Gifted,N.Y.,R.R. Bowker Co.,1980,p.3; Olstad,D. "The Pursuit of Excellence is not Elitism" Phi Delta Kappan, 60,3, November 1978,p.188

support such practices, on the grounds that children who require special services are provided with such services: and to be eligible for these services, all gifted children must be labelled and preselected. They see that standardized tests are highly desirable for making an objective comparison of the abilities of the applicants.[1]

In contrast to those who believe that the use of the pre- and fixed selection is justified and promoting equality are those who criticize such practice as elitist, exclusive, and unjust.[2] They see that the use of a high IQ score as a criterion to select the gifted seems to merely exclude students from these programs.[3] These educators appear to take a relatively egalitarian position since they believe that giftedness can be developed through designing enriched environments [4] and all children should be afforded the opportunities to develop their talents to the fullest.[5] They seem to justify their belief on the grounds that because there is no widely accepted theory of giftedness,[6]

---

[1]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.28

[2]For example, Callahan,C.M."Myth:There must be 'Winner' and 'Losers' in Identification and Programming!" op. cit.,p.17; Baer,N.A. "Programs for the Gifted: A Present or a Paradox?"Phi Delta Kappan,61,9, May 1980,p.623; Weiler,D."The Alpha Children: California's Brave New World for the Gifted" Phi Delta Kappan,60,3,November 1978,pp.185-7

[3]Roger,V.R. "Openness and the Gifted - Tentative Connections" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,4, Fall 1981,p.178

[4]Gallagher,J.J. "Issues in Education for the Gifted" in Passow, A.H.(ed.)The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development,op. cit.,p.29

[5]This belief was examined in the discussion of inclusive criteria.

[6]Renzulli,J.S. "What We Don't Know About Programming for the Gifted and Talented" Phi Delta Kappan,61,9,May 1980,pp.601-2

no identification system will ever provide the perfect tool for the selection of the gifted.[1]

Those educators who criticize current gifted programs as being elitist seem to base their argument on the unjustification of the selection methods employed by these programs rather than the belief that every child should receive the same education.

Baer, for example, points out that it seems unfair to provide special funds to the gifted when educators cannot be certain that some of these children may be mistakenly overlooked. According to him, gifted children from background other than the white middle class may be denied access to the programs based on their low test scores. He sees that the provision of an exciting program for a fixed small group of children is elitist and undemocratic.[2]

Baer's criticism is supported by Feldman and Bratton's study which shows that almost every child is gifted in some socially valued way, and the selection criteria employed by gifted programs may overlook some of these children.[3]

Furthermore, some educators questioned the justification of the reasons for the development of gifted programs that it is the right of the gifted to be preselected and to receive differentiated

---

[1]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.64

[2]Baer,N.A. "Programs for the Gifted: A Present or a Paradox?" op. cit.,p.623

[3]Feldman,D.H. and Bratton,J.C. "Relativity and Giftedness: Implications for Equality of Educational Opportunity" Exceptional Children, 38, 5, February 1972,pp.491-2

curriculum. Callahan, for example, asked:

> ... does such a right also give these children exclusive access to activities which might also be of benefit to other children? Do gifted children alone need to develop creative thinking or critical thinking skill?....To accept those assumptions, is to deny all the knowledge we have about the growth and learning of children.[1]

Callahan proposed that an identification process should be defensible on the grounds that children who require differentiated programs are provided with those programs. Such practice, according to Callahan, would reduce the need to label children.[2] She suggested that the issue of being an elitist program can be resolved if all children were guaranteed an education that would be tailored to fit their individual needs.

The concern that gifted programs may be elitist is not new in this field. The historical overview of gifted education showed that some educators, such as Townsend[3] and the writers in the Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE,[4] have warned that the development of gifted programs needs to be concerned about the needs of every individual. Such a concern, however, seems to be a rhetorical rationalization for

---

[1]Callahan,C.M. "Myth: There must be 'Winner' and 'Losers' in Identification and Programming", op. cit.,p.17

[2]Ibid.

[3]Townsend,H.G. "The Democratic Idea and the Education of Gifted Children", op. cit.,p.154

[4]Havighurst,R.J. et al. "The Importance of Education for the Gifted", op. cit.,p.13

the development of gifted programs. Slippage between the ideological and formal domains, therefore, may occur in those programs that state such an intention but have not carried it into practices.

Slippage or nonrationality between curriculum domains can be reduced if the decision in the highest level is justified. According to Jordan, the decision in the lower level (i.e., in the formal domain) can be justified only to the extent that the decision in the level higher up on which it depends (i.e., in the ideological domain) is justified.[1]

The justification of the decision in the ideological domain is important and difficult to achieve.[2] Curriculum workers should become sensitive to diverse values of equality[3] so that they can choose the best choice for program implications.[4] Such a practice would justify the decision in the ideological domain and would reduce the amount of slippage.

---

[1]Jordan,J.A. "Dialouge between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker", op. cit.,p.324

[2]Ibid.,p.322

[3]House, E.R. "Whose Goals? Whose Values? and Whose Kids?" The National Elementary Principal,5, 51, February 1972,p.61

[4]Jordan,J.A. "Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker", op. cit.,p.317

Conclusion

The review of the literature in this chapter shows that there are several conceptions of equality of educational opportunity. These conceptions are different from each other in terms of: their interpretations of 'equality', the nature of opportunity, their definitions of giftedness, and the criteria of relevance for similar or dissimilar treatment. Among these conceptions, the study selected to develop a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction since these positions are concerned with the distribution of educational resources.

The egalitarians would support the application of the inclusive thesis and are concerned about the development of individual potentialities. They would base their definitions of giftedness on the developmental or behavioral assumption that can be created if an individual is given access to a variety of educational opportunities. They would consider the use of non-competitive criteria for selecting the gifted and would provide different kinds of programs to meet different needs of an individual.

The elitists, on the other hand, would support the application of the exclusive thesis and are concerned about competition. They would base their definitions of giftedness on the nature assumption that is a fixed trait that can be predetermined by intelligence tests. They would set a high score on these tests as their standard for identifying the gifted and would homogeneously grouping these children for superior curriculum on a relatively permanent basis.

The differences between the ideas of the egalitarians and the elitists permit opportunities for slippage in a gifted program if different

positions are adopted by different domains of that program. In order to describe patterns of slippage between the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs, a classification system will be developed in the next chapter to analyze the value(s) underlying these domains.

CHAPTER IV

A CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

The study used the Goodlad Conceptual System as a guide to trace slippage between the ideological and formal domains that might occur in each sample program. According to Goodlad, such slippage can be traced by analyzing and comparing each domain's commonplaces.[1]

One of those commonplaces in the ideological domain is the statements of philosophy of a program; and two of those in the formal domain are the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection method of the program. Slippage, therefore, can be investigated by analyzing and comparing the value position(s) underlying these commonplaces in the two domains.

The purpose of this chapter is to develop a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction to analyze the selected commonplaces in the ideological and formal domains of each sample program. The development of such a classification system is based on two premises.

---

[1]Goodlad,J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p.66

First, Lazarsfeld[1] and Holsti[2] suggest that the development of a classification system can be done by formulating a structural scheme and then systematically applying it to the data on the subject of study. The structural scheme of the concept 'equality of educational opportunity' was developed in the last chapter as a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction. In this chapter, the study applies these two positions to the data regarding the selected commonplaces in the ideological and formal domains.

The collection of the above data is based on the second premise that categories can be developed by building an array of alternative positions from reviewing the literature on opinions and practices.[3]

The review of the literature in this chapter are divided into three parts including statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, identification and selection methods. Each part contains the sections on: an overview of opinions and current practices, and an analysis of values including three examples of each position, i.e., the egalitarians and the elitists. These examples are obtained from different sources. The examples of these positions on statements of philosophy as well as the examples of the elitist position on the two commonplaces in the formal domain

---

[1]Lazarsfeld,P.F. Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays , Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc.,1972,pp.232-3; Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Barton,A.H. "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification, Typologies, and Indices", op. cit.,p.166

[2]Holsti, O.R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities, Reading, Mass.,Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.,1969,p.104

[3]Goodlad, J.I. "What Goes on in Our Schools?", op. cit.,p.6

are obtained from some of the eighteen sample programs[1] and their updated information. The examples of the egalitarian position on these two commonplaces, however, are obtained from scholarly opinions because a cursory examination of these commonplaces in the sample programs revealed only a relatively elitist position.

Statements of Philosophy

Philosophical statements or a rationale which substantiates the purpose for a program[2] can be considered as a component of the ideological curriculum.[3] These statements typically include a number of items holding to the fostering of values or other general statements.[4] Slippage between the ideological and the formal domains of a gifted program is found when the value position of equality of educational opportunity underlying such statements is inconsistent with the one underlying the actual practice.[5]

An Overview of Opinions and Practices Regarding Statements of Philosophy

Several scholars suggest that statements of philosophy should be

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,pp.9-54

[2]Kaplan,S.N. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook, op. cit.,pp.9-54

[3]Goodlad,J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p.59

[4]Tanner, D. and Tanner, L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, op. cit.,p.65

[5]Goodlad, J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p.59

explicitly made so that they could be used to support the overall program design and implementation.[1] The statements of philosophy of a gifted program should also be a subject to an ongoing modification in the light of the new evidences about the nature of individuals and to meet the changing situations to which it is presumed to be applicable.[2] Newland[3] and Roger[4], however, observe that educators usually accept such a program as inherently valuable without the concern for its philosophical base and the compatibility of values between its practice and the overall aim of education.

In regard to an opinion on what values of equality of educational opportunity should be explicitly stated in the statements of philosophy, Kaplan suggests that these statements should include both elitist and egalitarian positions. She notes that the philosophy which is created for a gifted program "should be exclusive in its appropriateness for the educational needs of these students. At the same time, it must

---

[1]For example, Bloom, Benjamin S. All Our Children Learning, op. cit.,p.186; Molnar, Alex and Zohorik, J.A.(eds.) Curriculum Theory, Washington, D.C.,ASCD, 1977,p. vi; Wood,R.G. and Barrow, R. St. C. An Introduction to Philosophy of Education, op. cit.,p. 183; Tanner,D. and Tanner, L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, op. cit., p. 64; Roger, V.R. "A Sense of Purpose" The National Elementary Principal, 53, 4, 1974, p. 8; Thomas, L.G. "A Model for Making and Testing Value Judgements" in Thomas, L.G.(ed.) Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research, The Seventy-First Yearbook of the NSSE Part I, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press, 1972, p. 248; Pratt, D. Curriculum: Design & Development, op. cit.,p. 106

[2]Newland, T.E. The Gifted in Socioeducational Perspective, Englewood Cliff, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1976, p. 113

[3]Ibid.,p. 112

[4]Roger, V.R. "Openness and the Gifted - Tentative Connection", op. cit.,p. 175

also be inclusive of the appropriate aspects of the general philosophy written by the parent institution for all students."[1]

The above scholars seem to agree with Goodlad that there should be consistencies of values between the ideological and formal domains of a gifted program.

An Analysis of Values Regarding Statements of Philosophy

A dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction is developed to analyze statements of philosophy. These categories are applied from Roger's analysis. Roger developed three categories: socialization, development, and liberation to analyzed aims of gifted programs from Macdonald's classification system.[2] His analysis of values is summarized as follows:[3]

The Developmental View. The developmentalists hold that the aim of education is the fullest possible development of individuals' intellectual, moral, and social-personal qualities. This view draws from the works of Piaget (intellectual growth) and Kohlberg (moral growth). Educators who take this position would allow every child to have access to a rich variety of learning experiences.[4]

---

[1]Kaplan,S.N. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook, op. cit.,p.26

[2]Macdonald,J.B. "Values Bases and Issues for Curriculum", op. cit., pp. 10-21

[3]Roger, V.R. "Openness and the Gifted - Tentative Connections", op. cit.,p. 175

[4]Bee, H.L. "A Developmental Psychologist Looks at Educational Policy or the Hurrier I Go, the Behinder I Get", An occasional paper, N.Y., The Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1976,p.20

The Liberation View. This position places great value on persons. Educators who hold this position would challenge schools to educate and to free individuals from the narrowness of their own culture. They would believe that the purpose of education is to challenge the status quo.

The Socialization View. This view accepts the status quo by holding that education exists to replicate and support the existing sociopolitical and economic structure by the most efficient and effective means possible. Its goal is to make what already exists better and better, rather than to change it in any significant way.

Roger's categories are applied to the egalitarian and the elitist positions developed in the last chapter. The developmental[1] and the liberation views, which encourage every child to have access to educational resources, seem similar to the thought of the egalitarians who attempt to include as many children as possible in a gifted program. At the same time, the socialization view which accepts the status quo and supports the existing structure, seems similar to the thought of the elitists who attempt to identify and nurture only a small group of gifted children.

In summary, there seemed to be an agreement among some scholars that philosophical statements should be a framework for the development of a gifted program. They also seemed to agree that there should be consistencies of values underlying such statements and other components of the program. A dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction was developed to analyze these statements of each sample. The ana-

---

[1]Macdonald,however, sees that the developmentalists are influenced by the thought of the elitists on the ground that they tend to direct and guide children.(Macdonald,J.B."Values Bases and Issues for Curriculum" op.cit.,p.17)

lysis of these statements was based on two variables in which they may contain: (1) the kind of equality, (2) the reason used to justify the program. The criteria for analysis and examples of each position were as follows.

The Egalitarian Statements of Philosophy. The egalitarian statements would be based on the inclusive thesis. They would show an intention of program developers to provide access to gifted programs to almost every child. The reason used to justify these programs would be the concern for every child. For example:

"Every child has the right to discovery and maximum development of his/her potential."[1]

> It is the goal of...(the school district) to provide equal educational opportunities for all pupils. We recognize that there are extensive differences in pupils and that to provide equality, we must attend to these differences.[2]

"Every community should be responsive and responsible for educating its children to their highest peak of individual ability."[3]

The Elitist Statements of Philosophy. The elitists would base their statements on the exclusive thesis. They would intend to limit access to a gifted program to only a small number of children with high intellectual ability who are predetermined to become the leader of

---

[1]Wake County Public School System "Gifted and Talented Program: Resource Program Model", Raleigh, N.C., 1982, p.1 (This school district was appeared in the ERS as the "Raleigh School System".)

[2]Ontario-Montclair School District "Philosophy Statement", Ontario, CA., An updated information from the program coordinator, dated May 24, 1982

[3]Norwalk Board of Education Academically Talented Program: Curriculum Guide Grade 3-8, Norwalk, Conn., Norwalk School District,1982, p.3

the society. They would, therefore, base their justification on the utilitarian reasons, e.g. promise of future success. For example:

> Students of high intelligence and academic potentiality (2% of the population) need more than the intellectual challenge of heterogeneous self-contained classroom can provide.[1]

> ...the gifted and talented are those children whose academic and intellectual abilities and potential for accomplishment are so outstanding that they require special provisions to meet their individual needs.... By fostering the multiple and unique needs of each individual gifted students, those characteristics needed for self-actualization and the building of a better society will be developed.[2]

"The program is committed to those children demonstrating extraordinarily high abilities."[3]

Definitions of Giftedness

Similar to the statements of philosophy, a definition of giftedness can provide a direction for designing a program. The decision of program developers on the selection methods and program prototypes to be used in the program is dependent on their definitions of giftedness.[4]

---

[1]Norwalk Board of Education "Academically Talented Program: Curriculum Guide Grade 3-8", op. cit.,p.3

[2]Wake County Public School System "Gifted and Talented Program" Raleigh,N.C.,1982,p.2

[3]Chula Vista City School District "Gate Program", Chula Vista, CA.,1982,p.4

[4]Passow, A.H. and Tannenbaum,A.J. "Differentiated Curriculum for the Gifted and Talented: A Conceptual Model" A paper prepared for the Office of Projects for Gifted and Talented, Montgomery County (MD.) Public Schools, N.Y.,Teacher College, Columbia U.,1978,p.14

An Overview of Opinions and Practices Regarding Definitions of Giftedness

A large number of entries in the literature concerning the gifted define giftedness in terms of superior intellectual ability.[1] There are, however, theoretical disputes on the limitations of intelligence tests and many different forms of giftedness, such as the work of Guilford.[2] Some studies also have shown that giftedness can be subject to change and growth as a result of deliberate training or instruction.[3] These theoretical controversies have largely been put aside in practice and the utility of the intelligence test to select the gifted has been given prominance.[4] Such a practice implies an emergence of a strong tendency to equate giftedness with high IQ scores and to ignore the controversies and uncertainties about the nature of the concept.[5]

The IQ definitions can be conversely stated in statistical definitions which define giftedness in terms of the percentage of individuals who range above average on the frequency curve of distribution of measured abilities. According to the statistical definitions, a gifted child is one who deviates to a substantial degree in a plus direction of the normal

---

[1]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children,op. cit.,p.4

[2]Guilford,J.P. The Nature of Human Intelligence, op. cit.

[3]For example, Munday,L.A. and Davis,J.C. "Varieties of Accomplishment After College: Perspectives on the Meaning of Academic Talent" Iowa City, American College Testing Program Research Report,No. 62, 1974; Sternberg,R.J. "The Componential Theory of Intellectual Giftedness" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25, 2, Spring 1981,pp.86-93

[4]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.40

[5]Ibid.

curve.[1] The IQ and the statistical definitions seem to be influenced by Terman's study. He defined gifted children as those in the top centile. His 905 standardization cases for the 1916 Stanford-Binet Scale showed that the distribution of the IQ scores of 130 and above constituted 2.2 percent of the total population.[2] His study implied that giftedness can be predetermined by stating the cutoff IQ scores or percentile rank on the normal curve. A large number of states and local school boards still use the IQ and the statistical definitions by defining a gifted child as one with an IQ above 130, or one within the upper two percent of the local population.[3]

Terman's conception of gifted children as those in the top centile of the normal curve leads to an attempt to define giftedness as the handicapped. There has been a profession-building effort to establish the need for recognition of a special treatment for the gifted and for the retarded by comparison between the two ends of the normal curve,[4] since 1911.[5] Such an effort probably came from the awareness of educators that special programs for the handicapped in this country always received

---

[1]Hildreth, G.H. Introduction to the Gifted, op. cit.,pp.24-6

[2]Ibid.,p.26

[3]Paul, J. "Educating the Gifted" in Thompson,G.R. (ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1980-81, Chicago,Ill. Marquis Academic Media,1981, p. 327; Clendening,D.P. and Davies,R.A. Creating Programs for the Gifted, N.Y.,R.R. Bowker Co., 1980,pp.19-39

[4]Hildenbrand,S. "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", op. cit.,p.45

[5]Rottman, R.L. "Selected Factors Related to the Enrollment of Exceptional Children in Programs of Special Education", Ph.D. Dissertation, Berkeley, CA., U. of California, 1965,p.13

public support and sympathy.[1] A current survey of state statutory definitions of gifted children showed that almost 50 percent of the states have classified these children within the category of exceptional children.[2] Florida, wherein few of its school districts are among those participants in the ERS sample, for instance, use the phrase "exceptional children" to mean mentally and physically handicapped as well as gifted.[3]

The most popular definition of giftedness adopted in recent year is the one that set forth by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE).[4] This definition broadens the concept of giftedness from academically gifted to include other abilities. These abilities are: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, visual and performing arts, and psychomotor ability. The definition also states that, "It can be assumed that utilization of these criteria for identification of the gifted and talented will encompass a minimum of 3 to 5 percent of the school population."[5] This expanded definition is probably a result from a societal force of increas-

---

[1]Gallagher,J.J. "Needed: A New Partnership for the Gifted" in Gibson,J. and Chennells,P.(eds.) Gifted Children: Looking to Their Future, London,Latimer New Dimensions Ltd.,1976,p.58

[2]Zettle,J.J. Gifted and Talented Education From a Nationwide Perspective, op. cit.,p.3

[3]State of Florida Dept. of Education "A Resource Mannual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students" Tallahassee, Florida, March 1981,p.3

[4]Renzulli, J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition", op. cit.,p.181; Karnes,F.A. and Collins,E.C. "State Definitions of the Gifted and Talented: A Report and Analysis" Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 1,2, 1978,pp.44-62

[5]Marland,S.P.,Jr. Education for the Gifted and Talented, op. cit., pp.10-11

ing emphasis on the culturally different gifted children.[1]

The USOE definition has served the useful purpose of calling attention of educators to a variety of abilities, however, it received some criticisms. Gallagher[2] and Renzulli[3] point out that the difinition fails to state in operational terms and fails to give guidance in program development; and, it can be misinterpreted as if the six categories of giftedness were mutually exclusive.[4]

Some ducators see that the USOE definition is elitist since it has been expanded from the IQ definitions.[5] Treffinger, for example, points out that the predetermined percentages of gifted children indicated in the definition can be interpreted as the suggested fixed numbers of gifted children.[6] Renzulli also notes that the definition has created a myth of the contemporary gifted education that the gifted constitute 3-5 percent of the population.[7] These criticisms may be based on the fact

---

[1]Gallagher,J.J. "Issues in Education for the Gifted" in Passow, A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, op. cit.,p.30; Abernathy,S.M. Who Says He's Gifted?: A Look at the Present Legal Status of Gifted Education, December 1980, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 216 472,p.8

[2]Gallagher,J.J. "Issues in Education for the Gifted",op. cit.,p.30

[3]Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?:Reexamining a Definition", op. cit.,p.181

[4]The USOE Report, however, notes that these categories are not mutually exclusive. (Marland,S.P.,Jr. Education for the Gifted and Talented, op. cit.,p.29)

[5]For example, Feldman,D. "Toward a Nonelitist Conception of Giftedness", op. cit.,p.662

[6]Treffinger,Donald J. "Myth: Your Sample must be the same as the Population!" Gifted Child Quarterly,26,1, Winter 1982,p.16

[7]Renzulli,J.S. "Myth: The Gifted Constitutes 3-5% of the Population!" Gifted Child Quarterly, 26,1, Winter,1982,p.11

that such percentages can be conversely interpreted as suggested IQ scores. The table of frequency equivalents for the distribution of IQs developed by Percival M. Symonds shows that children who are in the top 5 percent of the total population have the IQ scores of 125 and above.[1]

The criticism that the USOE definition is elitist also lies in its failure to include a motivational factor as an ingredient of giftedness.[2] The belief that such a factor is an important part of giftedness has been supported by much research.[3] A selection process based on this definition, therefore, may overlook some gifted children.

The USOE definition was later modified in 1978. The new federal definition still retains the broad categorical definition of giftedness. It, however, appears to deemphasize psychomotor abilities by not specifically mentioning them as a potential target population, and does not indicate any minimum percentage of the gifted from the total population.[4] Zettel notes the impact of this new definition on state policy that twelve states have deleted the psychomotor category from their definitions of giftedness.[5]

An alternative way to define giftedness is the behavioral definition developed by Renzulli. According to him, giftedness consists of an

---

[1]The table was cited in Hildreth,G.H. Introduction to the Gifted, op. cit.,p.27

[2]Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" op. cit.,p.181

[3]Freehill,M.F. and McDonald,J. "Zeal: Essential to Superior Intellectual Achievement?" Gifted Child Quarterly,25,3, Summer 1981,p.126

[4]The new federal definition was cited in Ford,B.G. and Jenkins, R.C. "Changing Perspectives in the Education of the Gifted",op.cit.,p.169

[5]Zettle,J.J. Gifted and Talented Education From a Nationwide Perspective,op. cit.,p.12

interaction among three clusters of human traits: above average abilities, task commitment, and crativity. He also suggests that children have the potential to behave in gifted ways if they are given opportunities to engage in a wider range of activities.[1]

It is important to note that each trait is weighted equally in Renzulli's definition[2] while the IQ definitions seem to place greater emphasis on the ability level of the child than on other characteristics. The above-average abilities, according to Renzulli, is not simply considered "above-average intelligence" nor "extraordinary", but, rather, above average aptitude achievement in any field of human endeavor.[3] He also explains that "creativity" is originality within some specified areas of interest that may be not indicated by scores on existing creativity tests.[4]

Renzulli sees that the above traits are exhibited by a relatively large proportion of the general population at certain times and in certain situations.[5] His definition identifies giftedness as a situational or an interactional concept[6] rather than as a fixed characteristic as is the case with traditional definitions.

---

[1]Renzulli, J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition", op. cit.,p. 216

[2]Ibid.,p. 184

[3]Ibid.

[4]Renzulli, J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?", op. cit.,p. 5

[5]Renzulli, J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" op. cit.,p. 182

[6]Ibid.,p. 180

An Analysis of Values Regarding Definitions of Giftedness

A dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction is developed to analyze the value underlying the definition of giftedness of the sample programs. It is applied from Renzulli's analysis of this commonplace on a conservative-liberal continuum.[1] His criteria for classification were based on the degree of restrictiveness of two factors: the areas and the level of performance that one must attain to be considered gifted.[2]

According to Renzulli, the conservative definitions would limit the areas of performance to only the academic ones and exclude other areas, such as music and art. They would also restrict the predetermined degree or level of excellence one must attain on objective tests. Renzulli then cites Terman's definition which limited the area of performance to the general intellectual ability, and the level of performance to the top one percent of the population on the Stanford-Binet Test as an example of these definitions.[3]

The liberal definitions, Renzulli says, would expand the number of performance areas and put less emphasis on the precision of degree or level of excellence than the conservative ones.[4] His behavior definition which expands the areas of performance from academic to include other

---

[1] Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition", op. cit.,p.180

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

aspects of school activities may be an example of these definitions.

Renzulli's categories are applied to the egalitarian and elitist categories developed in Chapter Three. The liberal definitions which define more students as being gifted than the conservative ones are inferred to be egalitarian while the conservative definitions are inferred to be elitist.

In summary, a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction was developed to analyze four variables: (1) the conception of giftedness, (2) the restricted areas and (3) levels of performance, and (4) the percentage of the population considered as being gifted, that might be contained in the definition of a sample program. The criteria for analysis and examples of each position on these variables are as follows.

The Egalitarian Definitions. The egalitarians would base their definitions of giftedness on a behavioral, or a developmental, or an interactional assumption that giftedness can be developed if a child is given access to an appropriate environment. Such definitions would not restrict the areas or levels of performance and would include many children (at least 15% of the total population)[1] in a gifted program. For example:

> Giftedness is an interaction of three clusters of traits: above average abilities, task commitment, and creativity. Each cluster plays an equal role in the development of giftedness.[2] (As a result of this definition, about 15-26%

---

[1]The lowest percentage found in the pilot programs that implemented Renzulli's definition.(Callahan,C.M."Superior Abilities" in Kauffman,James M. and Hallahan,Daniel P. (eds.) Handbook of Special Education, Englewood Cliffs,N.J.,Prentic-Hall, Inc.,1981,p.62)

[2]Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" op. cit.,p.180

> of the total population are considered as being gifted.)[1]
>
> Giftedness is the product of an interaction of the environment and native ability that can be created through designing enriched environment and opportunities.[2]
>
> The concept of giftedness must be broadened to encompass many kinds of gifts and shift from a trait to a developmental view of giftedness that every child is gifted in some socially valued way.[3] There are few, if any, gifts that children cannot acquire or enjoy. All gifted behaviors simply are not innate and confined to a special group of students but can be taught and learned to some degree by all children.[4]

The Elitist Definitions. The elitists would base their definitions of giftedness on a genetic or a psychometric assumption[5] that giftedness is a relatively unchanging trait of an individual that can be predetermined. Such definitions would restrict the areas of performance to high IQ scores. These definition, therefore, would include only a small number

---

[1] Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.62; Delisle, J.R. et al. "The Revolving Door Identification and Programming Model" Exceptional Children, 48, 2, Oct. 1981, p.153

[2] Gallagher, J.J. "Issues in Education for the Gifted", op. cit., p. 29

[3] Feldman, David "Toward a Nonelitist Conception of Giftedness" op. cit.,pp. 662-3

[4] Finkel, Ira "Today's Gifted Education: From Questionable to Stupid",Learning, 9, 3, Oct. 1980, pp.93-4

[5] Feldman,D. "The Mysterious Case of Extreme Giftedness" in Passow, A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, op. cit.,p.340

of children (less than 1% of the total population) in a gifted program. For example:

> A gifted student is one who excels to an exceptional degree in one or more of the mental processes. To qualify as gifted, a student's test results on one of several special tests of mental ability must be equal to or higher than 98% of all other students in his or her age group. Roughly two students out of one hundred qualify.[1]
>
> Gifted students are those children and youth who possess a high degree of general intellectual ability and have the potential for high academic achievement and performance. These children comprise approximately 3% of the general school population.[2]
>
> Gifted students are those in the upper 2% of the school population in intelligence test scores, school achievement and potential growth, or score above an established level in standardized creativity tests.[3]

Identification and Selection Methods

A part of a written plan that needs to be established before the implementation of a gifted program is the identification procedure which determines who the gifted are and what techniques should be used to identify them.[4] The development of such a procedure should evolve from the

---

[1]Ontario-Montclair School District, "Programs for the Gifted", Ontario, CA.,1982,p.1

[2]Atlanta Public Schools "Programs for Exceptional Children: Criteria and Placement Procedures for the Challenge Program", Atlanta,GA., 1982,p.1

[3]Norwalk Board of Education "Academically Talented Program: Curriculum Guide Grade 3-8", Norwalk, Conn., Norwalk School District, 1982, Appendix A

[4]Couillard,R.G. "Guidelines for Identification and Instrument Selection" in Connecticut State Dept. of Education Conn. Cept V, Hartford, Conn.,1978, Revised Edition, p.10

statements of philosophy of the program.[1] In other words, the value underlying the ideological domain should be consistent with the value underlying the formal domain of that program. An overview of opinions and practices in the next section will provide the information on the available procedures and techniques. Such knowledge may be an aid for making an inference about the values underlying these procedures and techniques and may reduce the inconsistencies of values between the two domains.

An Overview of Opinions and Practices Regarding Identification and Selection Methods

A typical procedure employed by many programs usually involves a two-step diagnostic-prescriptive process.[2] For example, the gifted are identified in the spring of the year, and, once involved in the program, are eligible to stay in it for at least one year.[3] Such a practice as well as its alternative procedures and techniques will be discussed below.

Identification Procedures

There are at least four suggested methods of identification in the literature: (1) the sequential method, (2) the case study method, (3) the matrix approach, and (4) the Revolving Door Identification Model. The first three methods are the commonly recommended procedures to select students prior to the time they enter a program,[4] while the last one is

---

[1]Roedell, W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.27

[2]Passow,A.H."The Nature of Giftedness and Talent",op.cit.,p.9

[3]Renzulli, J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Revolving Door: A Truer Turn for the Gifted", op.cit.,p.92

[4]Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.59,61

a continuous procedure.[1]

The first procedure, the sequential method, is conceived of as the procedure that is organized into a sequence of events,[2] perhaps parents and teacher nominations, followed by group and individual testings. Any child who fails to meet the standard of any part of the sequence is eliminated from further consideration. The rationale for the use of this method is economic.[3]

The second method, the case study, is ideally conceived of as the procedure that allows all applicants to participate in all stages of the selection process and considers multiple sources of information on each applicant in the final selection.[4] One expert, however, suggests the use of this method as the final step of the sequential method.[5] A study by Renzulli and Smith has shown that the case study method is generally superior, less costly, and less time consuming than the first one.[6] It also increases the opportunities for every applicant.[7]

The third method, the matrix approach or a point system is somewhat similar to the case study method. It involves the weighting

---

[1]Renzulli,J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Revolving Door: A Truer Turn for the Gifted", op. cit.,p.92

[2]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.63

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Martinson,R.A. A Guide Toward Better Teaching for the Gifted, Ventura,CA.,Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools,1976, p.23

[6]Renzulli, J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Two Approaches to Identification of Gifted Students" Exceptional Children, May 1977,43,8,pp.512-8

[7]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit.,p.63

of various identification data, such as the procedure in the Baldwin Identification Matrix.[1]

Three shortcomings of the use of the matrix approach have been pointed out by Callahan. First, although a matrix is purported to serve as a means of reducing cultural bias in the selection procedure, the data from standardized tests are usually given more weight than other data. Second, those variables with greater variance become the determining factors in selection; thus test scores are still more likely to have the greatest influence on selection. Third, the use of such a matrix may lead one to make judgements on the basis of a single score derived from a potentially biased and somewhat restricted sample of behavior.[2]

The last method, the Revolving Door Identification Model (RDIM) is based on Renzulli's behavioral definition of giftedness. The definitional attribute of above average ability suggested that there is a large pool of children who will be selected at any given time for program placement.[3] These are children who have been identified by several objective and subjective techniques. Placement, however, is dependent upon the concurrent presence of the other two characteristics noted in the definition: task commitment and creativity.

It is not expected by the RDIM that the above gifted behaviors will be consistently present, but rather that they emerge at certain time

---

[1]Cooke,G. and Baldwin,A. "Unique Needs of a Special Population" in Passow,A.H. (ed.) The Gifted and Talented: Their Education and Development, op. cit.,p. 391

[2]Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,pp.61-2

[3]Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?", op. cit.,p. 5

and under certain conditions when a child becomes "turned on" to a particular topic, or event.[1] The model allows children to enter the program at those points when the three attributes are present and exit when that condition no longer prevails.[2]

The Renzulli Model can be an alternative identification procedure to the traditional ones. An outcome of the adoption of this model is a program with (1) an ever-changing population, (2) the capability to serve a large number of children, and (3) a curriculum based on the areas of interest and task commitment of the children placed in that program.[3]

Identification Techniques

A review of opinions and practices showed that the above procedures usually employ some of the following techniques.[4]

1. Group and Individual Intelligence Tests. Although intelligence tests are widely used in the identification of the gifted,[5] the use of these tests as the sole criterion has come under much criticism. Renzulli, for example, states that the reliance on these tests alone is roughly analogous to selecting students on "the basis of hair or eye color."[6]

---

[1]Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?", op. cit.,p.5

[2]Renzulli,J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Revolving Door: A Truer Turn for the Gifted", op. cit.,p.92

[3]Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.62

[4]Ibid.,pp.59-62

[5]Baer,N.A. "Programs for the Gifted: A Present or a Paradox?" Phi Delta Kappan, op. cit.,p.622

[6]Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?", op. cit.,p.9

His analogy implies that such a criterion does not correlate with relevant characteristics of the gifted since there is the lack of agreement among scholars about the assumption that giftedness is some sort of absolute that can be predetermined.[1]

In addition, Callahan summarizes four problems inherent in the use of intelligence tests. First, group intelligence tests often do not ask a sufficient number or variety of questions to assess the gifted accurately. Second, intelligence tests in general provide very little diagnostic data for planning to meet the needs of these children. Third, these tests tap a very restricted domain of potential intellectual abilities. Fourth, they are culturally biased and result in the identification of students from the predominant cultural group.[2]

Despite the above limitations, many programs seem to base their selection decisions on these tests as if they were the most accurate criterion. A national survey of identification practices showed that the most common standard to identify the gifted is a minimum score of 130 or the attainment of at least two standard deviations above the norm on an individual intelligence test.[3] Another survey found abuse of standardize testing and other inappropriate practice, such as the use of IQ and achievement tests to identify the nonintellectually gifted.[4]

---

[1]Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children,op. cit.,p.40

[2]Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.62

[3]Zettel,J.J. "State Provisions for Educating the Gifted and Talented" Exceptional Children, October 1981,48,2, pp.124-31

[4]Alvino,J. et al. "National Survey of Identification Practices in Gifted and Talented Education" Exceptional Children, October 1981,48, 2, pp.124-31

2. Achievement Tests. As with the IQ tests, achievement tests have been criticized as being indicators only of what a child already knows and what his culture values rather than tests of potential ability.[1] Their usefulness, however, lies primarily in their ability to assess the degree to which the child is able to master the standard curriculum quickly and accurately, and in indicating patterns, strengths, and weaknesses in those areas.[2] A series of investigations at the John Hopkins University which emphasized the importance of using difficult standardized group tests to identify mathematically gifted found that these tests were far better predictors than teacher judgement.[3]

3. Creativity Tests. Unlike intelligence and achievement tests which tend to measure convergent thinking or the knowledge of the one right answer, creativity tests generally purport to measure divergent thinking or the development of new ideas.[4] Criticisms of these tests revolve around their reliability and validity because the concept of creativity is difficult to define and be measured objectively.[5]

With an awareness of the limitations of these tests, some scholars have recommended the use of more subjective methods than paper-

---

[1]Torrance,E.P. "Training Teachers and Leaders to Recognize and Acknowledge Creative Behavior Among Disadvantaged Children" Gifted Child Quarterly, 1972,16,pp.3-10; Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?:Re-examining a Definition", op. cit.,p.182

[2]Callahan,C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.60

[3]Stanley,J.C. "Test Better Finder of Great Math Talent Than Teachers" American Psychologist, 1976, 31, pp.313-4

[4]Fox, L.H. et al. Productive Thinking of Gifted Children in Classroom Interaction,Reston,VA.,Council for Exceptional Children,1967,p.20

[5]Khatena,J."Some Problems in the Measurement of Creative Behavior" Journal of Research and Development in Education,4,Spring 1971,pp.77-9

and-pencil tests,[1] such as a student self-report;[2] or a combination of these tests with other techniques, i.e., teacher's screening and expert's judgement,[3] to measure divergent thinking.

4. Teacher's Judgement. A review of the literature dealing with the role of teacher's judgement showed that most authorities agree that this technique should be accompanied with other objective rating techniques.[4]

A widely used rating scale is the Renzulli and Hartman Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristic of Superior Students.[5] The scale was designed to serve as a guide for teacher's judgement in the areas of learning, motivation, creativity, and leadership and has been found to correlate highly with the results of standardized instruments.[6]

Besides the above scale, there are, however, some current check-lists that seem to associate gifted characteristics with genetic factors, such as early speech, stronger and heavier than average children.[7] Such

---

[1]Thomson, Margery "Identifying the Gifted" The National Elementary Principal, 51, 5, Feb. 1972, p.44

[2]Wallach, M.A. "Tests Tell Us Little About Talent" American Scientist, 64, 1976, p.57

[3]Rubenzer,R. "Identification and Evaluation Procedures for Gifted and Talented Programs" Gifted Child Quarterly, 23, 2, Summer 1979,p.309

[4]Gallagher, J.J. Research Summary on Gifted Child Education, Springfield, Ill., Superintendent of Public Instruction,State of Ill.,1966,p.12

[5]Clendening,C.P. and Davies,R.A. Creating Programs for the Gifted, op. cit.,p.19

[6]Renzulli,J.S. "System for Identifying Gifted and Talented Students" in Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Conn.Cept V, op. cit.,p.26

[7]Coffey,G. et al. "Qualities of Gifted Children" in Thompson,G.R. (ed.)Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79,Chicago,Ill.,Marquis Academic Media,1979,p.430; and also the other two articles in the same Yearbook: Abraham,W."The Young Gifted Children",p.432; Sisk,D.A."What if Your Child is Gifted?",p.427

checklists seem to treat giftedness as something that is existing in particular children and have contributed greatly to the formation of stereotypic images of this population.[1]

Most of the descriptions of the overall superiority of the gifted are derived from studies that have compared groups of gifted children, usually identified by a single intelligence test score, with various groups from the general population, such as Terman's study.[2] These studies have focused on the dominant or white population and have found that greater numbers of the gifted have come from high socioeconomic groups.[3] The characteristics of the gifted generated from the sample of these studies, therefore, may be the characteristics of the white socio-economic advantage rather than those of the gifted.[4]

Those educators who look for simple descriptions of the gifted, however, have ignored Terman's own finding that the gifted are heterogeneous and differ among themselves in many ways.[5] In this connection, Passow warned that these characteristics are useful only if it is remembered that an individual may not possess all of the traits and behaviors described to a group of gifted persons.[6]

5. Parents, Peers, Self, and Experts' Identification. A review of gifted

---

[1]Callahan, C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.52

[2]Roedell, W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children, op. cit ,p.26

[3]Callahan, C.M. "Superior Abilities", op. cit.,p.52

[4]Ibid.

[5]Terman, L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol. 3: The Promise of Youth: Follow-up Studies of a Thousand Gifted Children,op.cit., p.55

[6]Passow,A.H. "The Nature of Giftedness and Talent",op. cit.,p.5

program descriptions showed that some programs use parents, peers, and experts in music, art, and drama to aid in the identification process.[1] Self selection was also reported as being used by some programs.[2] One study indicated that even though parents did overestimate their children's abilities, they provided a more effective gross screening technique than teacher's judgement or tests.[3]

An Analysis of Values Regarding Identification and Selection Methods

A dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction is developed to analyze the value underlying the identification and selection method of each sample program. Such a category is applied from Renzulli's analysis of this commonplace on an objective-subjective continuum.[4]

According to Renzulli, educators at the subjective end would totally discount test scores and select students on subjective criteria, i.e., teachers, parents, peers, or self nominations to be followed by interviews and a trail admission to the program. On the other hand, Renzulli explains, educators at the objective end would base their criteria of selection on standardized tests in an effort to eliminate all

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.4

[2]The National Commission on Resources for Youth,Inc.,Community-Based Mentorships for Gifted and Talented: Final Report,N.Y.,1977, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 150 794, p.10

[3]Ciha,T.E. et al. "Parents as Identifiers of Giftedness, Ignored But Accurate", Gifted Child Quarterly, 18, 1974, pp.191-95

[4]Renzulli,J.S. and Stoddard,E.P.(eds.) Under One Cover: Gifted and Talented in Perspective,1980,ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 192 501, p.9

accusations of a biased selection process.[1] Inherent in the use of such tests are the cutoff IQ scores and the belief that giftedness is a relatively fixed characteristic.

Renzulli's classification appears to concern itself with the types of techniques used in a selection process rather than the values underlying them. In this connection, Husén has offered an analysis of value on an egalitarian-elitist distinction.[2] According to him, the more restrictiveness of the admission criteria, the more biased the system is against lower class pupils.[3] He, therefore, considers such a practice as being elitist.[4] Husén further points out that an egalitarian program would be open and provide possibilities for students to re-enter the program once they left it.[5]

Renzulli's categories and Husén's analysis are applied to the egalitarian and elitist categories developed in the last chapter. The practice of those educators at the subjective end appears to be similar to that of the egalitarians who are not concerned about competition. The use of subjective criteria and a trial admission can be construed to mean restrictions are lifted and the program is open to serving more children. At the same time, the emphasis on competition of those at the objective

---

[1]Renzulli,J.S. and Stoddard,E.P.(eds.) Under One Cover: Gifted and Talented in Perspective, op. cit.,p.9

[2]Husén, Torsten Talent, Equality and Meritocracy: Availability and Utilization of Talent, The Netherlands, Martinus Nijhoff, 1947

[3]Ibid.,p.141

[4]Ibid.,p.8

[5]Ibid.,p.142

end appears to be elitist.

A review of the sample programs from the ERS[1] showed that the sequential and the matrix approaches were the identification methods used. Several selection techniques were employed by these programs but their major criterion was based on the IQ scores of 128 and above , and/or the achievement test scores of 90 percentile and above. Once the gifted were selected, they were eligible to stay in the program for at least one year or through a level of their schooling. Such practices can be inferred to be elitist since they limit access to the program to only a small number of children on a relatively permanent basis.

Few sholars have proposed alternative models which can be inferred to be egalitarian. These models seem to provide more opportunity to more children than those methods used by the ERS sample programs. The Passow and Tannenbaum Model, which is similar to the RDIM, for example, is concerned with the creation of the right kinds of opportunity to create gifted behaviors,[2] rather than finding out who possess gifts. The model treats selection as a recurring activity that allows re-entry points in the program.[3] It also gives equal consideration to both objective and subjective information on the child.[4]

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,pp.9-54

[2]Passow,A.H. "The Nature of Giftedness and Talent", op. cit.,p. 9

[3]Passow,A.H. and Tannenbaum,A.J. "Differentiated Curriculum for the Gifted and Talented: A Conceptual Model", op. cit.,p.14

[4]Passow,A.H."The Nature of Giftedness and Talent", op. cit.,p.9

In summary, a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction was developed to analyze two variables of the selection process of each sample program: (1) the major criterion for selection, (2) the period that the selected child is eligible to stay in the program. The criteria for analysis and example of each position on these variables are as follows.

The Egalitarian Identification and Selection Methods. The egalitarians would either use subjective techniques, such as self identification, as their major criterion, or give equal recognition to both objective and subjective criteria. They would also employ a recurring identification process, i.e., data are gathered during the time a child is interacting with experiences. Such a practice would allow the child to flow into and out of the program whenever he exhibits the need for such a program. For example:

> The model gives equal attention to the use of objective and subjective criteria.... It is also seen as a continuous process that creates the right kinds of educational opportunities which facilitate self identification. For instance, a program of instruction and practice in creative poetic expression in different structural forms enables children with poetic talent to reveal themselves.[1]

> Identification procedures should place as much emphasis on the way in which children interact with experiences (i.e., action or performance information) as they do on the ways in which children respond to structured questions or rating (i.e., status or psychometric information).... The regular classroom teacher can become more involved by providing certain types of enrichment experiences that will become useful as the situations or occasions for spotting children who should be "fed into" the resource room.[2]

---

[1]Passow, A.H. "The Nature of Giftedness and Talent",op. cit.,p.9

[2]Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?", op. cit.,pp.5-6

> The discovery of talent is a continual process that must begin early and continue later in a child's career through the educational system. All along the way it must provide him with a wide range of opportunities to learn and develop, and it must also provide frequent occasions for observing all aspects of his development.... These observations must include formal tests..., and non standard measures. Educators must learn to be comfortable with the idea that all measurement... does not reside in "objective tests" and that, indeed, the measurement of all human behavior is ultimately rooted in subjective judgement. The task is to make these judgements as good and reliable as possible.[1]

The Elitist Identification and Selection Methods. The elitists would emphasize competition by basing their major criterion for admission on high scores on objective tests. They would also employ a one-shot identification process to select a child prior to the time he enters a program. Accessibility to the program, therefore, is limited to only this preselected group of children for at least one year.[2] For example:

> A gifted student is identified by classroom observation, then he is screened with individual tests.... If he received a score of 130 or above on two or more tests, the selection process continues... Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program at each of the school levels.[3]

> Selection is based on score of 130 or above on the individual test (Binet or WISC). Selected students are reevaluated every three years.[4]

---

[1]Thomson,Margery "Identifying the Gifted", op. cit.,p.44

[2]Renzulli,J.S."Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?",op. cit.,p.4

[3]Ontario-Montclair School District, "Program Guide for Gifted and Talented Education",CA.,Ontario-Montclair, Sept. 1981,p.5

[4]Wyoming Valley West School District, Kingston,PA.,as cited in Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.32

> Identification is based on superior mental development as indicated by IQ score of two standard deviations or more above the mean on an individual test, or score of 130 on WISC-R, and 132 on the Binet. Each student will be re-evaluated every three years to determine continued placement.[1]

Conclusion

A dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction was developed to analyze the values underlying the ideological domain, or the statements of philosophy, and the formal domain, or the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection method, of each sample program.

The criteria for analyzing statements of philosophy were: (1) the kind of equality, and (2) the reason used to justify the program that might be contained in those statements. The egalitarian statements would be based on the inclusive thesis to provide access to a gifted program to almost every child and would show a concern for the development of every child. The elitist statements, on the other hand, would be based on the exclusive thesis to limit access to the program to only a small number of children with high intellectual ability and would have concern for only the development of those who will become the leaders of the society in the future.

The criteria for analyzing definitions of giftedness were: (1) the conception of giftedness, (2) the restricted areas, (3) levels of performance, and (4) the percentage of the population considered to be gifted. The egalitarian definitions would be based on a behavioral,

---

[1]Hillsborough County Public Schools "Hillsborough County's District Procedure for Gifted", Tempa, Florida, 1982,p.2

or a developmental, or an interaction assumption that giftedness can be created by designing the environment. Such definitions would not restrict the areas or levels of performance and would include many children (at least 15% of the population) in a gifted program. The elitist definitions, on the contrary, would be based on a genetic or a psychometric assumption that giftedness is a relatively fixed characteristic that can be predetermined. Such definitions would restrict the area of performance to only the academic ones and/or would restrict the level of performance to high IQ scores. These definitions would include only a small number of children (less than 1% of the population) in a gifted program.

The criteria for analyzing identification and selection methods were: (1) the major criterion for admission, and (2) the eligible period that a selected child can stay in the program. The egalitarians would either use subjective techniques as their major criterion, or give equal recognition to both objective and subjective techniques. They would employ an ongoing selection process that allows the child to be in the program on a temporary basis (less than one year). The elitists, in opposition, would base their major criterion for admission on high, predetermined scores on objective tests. They would allow the selected child to stay in the program on a relatively permanent basis (at least one year).

The study will use these developed criteria to analyze the value position(s) underlying the ideological and formal domains of each sample program in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

THE RESULTS

This chapter reports the findings of the analysis of slippage between the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs. The organization of the report follows the outline of: the framework for analysis, the analysis of the data, and the analysis of slippage. Before presenting the results, it is useful to describe briefly the sample programs used in the analysis.

The Data

The data were the eighteen sample program descriptions from the ERS,[1] the updated information from the districts, and the additional information from their state guidelines. These sample programs were from six states: California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

The descriptions of the eighteen programs and their state guidelines were summarized in Appendix A. The organization and the order of these sample programs in the study were arranged differently from the

---

[1] Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit., pp. 9-54

way they appeared in the ERS publication. Names of individuals were deleted; minimal editing was done for format consistency and to reduce the length of the sample without altering their basic content. A summary box was presented at the beginning of each sample to provide an overview of the program.

The Framework for Analysis

In order to answer the major question which was concerned with the investigation of the pattern of slippage between the value positions of equality of educational opportunity underlying the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs, there was a need to answer three minor questions. The first one was concerned with the development of a framework for analysis. The second and third ones were concerned with the analyses of the ideological and formal domains of each of these programs.

A classification scheme for analysis was developed in Chapter IV. This classification scheme evolved from an analysis of the review of the literature related to an egalitarian-elitist distinction on the selected commonplaces in the ideological and formal domains. The selected commonplaces in the ideological domain were statements of philosophy of gifted programs while those in the formal domain were definitions of giftedness and identification and selection methods. This developed framework was the answer to the first minor question and was summarized in Table 8, Appendix B.

The Analysis of the Data

The value position(s) of the selected concept underlying the ideological and formal domains of each of the sample programs was revealed by using the developed framework to analyze these two domains.

The Analysis of the Ideological Domain

The value position(s) of the selected concept underlying the ideological domain of each sample program was revealed by the analysis of its statements of philosophy. It was apparent that six of the sample programs (Programs: 6, 11, 12, 13, 17, and 18) did not specify such statements. The study, therefore, borrowed those statements from the districts' state guidelines and substituted them for the unspecified statements.

The analysis of the statements of philosophy was derived from two variables: (1) the kind of equality and (2) the reason for justifying the program. The analyses of the ideological domain of each of the sample programs were provided in Table 9-26, Appendix B. Each analysis revealed the answer to the second minor question which was concerned with the investigation of the inferential value position(s) of the selected concept underlying the ideological domain of each of the sample programs. The results of the analyses were summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

THE INFERENTIAL VALUE POSITION(S) OF THE IDEOLOGICAL DOMAIN OF THE SAMPLE PROGRAMS

Programs	n	The inferential value(s)
2, 14	2	egalitarian
1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15	6	elitist
3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18	10	egalitarian and elitist

Table 1 showed that the value positions underlying the sample programs were egalitarian, elitist, and both positions.

The Analysis of the Formal Domain

The value position(s) of the selected concept underlying the formal domain of each sample program was revealed by the analysis of the two commonplaces in this domain, i.e. the definition of giftedness, and the identification and selecteion methods used.

The analysis of the definition of giftedness was derived from four variables: (1) the conception of giftedness, (2) the restricted areas, (3) the restricted level of performance, and (4) the percentage of the gifted. It was apparent that four of the sample programs (Programs: 3, 9, 11, and 12) did not specify the percentage of the gifted in their definitions. The analyses of these programs were done by substituting the actual percentage of the gifted in the summarized box for the unspecified percentage.

The analysis of the identification and selection method was

derived from two variables: (1) the major criterion for admission, and (2) the eligible period to stay in the program.

The analyses of the formal domain of each of the sample programs were provided in Table 9-26, Appendix B. Each analysis revealed the answer to the third minor question which was concerned with the investigation of the inferential value position(s) of the selected concept underlying the formal domain of each of the sample programs. The results of these analyses were summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

THE INFERENTIAL VALUE POSITION(S) OF THE FORMAL DOMAIN OF THE SAMPLE PROGRAMS

Programs	n	The inferential value(s)
1-13, 15-18	17	elitist
14	1	egalitarian and elitist

Table 2 showed that the inferential value positions underlying the formal domain of the sample programs were elitist, and both egalitarian and elitist.

The Analysis of Slippage

The investigation of slippage that might occur between the ideological and formal domains of each of the sample programs was done by assessing the inconsistency of the value positions underlying the two domains. The analyses of the two domains of each of the eighteen sample programs were shown in Table 9-26, Appendix B.

The results of the assessments showed that slippage was found in twelve of the sample programs. Among these programs, three patterns of slippage were found. There was, however, no slippage found in the other six of the sample programs. The details of the results are as follows.

1. Three patterns of slippage.

Pattern 1: The ideological domain was inferred to be egalitarian while the formal domain was inferred to be elitist. This pattern was found in the analysis of Program 2 as presented in Table 3.

Pattern 2: The ideological domain was inferred to be both egalitarian and elitist while the formal domain was inferred to be elitist.

This pattern was found in the analyses of ten of the sample programs (Programs: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, and 18). The commonality among these programs was that one variable (i.e., the kind of equality) in the ideological domain was inferred to be elitist; while the other variable (i.e., the reason for justifying the program) was inferred to be egalitarian. All variables in the formal domain, however, were inferred to be elitist. This pattern was shown in Table 4.

Pattern 3: The ideological domain was inferred to be egalitarian while the formal domain was inferred to be both egalitarian and elitist.

This pattern was found in the analysis of Program 14 as shown in Table 5.

2. No slippage was found in the analyses of six of the sample programs (Programs: 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15). The commonality found among these analyses was that their ideological and formal domains were

inferred to be elitist. None of these programs, however, was analyzed to be egalitarian in both domains. Such a commonality was shown in Table 6.

3. Slippage between the formal and operational domains was found in the analysis of Program 14. The percentage of the gifted specified in its definition was more than 15% of the population which was inferred to be egalitarian. Its actual percentage, however, was 8% which was inferred to be elitist. The inconsistency between the percentages of the gifted stated in the definition and the actual practice was also found among other sample programs, but the two percentages were inferred to be the same position. Table 7 showed such an inconsistency found among the sample programs.

Although the finding of slippage between the formal and operational domains was not within the scope of the study which was concerned with slippage between the ideological and formal domains, it suggested the possibility of slippage between the other two domains of the Goodlad Conceptual System for further studies.

TABLE 3

PATTERN 1 OF SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS OF PROGRAM 2

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality	inclusive	
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restrict to particular areas
3. The restricted level of performance		restrict to high scores on intelligence and/or achievement tests
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least three years

TABLE 4

PATTERN 2 OF SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS OF SOME SAMPLE PROGRAMS

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restrict to particular areas
3. The restricted level of performance		restrict to a high score on intelligence and/or achievement tests
4. The percentage of the gifted		2-5% of the population
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		1-3 years

TABLE 5

PATTERN 3 OF SLIPPAGE BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGICAL AND FORMAL DOMAINS OF PROGRAM 14

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality	inclusive	
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restrict to four areas
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score in the upper 5% of the population
4. The percentage of the gifted	more than 15% of the population	
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		a high score on an objective test
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least three years

TABLE 6

COMMONALITY AMONG SOME OF THE SAMPLE

PROGRAMS WITH NO SLIPPAGE

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restrict to particular areas, i.e., academics
3. The restricted level of performance		restrict to high scores on an intelligence and/or achievement tests
4. The percentage of the gifted		1-3%
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		1-3 years

TABLE 7

THE INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE PERCENTAGES OF THE GIFTED IN THE DEFINITION AND THE ACTUAL PRACTICE OF THE SAMPLE PROGRAMS

Program	Percentage of the gifted stated in the definition	The actual percentage	The different percentage from that stated in the definition
1	2	4.5	+2.5
2	2	3.1	+1.1
3	n/a	4.8	n/a
4	2	6.3	+4.3
5	2	4.9	+2.9
6	5	0.2	-4.8
7	2	2.8	+0.8
8	1	0.4	-0.6
9	n/a	2	n/a
10	3	1.9	-1.1
11	n/a	0.9	n/a
12	n/a	3.4	n/a
13	3	1.9	-1.1
14	15	8	-7
15	3	1.5	-1.5
16	5	6.6	+1.6
17	2	0.6	-1.4
18	3	2.1	-0.9

n/a = not specified

The range of the inconsistency was between -4.8% to +4.3%

Conclusion

The study used a framework developed in Chapter IV to analyze and assess the inconsistencies between the value positions of equality of educational opportunity underlying the ideological and formal domains of the sample programs. The results showed that three patterns of slippage were found among twelve of the eighteen sample programs. One of these programs also indicated slippage between the formal and operational domains.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was concerned with an investigation of patterns of slippage that might occur in the interpretation of the concept "equality of educational opportunity" from the intention of the planning group into the practice of the selected gifted programs. The investigation used the Goodlad Conceptual System as a map to trace such slippage.

The Conceptual System identifies five domains of a curriculum system that can be perceived differently by those who are involved in its development. These domains are: ideological, formal, perceived, operational, and experiential. Among these domains, the study chose to investigate slippage between the first two domains because their products are usually in a written form,permitting an objective analysis.

The ideological curricula are the educational planning group's ideas of what ought to be, oftentimes contained in the statements of philosophy of a program. The formal curricula are the written plans that have gained official approval by a state or a local school board.

Slippage between domains, according to Goodlad, is likely to be found in the transaction of an idea from the ideological domain to

the other domains. Such an idea may be adapted or modified through the sociopolitical and personal interpretative processes involved in the transaction.

The design of the study was to analyze slippage between the value position(s) of equality of educational opportunity embraced in the two domains of each sample program.

The value position(s) underlying the ideological domain was revealed by an analysis of the statements of philosophy of the program. The value position(s) underlying the formal domain was revealed by an analysis of two commonplaces, i.e., the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection methods used. Slippage between the two domains, if any, was revealed by an assessment of their inconsistencies.

The data for analysis were the eighteen program descriptions obtained from the ERS, additional information obtained from their school districts and state guidelines.

Three minor questions needed to be answered before the finding of the patterns of slippage. The first one concerned the development of a framework for analyzing the two domains of a gifted program.

The development of the framework involved two steps. First, the study developed a structural scheme of a dichotomous category of an egalitarian-elitist distinction. Second, the study applied the structural scheme to the data on the selected commonplaces in the ideological and formal domains to form each position's constellations of commonplaces. The selected commonplaces in the ideological domain were statements of philosophy of gifted programs while those in the formal domain were

definitions of giftedness and identification and selection methods.

The data for developing the structural scheme were obtained from the review of the literature on philosophical analysis of the concept of equality of educational opportunity in the context of gifted education. The developed scheme showed that the egalitarians would support the application of the inclusive thesis, base their definitions of giftedness on a behavioral assumption, and use non-competitive criteria to select children into the program. The elitists, as indicated by the scheme, would support the application of the exclusive thesis, base their definitions of giftedness on a genetic assumption, and use competitive criteria to select children into the program.

The data on the ideological and formal domains of gifted programs were obtained from an overview of opinions and practices regarding the selected commonplaces in the two domains (i.e., statements of philosophy, definitions of giftedness, and identification and selection methods) and the eighteen sample programs.

The second and third minor questions concerned the classification of value position(s) underlying the ideological and formal domains of each of the sample programs by using the developed framework. The value position(s) underlying the ideological domain was revealed by analyzing the statements of philosophy of the program. The value position(s) underlying the formal domain was revealed by analyzing the definition of giftedness and the identification and selection methods of the program.

Once the value position(s) underlying the two domains of each of the sample programs was identified, the next concern was to assess the inconsistencies between these domains and to find the patterns of

slippage among those programs that indicated such inconsistencies.

The results of the analysis of the study indicated three patterns of slippage among twelve of the eighteen sample programs. There was no indication of slippage in the other six of the sample programs.

Conclusions

The study has provided a basis for the following main conclusions:

1. The study found a way to analyze/investigate slippage between the value positions of equality of educational opportunity underlying the ideological and formal domains of a gifted program. The developed framework for analysis was summarized in Table 8, Appendix B.

2. Slippage was found in twelve of the sample programs in three patterns:

Pattern 1: The ideological domain was inferred to be egalitarian while the formal domain was inferred to be elitist.

Pattern 2: The ideological domain was inferred to be both egalitarian and elitist while the formal domain was inferred to be elitist.

Pattern 3: The ideological domain was inferred to be egalitarian while the formal domain was inferred to be both egalitarian and elitist.

Recommendations

This study was an attempt to understand slippage, a curriculum phenomenon, by finding out whether the idea of equality of educational opportunity in the ideological domain was inconsistent with the practice in the formal domain of gifted programs. The study represents just a small part of slippage that can occur within and between the five domains

identified by the Conceptual System, but it is hoped that through studies such as this, some of the issue of slippage in the development of a gifted program could be brought into clearer focus and more understanding of the relationships of some of the variables between domains could be added to the whole.

Two kinds of study need to be undertaken in order to pursue more understanding about this phenomenon.

1. It was shown by this study that there was possibility of slippage between the formal and operational domains, much research, therefore, needs to be done to observe and analyze slippage between other domains, besides those that were analyzed by the study.

2. An alternative approach would be to analyze slippage between the ideological and other domains regarding some fundamental concepts underlying other educational programs, such as open education and individualization.

The historical overview of gifted education showed that the development of educational programs in this country has been responding to immediate needs and pressures rather than being concerned with their philosophical bases. Decisions about such bases in the highest level or the ideological domain, however, are fundamental to all decisions in the other domains. Decisions in the ideological domain are also the hardest ones to be completely rational about and any amount of nonrationality allowed at this level infects every decision in the lower levels. Decision makers in the ideological domain, therefore, should seek the best possible reasons for what they do.

Conceptual clarification of the other educational concepts would

provide educational planners and curriculum workers with the knowledge of the alternative values underlying such concepts which could be used as a data source for making rational decisions and for checking the amount of slippage that might occur in their own programs

"The curriculum is in the eye of the beholder"[1], therefore a curriculum may be inconsistently perceived by various individuals and groups in different domains of the Goodlad Conceptual System. The work in this study was to analyze such inconsistencies between the ideological and formal domains of the selected gifted programs regarding the concept of equality of educational opportunity. The inconsistencies found in this study are a part of the data that can be used to understand slippage that can occur in the whole system.

---

[1]Goodlad, J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, op. cit.,p.30

Appendix A: The Data for Analysis

State Guideline (Programs 1-5)

Statements of Philosophy.

1. Gifted and Talented Education is consistent with basic principle of American education which seeks full development of each individual's capabilities.
2. The future of our country depends upon the values, patterns of behavior, analytical and problem-solving skills, creativity, and leadership fostered in highly able children and youth.
3. Needs-based and ability-based education of the gifted and talented nourish an important source of solutions to horrendous economic, social, political, and military problems - - and uphold such basic principles as "equal opportunity", "self-realization", and "freedom".[1]

Definition of Giftedness.

> "Gifted and talented pupil" means a pupil who is identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in the following categories: intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability; high achievement; performing and visual arts talent; or any other category which meets the standards set forth in the regulations.[2]

Selection and Identification Method. The 1981 guideline suggests school districts to identify those pupils whose extraordinary capabilities require special services and programs, and to assure equal opportunity for screening.[3] Such a suggestion does not specify the meaning of "extraordinary" nor the major criteria for admission. The old guideline published in 1975, however, suggested the use of a score at or above the 98th percentile on an individual intelligence test (or the IQ score of

---

[1]California State Dept. of Education The Gateway, Sacramento, CA.,February 1981,p.1

[2]California State Dept. of Education Education Code Section 52201 and 52202, Chapter 774, Stats., Sacramento, CA.,1979

[3]California State Dept. of Education The Gateway, op. cit.,p.5

132+) as the major criterion.[1] Both publications do not suggest the eligible period that a selected child can stay in the program.

Program 1[2]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-12 Total enrollment: 18,750 Enrollment in the program: 850 (4.5% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The program attempts to address the specific intellectual, social, and psychological needs of the gifted.

Definition of Giftedness. "Gifted and talented pupil" means a pupil who is identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in the following categories: intellectual, high achievement, and specific academic ability in mathematics.

Identification and Selection Method. Different criteria are used to identify the gifted in different categories:

Intellectual Ability - the candidate is in the upper two percent of the population with the minimum score of 132 on Stanford-Binet.

Specific Academic Ability - the candidate must score at or above the 95 th percentile on an achievement test and must maintain a grade-point average of 3.5 or higher in that area for at least four consecutive semesters prior to identification.

High Achievement - the candidate must score at 125 or higher on an indi-

---

[1]California State Dept. of Education Educating the Gifted in California Schools, Sacramento, CA.,1975, p.6

[2]Doobs, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.34 and the additional information from the District dated March 11,1982

vidually administered IQ test and must have at least a 3.5 grade-point average in academic areas.

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program at each of the school levels.

Program 2[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-12
Total enrollment: 11,777
Enrollment in the program: 366 (3.1% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The objective of the program is to ensure that all students are provided equal access to program services.

Definition of Giftedness. "Gifted and talented pupil" means a pupil who is identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in the following categories: intellectual, specific academic, high achievement, and leadership ability.

Identification and Selection Method. Eligibility to enter the program is based upon individual intelligence scores at or above 98 percentile. Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program at each of the school levels.

Program 3[2]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: pre-K - 6
Total enrollment: 14,5000
Enrollment in the program: 700 (4.8% of the population)

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.45 and the additional information from the District dated June 11,1982

[2]Doob,H.S., Ibid.,p.49; and Chula Vista City School District Gifted and Talented Education Program, Chula Vista, CA.,1982

Statements of Philosophy.

> Each child is an individual of great worth, and there are many gifts and talents. Limited resources required that we focus on a few of these in the selection of participating pupils. The program is committed to those children demonstrating extraordinarily high abilities.... At all times, the prime consideration will be program options which best suit individual student needs and abilities. The program will be seen as one in which students may enter, leave, or reenter with ease depending on abilities, interests, needs, and program/student compatibility.

Definition of Giftedness. "Gifted and talented pupil" means a pupil who is idenitified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in the following categories: intellectual/academic achievement, underachievers, visual and performing arts.

Identification and Selection Method. Different matrix systems are employed to identify the gifted in different categories.

Intellectual Ability/Academic Achievement - the highest score of 26 points is given to the standard test scores in achievement at 9th stanine in reading and mathematics, or the IQ score of 140. The lowest score of three points is given to teachers' recommendation.

Underachieving Gifted - More weight is also given to IQ scores than teachers' recommendation.

Art Talented - Only three or four students at a school site are expected to exhibit the exceptional level of ability in this category. Subjective criteria, such as pupil's products, parent, and self nomination, are used. The gifted in this category are not identified on the basis of objective tests.

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program unless a later recommendation is made.

Program 4[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-8
Total enrollment: 15,000
Enrollment in the program: 950 (6.3% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy.

> It is the goal of the Ontario-Montclair School District to provide equal educational opportunities for all pupils. We recognize that there are extensive differences in pupils and that to provide equality, we must attend to these differences. Special programs for the academically talented and gifted students are a consequence of this commitment to provide every student with educational opportunities suited to his or her level of ability.

Definition of Giftedness. A gifted child is the child who, in intellectual ability, performs in the top two percent of his or her age group. Categories served are: intellectual ability, visual and performing arts, specific academic ability, creative ability, high achievement, and leadership ability.

Identification and Selection Method. An individual test showing mental ability at or above 98th percentile (or the scores at 130 or above on IQ tests) is normally sufficient evidence for admitting a child into the program.

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program at each of the school level.

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.14; the additional information from the District dated May 24,1982; Ontario-Montclair School District, "Programs for the Gifted", Ontario, CA.,1982; and Ontario Montclair School District "Programs Guide for Gifted and Talented Education", Ontario, CA., September 1981.

Program 5[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-12
Total enrollment: 20,015
Enrollment in the program: 985 (4.5% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The district is concerned with the education of each child, recognizing the needs of those with outstanding ability and potential for superior achievement in intellectual, creative, and leadership activities.

Definition of Giftedness. "Gifted and talented pupil" means a pupil who is identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in the following categories: intellectual, creative, specific, academic, or leadership ability; high achievement; performing and visual talent.

Identification and Selection Method. Eligibility to enter the program is based upon a score at or above the 98th percentile on an approved full-scale individual intelligence test.

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program at each of the school level.

State Guideline (Programs 6-8)

Statements of Philosophy.

> The Department of Education recognizes the needs of all children being served and assists all the school districts in Connecticut in developing educational programs which provide maximum opportunities for all children to fulfill their capabilities.

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.20

> Connecticut's legislation,... reflects its commitment to all children and youth requiring special education. Equal opportunities for all children and youth with special education needs are provided for under this statute. The gifted and/or talented in Connecticut are those possessing extraordinary learning ability and outstanding talent in the creative arts.
>
> It is the Department's position that these children and youth are found in every school district regardless of age-groups, ethnic groups, socioeconomic conditions and geographical environments. The gifted and talented know none of these barriers and they possess the demonstrated and potential ability to become the future leaders of Connecticut and America as a whole.[1]

Definition of Giftedness. "The gifted and talented are those possessing 'extraordinary learning ability' and 'out-standing talent in the creative arts.' Both abilities refer to the top five percent of children so identified."[2]

Identification and Selection Method. The major criterion for identifving the gifted and talented is "very superior scores on appropriate standardized tests. Such scores might be the upper two or three percent of an appropriate criterion group or scores which are at least two standard deviations above the local norm.[3]

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program for at least a school year.[4]

---

[1]Connecticut State Dept. of Education Conn-Cept I: Practical Suggestions for Gifted and Talented Program Development, Hartford, Conn., 1979, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 179 042,pp.90-1

[2]Connecticut State Dept. of Education "Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, and Prior Approval Application for Gifted and Talented Program", Hartford, Conn., Revised Edition Fall 1981,p.1

[3]Ibid.,p.5

[4]Ibid.

Program 6[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 3, 6-8 Total enrollment: 23,000 Enrollment in the program: 45 (0.2% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the District are not available for analysis, the study will use those statements in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. The gifted and talented are those possessing "extraordinary learning ability" and "outstanding talent in the creative arts". Both abilities refer to the top five percent of children so identified.

Identification and Selection Method. The major criterion for selecting children into the program is based on the IQ scores of two-standard deviations above the norm.

Once identified, a student is not retested and remains in the program for at least a school year.

Program 7[2]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 3-8 Total enrollment: 17,000 Enrollment in the program: 480 (2.8% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy.

> Every community should be responsive and responsible for educating its children to their highest peak of

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.36

[2]Ibid.,p. 10; Norwalk Board of Education, Academically Talented Program Curriculum Guide Grade 3-8, Norwalk, Conn.,1982

> individual ability. Students of high intelligence and academic potentiality (2% of the population) need more than the intellectual challenge of heterogeneous self-contained classroom can provide.... The organization of small homogeneous classes of gifted students within the scheduled day offers an opportunity to reach higher, educationally, create more challenging curriculum, open individualized opportunities to bright pupils and establish an environment for students to educationally stimulate one another.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted students are those in the upper two percent of the school population in intelligence test scores, school achievement and potential growth, or score above an established level in standardized creativity tests.

Identification and Selection Method. The selected student must be in the upper two percent of the school population in intelligence test scores, school achievement and potential growth, or scored above an established level in standardized creativity tests.

Once identified, a student is generally not retested and remains in the program through the school years.

Program 8[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-12 Total enrollment in the districts served by this program:200,000 Enrollment in the program: 800 (0.4% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The institution is dedicated to increasing the gifted science students' understanding and appreciation of the physical world.

---

[1]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.46; and the additional information from the institution dated April 2, 1982

Definition of Giftedness. The gifted are those possessing extraordinary learning ability in science. They are in the top one percent of the population.

Identification and Selection Method. The selected student must have a very superior scores on one of the standard IQ tests.

Once identified, a student is occasional interviewed and administered the Slosson Intelligence Test. The selected student will remain in the program for at least a school year.

State Guideline (Programs 9-11)

Statements of Philosophy.

> In the state of Florida, there are students who possess outstanding intellectual abilities which may require additional special instruction. In order to provide for the educational and personal needs of these gifted students, intellectually challenging and aesthetically rewarding programs have been established throughout the state.[1]

Definition of Giftedness. A gifted child is one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two standard deviations or more above the mean.[2]

Identification and Selection Method.[3] A student is eligible for special programs for the gifted if he/she demonstrates superior intellectual development - an intelligence quotient of two standard deviations or more

---

[1]State of Florida Dept. of Education A Resource Mannual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students, V. II-G: Gifted, Tallahassee, Florida, October 1980, p.9

[2]State of Florida Dept. of Education A Resource Mannual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students, op. cit.,p.1

[3]Ibid.

above the mean on an individually administered standardized test of intellegence. The standard error of measurement may be considered in individual cases.

A selected student is reevaluated every three years on educational plan, update characteristic checklist, and a need statement. Re-taken the IQ test is not required nor recommended.

Program 9[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 1-12 Total enrollment: 115,000 Enrollment in the program: 2,400 (2% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The program is concerned with the development in identified children, of thinking skills, independent study skills, and the enhancement of creativity, leadership and evaluative ability through exposure to a variety of academic enrichment not generally available in the general school curriculum.

Definition of Giftedness. A gifted child is one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two standard deviations or more above the mean.

Identification and Selection Method. The final selection is based on the IQ score of two standard deviations or more above the mean on an individual test, or a score of 130 on WISC-R, or 132 on the Binet.

Each selected student will be re-evaluated every three years (in the 3rd, 6th, and 9th grade) to determine continued placement.

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization,op. cit.,p.40: the additional information from the District dated April 30,1982; and Hillsborough County Public Schools "Hillsborough County's District Procedures for Gifted", Tempa, Florida, 1981

Program 10[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 1-8
Total enrollment: 91,713
Enrollment in the program: 1,750 (1.9% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The program is concerned with the educational and personal needs of those children who possess outstanding intellectual abilities.

Definition of Giftedness. A gifted child is one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two standard deviations or more above the mean.

Identification and Selection Method. The final selection is based on the IQ score at two standard deviations or more above the mean on an individual test, or a score of 130 on WISC-R, or 132 on the Binet.

Each selected student will be re-evaluated every three years on educational plan, update characteristic checklist, and a need statement. Re-taken the IQ test is not required nor recommended.

Program 11[2]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-6
Total enrollment: 65,000
Enrollment in the program: 585 (0.9% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the District are not available for analysis, the study will use those state-

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.47

[2]Ibid.,p. 18; and the additional information from the district dated March 11, 1982

ments in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. A gifted child is one who has superior intellectual development or outstanding talent and is capable of high performance including those with demonstrated achievement or potential ability. The mental development of a gifted student is greater than two standard deviations above the mean.

Identification and Selection Method. Any student who has a score of 130+ on WISC-R, or 132+ on the Binet is qualified to attend the program.

A selected student is reevaluated every three years on educational plan, update characteristic checklist, and a need statement. Re-taken the IQ test is not required nor recommended.

State Guideline (Programs 9-11)

Statements of Philosophy.

> The curriculum framework for gifted and talented students should consider each individual's style of thinking and learning. Each student's abilities, strengths, weakness and interests should be assessed.... Because gifted and talented students of today will be tomorrow's decision makers, they must be equipped with abilities and skills which enable them to identify problems and find effective solutions. The curriculum for gifted and talented students should provide special programs of instruction for students possessing outstanding needs which might not be met in the regular classroom.... The program for gifted and talented learners in Georgia is geared to provide stimulation and opportunities for accomplishment for the entire range of giftedness....[1]

---

[1]Georgia State Dept. of Education Program for the Gifted and Talented: September 1, 1976 through August 31, 1979 Office of Instructional Service, Atlanta, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 223 061, p. 3

Definition of Giftedness.

> Gifted students are those children and youth who possess a high degree of general intellectual ability and have the potential for high academic achievement and performance. These students have the intellectual potential to become high level innovators, evaluators, communicators, problem formulators and problem solvers in our complex society. This group comprises approximately three percent of the general school population.[1]

Identification and Selection Method. A student must have a standardized mental ability test score of at least 1 3/4 standard deviations above the mean of the test administered.[2]

All children enrolled in gifted programs shall be re-evaluated educationally or psychologically every three years.[3]

Program 12[4]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: K-12 Total enrollment: 70,000 Enrollment in the program: 2,350 (3.4% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the district are not available for analysis, the study will use those statements in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted students are those children and youth

---

[1]Georgia State Dept. of Education State Plan for the Education of the Gifted, Atlanta, Office of Instructional Service, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 192 502, p.14

[2]Ibid.,p.14

[3]Ibid.,p.24

[4]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.52; and the additional information from the district dated August 5,1982

who possess a high degree of general intellectual ability and have the potential for high academic achievement and performance. These students have the intellectual potential to become high level innovators, evaluators, communicators, problem formulators and/or problem solvers in our complex society.

Identification and Selection Method. A selected student must have a standardized mental ability test score of at least 1 3/4 standard deviations above the mean of the test administered.

A selected student shall remain in the program as long as the In-school Team recommends his/her retention based on appropriate grade and performance. All selected students must be re-evaluated educationally within a three-year period. In order to remain in the program, the selected student must score in the 90 percentile or above on the California Achievement Test.

Program 13[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted:1-7,10-12 Total enrollment: 89,000 Enrollment in the program: 1,700 (1.9% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the district are not available for analysis, the study will use those statements in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted students are those children and youth who possess a high degree of general intellectual ability and have

---

[1]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.9

the potential for high academic achievement and performance. These students have the intellectual potential to become high level innovators, evaluators, communicators, problem formulators, and problem solvers in our complex society. This group comprises approximately three percent of the general school population.

Identification and Selection Method. To be eligible to enter the program, a student must have:

1. Two or more grade levels above placement on an achievement test. (This is approximately 94% and 8th, or 9th stanines.)

2. An IQ score of 128 on a group intelligence test and an individual intelligence test score which indicates that the student is in the very superior range.

All selected students shall be re-evaluated educationally every three years.

Program 14[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 2-12
Total enrollment: 6,894
Enrollment in the program: 550 (8% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. In conducting the Program for Gifted students, we wish to avoid a rigid "cut off" point in IQ scores since no known instrument is reliable enough to warrant this. We also wish to establish procedures to guard against (1) exclusion of culturally deprived children and (2) limiting identification to a narrow conception of giftedness.

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.33

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted children comprise 15-20% of the school population. Categories served are in the areas of : intellectual, creative writing, high achievement, performing and visual arts talent in music, art, and drama.

Identification and Selection Method. A selected student must have an IQ score in the upper five percent of the population as tested on a group or an individual IQ test, or score above an established level in standardized creativity tests.

All students enrolled in gifted programs will be re-evaluated educationally or psychologically every three years.

Program 15[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 1-8 Total enrollment: 32,000 Enrollment in the program: 480 (1.5% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. The program is designed to enrich the learning experiences of intellectually able children in Richmond County's public schools. These children are those who participate rank in the upper three percent intellectually of the total school population.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted children are those in the top three percent of the population as identified intellectually.

Identification and Selection Method. To be eligible to enter the program, a student must have an IQ score of two standard deviations above the mean (individually administered), and must be in two grade levels above place-

---

[1]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.43; and Richmond County Board of Education Program for the Gifted 1981-82, Augusta, Georgia, 1982

ment on WRAT in reading and arithmetic.

Once identified, a student is re-evaluated every three years academically and on basis of need.

State Guidelines[1] (Program 16)

Statements of Philosophy. There is no statements of philosophy in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted and talented students are defined as those students who (1) possess demonstrated or potential intellectual, creative or specific academic abilities and (2) need differentiated educational services beyond those being provided by the regular school program in order to realize their potentialities for self and society. A student may possess singularly or in combination these characteristics: general intellectual ability; specific academic aptitude; creative or productive thinking abilities.

Identification and Selection Method. The guideline suggests the development of a matrix system to identify the gifted. Within that system, more weight is suggested to be given to the achievement/aptitude component than to the other three criteria(i.e., the data on an IQ test, performance data, and teachers' recommendation).

Each gifted child will have an indepth reassessment at least every three years.

---

[1]State Dept. of Public Instruction "Identification of Gifted and Talented" Raleigh, N.C.,Division of Exceptional Children, July 1980

Program 16[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 2-12
Total enrollment: 53,000
Enrollment in the program: 3,500 (6.6% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy.

> Every child has the right to discovery and maximum development of his/her potential ... The program recognized that gifted and talented are those whose academic and intellectual abilities and potential for accomplishment are so outstanding that they require special provisions to meet their individual needs. The program is designed to meet these individual needs by emphasizing intellectual functioning, academic performance, and development of creative ability. By fostering the multiple and unique needs of each individual gifted student, those characteristics needed for self-actualization and the building of a better society will be developed.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted and talented students are those who possess demonstrated or potential intellectual, creative or specific academic ability. These children consist of five percent of the total population. Categories served are in the areas of academic and intellectual abilities, and Language Arts/English in grade 7-12.

Identification and Selection Method. Matrix Systems are developed to identify the gifted in grades 2-3, 4-6, and 7-12. With-in each system, more weights are given to the highest scores on standardized achievement tests in Reading and Mathematics and performance in these areas than other criteria. For example, the matrix system developed to identify the

---

[1]Wake County Public School System, "Gifted and Talented Program" Raleigh, N.C.,1982 (This program was published in Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit. p. 16 under the name of the Raleigh Public Schools. Since the publication of the ERS, the Raleigh Public Schools and the Wake County Public Schools have merged into one consolidated system.)

gifted in grade 2-3 is based on the following criteria:

The highest scores of 98-99% in standardized achievement tests in Reading and Mathematics is equal to..... 10 points.
Superior performance in Reading and Mathematics is equal to... .... 10 points.
Intelligence test score of 99% is equal to..... 5 points.
Strongly recommendation from teachers is equal to... 5 points.

Each gifted child will be re-evaluated in the spring of his or her 3rd, 6th, and 9th grade years.

State Guideline (Programs 17-18)

Statements of Philosophy.

> Gifted programs are logically manifestations of our concern for individual differences, for equality of educational opportunity and for the optimal development of each child. By recognizing and educating the gifted as a group with identifiable differences (capabilities, interests and needs), teachers and school administrators can plan educational programs to fit the individual needs of extremely able persons and at the same time include experiences that help them develop their problem-solving and creative abilities.
>
> The recognition of individual differences among children and the attempt to educate each child in terms of strengths and potentialities are key features of American educational practice.... Because there is some difficulty in making necessary and desirable curricular adaptations to the special needs of gifted children, the American school must give more effort to recognition and development of suitable educational provisions for the full range and diversity of the gifted child's capabilities. The challenge is to turn these objectives into practice through development and use of individualized education programs for each child.[1]

Definition of Giftedness.

"Mentally Gifted/Talented" are those who have out-

---

[1]Pennsylvania Dept. of Education Guide for Organizing and Operating Programs for the Mentally Gifted and Talented, Harrisburg, PA.,1982 pp.1-2

> standing intellectual and/or creative ability, the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided in the regular program. Persons shall be assigned to a program for the gifted when they have an IQ score of 130 or higher. A limited number of persons with IQ scores lower than 130 may be admitted to gifted programs when other criteria in the person's profile strongly indicated gifted ability.
> "Talented" are those who are outstanding in the areas of art, music, dance, photographic arts or theater, the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided in the regular program.[1]

Identification and Selection Method.[2] The final selection is based on an IQ score of 130 or more on an individual psychological test.

Each gifted student is eligible to stay in the program through a level of school years.

Program 17[3]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 11-12 Total enrollment: 4,900 Enrollment in the program: 31 (0.6% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the district are not available for analysis, the study will use those statements in the state guideline.

---

[1]Pennsylvania Dept of Education "Special Education Standards Issued by the Commissioner for Basic Education, Section 341.1" Harrisburg, PA., April 1977 cited in Clendening, C.P. and Davies, R.A. Creating Programs for the Gifted: A Guide for Teachers, Librarians, and Students, N.Y.,R.R. Bowker Co.,1980,p.35

[2]Pennsylvania Dept. of Education Guide for Organizing and Operating Programs for the Mentally Gifted and Talented, op. cit.,p.4

[3]Doob, H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization, op. cit.,p.38

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted children are those having outstanding intellectual ability who are ranked in the top two percent of the senior-high enrollment.

Identification and Selection Method. Final identification and selection of the gifted will be determined by an individual psychological evaluation on a minimum score of 130.

Each selected child is eligible to stay in the program for two years (grade 11 and 12).

Program 18[1]

Grade levels included in the program for the gifted: 1-7 Total enrollment: 7,412 Enrollment in the program: 157 (2.1% of the population)

Statements of Philosophy. Since the statements of philosophy of the district are not available for analysis, the study will use those statements in the state guideline.

Definition of Giftedness. Gifted pupils are those who are academically gifted and ranked in the top three percent of the district's elementary population.

Identification and Selection Method. Final judgement is based on an IQ score of 130 or above (Binet or WISC).

Once identified, each child will be re-evaluated in grade four or five in order to allow for movement in and out of the program where it is deemed necessary.

---

[1]Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Orgainzation, op. cit.,p.32

Appendix B: The Classification System and The Analysis of the Sample Programs

TABLE 8

A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING THE IDEOLOGICAL AND

FORMAL DOMAINS OF A GIFTED PROGRAM

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality	inclusive(i.e.,access to the program is provided for every child)	exclusive(i.e.,access to the program is provided for only a small number of children)
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness	a behavioral assumption(i.e., giftedness can be developed)	a genetic assumption (i.e.,giftedness is a relatively fixed characteristic)
2. The restricted areas of performance	no restriction (include all socially valued activities)	restrict to particular areas
3. The restricted level of performance	no restriction	restrict to high scores on intelligence and/or achievement tests
4. The percentage of the gifted	more than 1% of the population	less than 1% of the population
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion	give equal recognition to both subjective and objective criteria	emphasize on objective criteria
2. The eligible period to stay in the program	a temporary basis (less than one year)	a relatively permanent basis(at least one year)

TABLE 9

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 1

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only the high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 132+
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (the actual percentage was 4.5)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: No slippage

TABLE 10

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 2

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statement of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality	inclusive	
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score at 98+ percentile
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (the actual percentage was 3.1)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 1

TABLE 11

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 3

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		restricted to high IQ scores
4. The percentage of the gifted		n/a(The actual percentage was 4.8)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		more than one year

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

n/a = was not specified

TABLE 12

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 4

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to six areas
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 130+
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (The actual percentage was 6.3)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 13

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 5

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to six areas
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 98+ percentile
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (The actual percentage was 4.9)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 14

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 6

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics and arts
3. The restricted level of performance		IQ scores of two standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		5% of the population (The actual percentage was 0.2)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least one year

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 15

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 7

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 98+ percentile
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (The actual percentage was 2.8)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		more than one year

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 16

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 8

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of gifted-ness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to sciences
3. The restricted level of performance		restricted to a very high IQ score(the exact score was not specified)
4. The percentage of the gifted gifted		1% of the population (The actual percentage was 0.4)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		more than one year

Result: No slippage

TABLE 17

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 9

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of two standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		n/a(The actual percentage was 2% of the population)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests(132+ on Binet or 130+ on WISC-R)
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: No slippage

n/a = was not specified

TABLE 18

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 10

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of two standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		3% of the population (The actual percentage was 1.9)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests (132+ on Binet or 130+ on WISC-R)
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: No slippage

TABLE 19

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 11

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of two standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		n/a (The actual percentage was 0.9% of the population)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests(130+ on WISC-R or 132+ on Binet)
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: No slippage

n/a= was not specified

TABLE 20

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 12

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 1 3/4 standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		n/a (The actual percentage was 3.4% of the population)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

n/a = was not specified

TABLE 21

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 13

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 128+ and 94% on an achievement test
4. The percentage of the gifted		3% of the population (The actual percentage was 1.9)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective test
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 year

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 22

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 14

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality	inclusive	
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to four areas
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score in the upper 5% of the population
4. The percentage of the gifted	more than 15% of the population	(The actual percentage was 8% of the population)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 3

TABLE 23

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 15

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program		concern with only high IQ students
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of two standard deviations above the mean
4. The percentage of the gifted		3% of the population (The actual percentage was 1.5)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: No slippage

TABLE 24

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 16

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		restricted to high scores on standardized achievement tests
4. The percentage of the gifted		5% of the population (The actual percentage was 6.6)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on objective tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 25

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 17

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 130+
4. The percentage of the gifted		2% of the population (The actual percentage was 0.6)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		a high score on IQ tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		2 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

TABLE 26

THE ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM 18

Commonplaces	Egalitarian	Elitist
Statements of Philosophy		
1. The kind of equality		exclusive
2. The reason for justifying the program	concern with every child	
Definition of Giftedness		
1. The conception of giftedness		a genetic assumption
2. The restricted areas of performance		restricted to academics
3. The restricted level of performance		an IQ score of 130+
4. The percentage of the gifted		3% of the population (The actual percentage was 2.1)
Identification and Selection Method		
1. The major criterion		high scores on IQ tests
2. The eligible period to stay in the program		at least 3 years

Result: Slippage Pattern 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abernathy, S.M. Who Say He's Gifted?: A Look at the Present Legal Status of Gifted Education, December 1980,ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 216 472

Abraham,W. "The Young Gifted Children" in Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79, Chicago, Ill.,Marquis Academic Media, 1979, pp. 432-3

Alvino, J. et al. "National Survey of Identification Practices in Gifted and Talented Education" Exceptional Children,48,2, October 1981, pp. 124-31

Baer, N.A. "Programs for the Gifted: A Present or a Paradox?" Phi Delta Kappan,61,9, May 1980,pp.621-3

Baldwin,B.T. "Methods of Selecting Superior or Gifted Children" in Whipple, G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children,The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington,Ill.,Public School Publishing Co.,1924,pp.26-43

Barker, Ernest The Politics of Aristotle, Book V, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952, Copyright 1946, Chapter 1:112, p.205

Beauchamp,G.A. Curriculum Theory,Wilmette,Ill., The Kagg Press,1975,209 p.

Beck,L.W. Philosophic Inquiry: An Introduction to Philosophy,N.Y.,Prentice-Hall Inc.,1952,pp.4-50

Bedau,H.A. "Egalitarianism and the Idea of Equality" in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.) Nomos IX: Equality, N.Y.,Atherton Press,1967, pp. 4-26

Bee,H.L. "A Developmental Psychologist Looks at Educational Policy or the Hurrier I Go, the Behinder I Get", An occasional paper,N.Y., the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, 1976,pp.1-22

Bell,Daniel "On Meritocracy and Equality" in Karabel,J. and Halsey,A.H. (eds.) Power and Ideology in Education,N.Y.,Oxford U. Press, 1977,pp.607-35

Bellack,A.A."Contrasting Approaches to Research on Teaching" in Tabachnik, B.R. et al.(eds.) Studying Teaching and Learning:Trends in Soviet and American Research,N.Y.,Praeger Publishers,1981,pp.62-9

Bellack,A.A."History of Curriculum Thought and Practice" Review of Educational Research,39,3,June 1969,pp.283-91

Benn,S.I."Egalitarianism and the Equal Consideration of Interests" in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.) NomosIX:Equality,N.Y.,Atherton Press,1967,pp.62-78

Benn,S.I. and Peters,R.S. The Principles of Political Thought,N.Y.,Collier Books,1964,pp.124-6

Berlin,Sir Isaiah "Equality" in Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society New Series,v.56,1955-56, London,1956,p.312

Bestor,Arthur "What Went Wrong with U.S. Schools?" U.S. News & World Report, v.44,January 24,1958,pp.68-77

Blackstone,W.T."Human Right,Equality, and Education" in Steiner,E. et al. (eds.) Education and American Culture,N.Y.,Macmillan Publishing Co.,Inc.,1980,pp.197-205

Blackstone,W.T."The Principle of Equality and Educational Opportunity" in Greene,M.(ed.) Proceedings of Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Lawrence,Kansas,The U. of Kansas, 1965,pp.60-74

Bloom,B.S. All Our Children Learning,N.Y.,McGraw-Hill,1981,pp.125-93

Bloom,B.S. "Letter to the Editor" Harvard Educational Review,39,2,Spring 1969,pp.419-21

Bowles,Samuel and Gintist,Herbert Schooling in Capitalist America, N.Y., Basic Books Publishers Inc.,1976,pp.5-44

Boyd,J.P. et al.(eds.) The Collected Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton,N.J.,The U. of Princeton Press,1952, v.2,pp.526-33

Breslow,Alice et al. "Forces Influencing Curriculum" Review of Educational Research, 30,3,June 1960,pp.202-3

Brookover,W.B. et al. "Quality of Educational Attainment,Standardized Testing,Assessment, and Accountability" in Gordon,C.W.(ed.) Uses of the Sociology of Education, The Seventy-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press,1974,pp.161-91

Broudy,H.S. "Between the Yearbooks" in Soltis,J.F.(ed.) Philosophy and Education, The Eightieth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press, 1981,pp.15-34

Broudy,H.S. Paradox and Promise: Essays on American Life and Education, Englewood Cliffs,N.J. Prentice-Hall Inc.,1961,pp.164-75

Bruner,J.S. The Process of Education,Cambridge,Mass.,Harvard U. Press, 1960, p.10

Callahan,C.M. "Myth: There Must be 'Winners' and 'Losers' in Identification and Programming!" Gifted Child Quarterly, 26,1, Winter 1982, pp. 17-9

Callahan,C.M."Superior Abilities" in Kauffman,J.M. and Hallahan,D.P.(eds.) Handbook of Special Education,Englewood Cliffs,N.J.,Prentice-Hall Inc.,1981,pp.49-85

Caswell,H.L. and Foshay,A.W. Education in the Elementary School,N.Y., American Book Co.,1957,pp.339-40

Ciha,T.E. et al. "Parents as Identifiers of Giftedness, Ignored but Accurate" Gifted Child Quarterly, 18,1974,pp.191-5

Clendening,C.P. and Davies,R.A. Creating Programs for the Gifted,N.Y., R.R.Bowker Co.,1980,pp.3-40

Coffey,G. et al. "Qualities of Gifted Children" in Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79,Chicago, Ill.,Marquis Academic Media,1979,pp.430-1

Coleman,James "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity" Harvard Educational Review,38,1, Winter 1968,pp.7-22

Collins,Clinton"Equality, Justice, and Desegregation" in Greene,M.(ed.) Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Lawrence, Kansas, The U. of Kansas,1965, pp. 101-6

Committee On the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society, General Education in a Free Society, Cambridge,Mass.,Harvard U. Press,1945,pp.7-9

Conant,J.B. The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens, N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co.,1959

Conant,J.B. Public Education and the Structure of American Society, N.Y., Teacher College Press,1945,p.33

Cooke,G. and Baldwin,A. "Unique Needs of a Special Population" in Passow, A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago,Ill., U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.391-4

Coombs,J.R. "Justice and Equal Opportunity" in Macmillan,C.J.B.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1980, Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Normal,Ill., 1981,pp.130-4

Couillard,R.G. "Guidelines for Identification and Instrument Selection" in Connecticut State Dept. of Education Conn.Cept V, Hartford, Conn.,1978, Revised Edition, pp.10-2

Cremin,L.A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957, N.Y.,Alfred A. Knopf,1961,pp.vii-350

De Hann,R.F. and Wilson,R.C. "Identification of the Gifted" in Henry,N.B. (ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, Ill., U. of Chicago Press, 1958,pp.166-92

Delisle,J.R. et al. "The Revolving Door Identification and Programming Model" Exceptional Children, 48,2, October 1981,pp.152-6

Dewey,John and Tufts,J.H. Ethics,N.Y., Holt,Rinehart, and Winston,1936, pp. 383-8

Dodson,D.W. "Factors Influencing Curriculum Development" Review of Educational Research, 27,3, June 1957,pp.264-5

Doob,H.S. Gifted Students: Identification Techniques and Program Organization,Arlington,VA.,ERS Information Aid, 1975, 54p.

Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth, Washington, D.C.,National Education Association, 1944

Educational Policies Commission, Education of the Gifted, Washington,D.C., National Education Association,1950,pp.12-4

Eliot,T.S. Notes Towards the Definition of Culture,London,Faber, rev. ed., 1962

Ennis,R.H."Equality of Educational Opportunity" Educational Theory,26,1, Winter 1976,pp.3-18

Eysenck,H.J. The Inequality of Man, London,Temple/Smith, 1973

Feldman,D.H. "The Mysterious Case of Extreme Giftedness" in Passow, A.H. (ed.) The Gifted and The Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eight Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago,Ill., U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.336-40

Feldman,D.H. "Toward a Nonelitist Conception of Giftedness" Phi Delta Kappan, 60,9, May 1979,pp.660-3

Feldman,D.H. and Bratton,J.C. "Relativity and Giftedness: Implications for Equality of Educational Opportunity" Exceptional Children,38,5, February 1972,pp.491-2

Fellman,P.V. "Some Aspects of the Distribution of the Capacity for Developed Preferences or If I like it so much, how come it's not good?" in Macmillan,J.C.B. (ed.) Philosophy of Education 1980, Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Normal, Ill.,1981,pp.149-58

Finkel,Ira "Today's Gifted Education: From Questionable to Stupid" Learning,9,3, October 1980,pp.93-4

Ford,B.G. and Jenkins,R.C. "Changing Perspectives in the Education of the Gifted" in Mann,L.(ed.) The Fourth Review of Special Education,N.Y.,Grune&Stratton,1980,pp.151-74

Fox,L.H. et al. Productive Thinking of Gifted Children in Classroom Interaction, Reston,VA.,Council for Exceptional Children,1967, pp. 19-22

Freehill,M.F. and McDonald,J. "Zeal: Essential to Superior Intellectual Achievement?" Gifted Child Quarterly,25,3, Summer 1981,pp.123-8

Freeman,F.N. "Provision in the Elementary School for Superior Children" Elementary School Journal,21, October 1920,pp.117-31

Gallagher,J.J."Issues in Education for the Gifted" in Passow,A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE,Part I, Chicago,Ill., U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.28-41

Gallagher,J.J."Needed: A New Partnership for the Gifted" in Gibson,J. and Chennells,P.(eds.) Gifted Children: Looking to Their Future, London, Latimer New Dimensions Ltd.,1976,pp.57-72

Gallagher,J.J. Research Summary on Gifted Education, Springfield, Ill., Superintendent of Public Instruction,State of Ill.1966,p.12

Gardner,J.W. Excellence: Can We be Equal and Excellent too?, N.Y., Harper & Rows Publishers,1961,pp.4-161

Getzels,J.W. "The Acquisition of Values in School and Society" in Chase, F.S. and Anderson,H.A.(eds.) The High School in a New Era, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press, 1958,pp.146-61

Goodlad,J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry, N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979, 364p.

Goodlad,J.I. et al. Looking Behind the Classroom Door, Belmont,CA., Wadsworth Publishing Co.,1974,pp.11-94

Goodlad,J.I. "What Goes on in Our Schools?" Educational Researcher,6,3, March 1977,pp.3-6

Goodlad,J.I. and Richter,M.N.,Jr., The Development of a Conceptual System for Dealing with Problems of Curriculum and Instruction, University of California,Los Angeles, 1966,ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 010 064

Gordon,E.W. "The Political Economics of Effective Schooling" in Miller, L.P. and Gordon,E.W.(eds.) Equality of Educational Opportunity, N.Y.,AMS Press,pp.440-8

Gowan,J.C. "Background and History of the Gifted Child Movement" in Stanley,J.C. et al.(eds.) The Gifted and the Creatives: A Fifty-Year Perspective, Baltimore,The John Hopkins U. Press,1977,pp.13-5

Gowin,D.B. "Equality: Three Analogies" Educational Forum,34,2, January 1970,pp.177-9

Green,T.F. "The Systemic Dynamics of Two Principles:'Best' and'Equal'" in Fenstermacher,G.R.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1978, Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, The Philosophy of Education Society, Champaign, Ill. U. of Ill.1979,pp.133-49

Griffin,E.K. "The Coleman Report's 'Fifth Conception' of Equal Educational Opportunity: A Reconsideration" in Steinberg,I.S.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1977, Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting, Urbana,Ill.,Educational Theory,U. of Ill.,1977,pp.100-10

Guilford,J.P. "Creativity" American Psychologist,5, 1950,pp.444-54

Guilford,J.P. The Nature of Human Intelligence,N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967

Guilford,J.P. "Structure of Intellect" Psychological Bulletin,1956,53, pp.267-93

Halfpenny,Peter "The Analysis of Qualitative Data" Sociological Review, 27,4, 1979,pp.799-825

Hall,Elizabeth "Bad Education - A Conversation with Jerome Bruner" Psychology Today,v. 4, December 1970,pp.50-2

Havighurst,R.J. et al. "The Importance of Education for the Gifted" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago,Ill., U.of Chicago Press, 1958,pp.13-20

Havighurst,R.J. "Opportunity,Equity or Equality" in Kopan,Andrew and Walberg,Herbert (eds.) Rethinking Educational Equality, Berkeley, CA., McGutchan Publishing Co.,1974,pp.84-133

Herrick,V.E. "Administrative Structure and Processes in Curriculum Development" Review of Educational Research,30,3,June 1960,p.265

Herrnstein,R. IQ in the Meritocracy, London,Penguin,1973

Heslep,R.D. "Thomas Jefferson's View of Equal Social Opportunity" Educational Theory, 13,2, April 1963,pp.142-8

Hildreth,G.H. Introduction to the Gifted,N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co.,1966, pp. 16-318

Hofstadter,Richard Social Darwinism in American Thought, Boston, The Beacon Press,1955,pp.4-16

Holsti,O.R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities, Reading,Mass.,Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969,235p.

Honore,A.M. "Social Justice" in Summers,R.S.(ed.) Essays in Legal Philosophy, Berkeley, U. of California Press,1968,pp.88-95

House,E.R. "Whose Goals? Whose Values? and Whose Kids?" The National Elementary Principal, 5, 51,February 1972,pp.56-61

Hunt,J. McV. "Parent and Child Centers: Their Basis in the Behavioral and Educational Sciences" in Ianni,F.A.J.(ed.) Conflict and Change in Education,Glenview,Ill.,Scott,Foresman and Co.,1975, pp.229-40

Husèn, Torsten Talent,Equality and Meritocracy: Availability and Utilization of Talent, The Netherlands,Martinus Nijhoff,1974,pp.8-143

Jarrett,J.L. "Toward Elitist Schools" Phi Delta Kappan, 60,9, pp.647-9

Jensen,A.R. Educability and Group Differences, London,Methuen,1973

Jensen,A.R. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review,39,1, Winter 1969,pp.1-123

Jensen,D. "The Gifted Child: Present Practices in Special Classes for the Gifted" Journal of Educational Research,15, March 1927,p.202

Jordan,J.A. "Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Curriculum Worker" in Goodlad,J.I.(ed.) Curriculum Inquiry,N.Y.,McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979,pp.303-42

Kaplan,S.N. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented: A Handbook, Ventura, CA.,Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1974,pp.26-41

Karnes,F.A. and Collins,E.C. "State Definitions of the Gifted and Talented: A Report and Analysis" Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 1,2,1978,pp.44-62

Katz,Michael Class,Bureaucracy and Schools,N.Y.,Praeger Publishers,1971

Kazamias, Andreas "Meritocracy and Isocracy in American Education: Retrospect and Prospect" Educational Forum,25,March 1961,pp.345-54

Khatena,J. "Some Problems in the Measurement of Creative Behavior" Journal of Research and Development in Education,4, Spring 1971, pp.77-9

Kliebard,Herbert "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect" in Witt,P.W.F. (ed.) Technology and the Curriculum,N.Y.,Teacher College Press,1968, pp. 69-84

Kolb,W.L. "Values,Determinism and Abstraction" in Barrett,D.N.(ed.) Values in America, Notre Dame,Indiana,U. of Notre Dame Press, 1961,pp.47-54

Komisar,B.P. and Coombs,J.R. "The Concept of Equality in Education" Studies in Philosophy and Education,3, Fall 1964,pp.223-41

Komisar,B.P. and Coombs,J.R. "The Equality Principle in Education" in Levit,Martin(ed.) Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Lawrence,Kansas,U. of Kansas, 1963,pp.112-20

Lakoff,S.A. Equality in Political Philosophy,Cambridge,Mass.,Harvard U. Press,1964,pp.8-9

Laski,H.J. A Game of Politics, London,George Allen and Unwin Ltd.,1967, Copyright 1925,pp.1-11,152-6

Lazarsfeld,P.F. Qualitative Analysis: Historical and Critical Essays, Boston,Allyn & Bacon,Inc.,1972,pp.232-3

Lazarsfeld,P.F. and Barton,A.H. "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification,Typologies, and Indices" in Lerner, Daniel and Lasswell,H.D.(eds.) The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method,CA.,Stanford U. Press,1951,pp.155-92

Lee, Dorothy "Equality of Opportunity as a Culture Value" in Bryson,Lyman (ed.) Aspects of Human Equality,N.Y.,Harper,1956.p.258

Lipset,S.M. The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective,N.Y.,Basic Books,Inc.,Publishers,1963, pp. 1-209

Lipset,S.M. "The Value Patterns of Democracy: A Case Study in Comparative Analysis" American Sociological Review,28,4,August 1963,pp.515-31

Lucito,L.J. "Gifted Children" in Dunn,L.M.(ed.) Exceptional Children in Schools,N.Y.,Holt Rinehart and Winston,1963,pp.183-4

Lucus,J.R. "Against Equality" in Bedau,H.A.(ed.) Justice and Equality, Englewood Cliff,N.J.,Prentice-Hall Inc.,1971,pp.139-50

Lucus,J.R. "Equality in Education" in Wilson,Bryan (ed.) Education, Equality and Society,N.Y.,Harper & Row Publisher,1975,pp.39-60

Macdonald,J.B. "Values Bases and Issues for Curriculum" in Molnar, Alex and Zohorik,J.A.(eds.) Curriculum Theory,Washington,D.C.,ASCD, 1977,pp.10-21

Macmillan,C.J.B."Equality and Sameness" Studies in Philosophy and Education,3,Winter 1964,pp.320-32

Marland,S.P. Education for the Gifted and Talented,Report to the Congress by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and Background Papers Submitted to the U.S. Office of Education,Washington,D.C.,U.S. Government Printing Office,1972,pp.2-88

Martinson,R.A. A Guide Toward Better Teaching for the Gifted,Ventura,CA., Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools,1976,p.23

Maslow,A.H. Motivation and Personality,N.Y.,Harper & Rows, Publishers, 1954,p.91

McClellan,B.E."On Historical Perspective and Educational Problems" in Steiner,E. et al.(eds.) Education and American Culture, N.Y., Macmillan Publishing Co.,Inc.,1980,pp.3-4

McCord,W. and McCord,A. Power and Equality: An Introduction to Social Stratification,N.Y.,Praeger Publishers,1977,pp.ix-296

Molnar,Alex and Zohorik,J.A.(eds.) Curriculum Theory, Washington,D.C., ASCD,1977,p.vi

Munday,L.A. and Davis,J.C. "Varieties of Accomplishment After College: Perspectives on the Meaning of Academic Talent" Iowa City, American College Testing Program Research Report,No. 62,1974

Myers,D.A. Decision Making in Curriculum and Instruction,Dayton,Ohio, Institute for Development of Educational Activities Inc.,1970, pp.6-10

Myers,H.A. Are Men Equal?: An Inquiry into the Meaning of American Democracy,Ithaca,N.Y.,Cornell U. Press,1955(Copyright 1945),pp.130-45

Nash,Paul History and Education: The Educational Uses of the Past, N.Y.,Random House,1970,pp.4-21

Nash,Paul Models of Man, N.Y.,John Wiley&Sons,Inc.,1968,385p.

The National Commission On Resources for Youth,Inc. Community Based Mentorships for Gifted and Talented: Final Report,N.Y.,1977,ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 150 794,p.10

Newland,T.E. The Gifted in Socioeducational Perspective,Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,Prentice-Hall,1976,pp.112-3

Newsome,G.L.,Jr. Philosophical Prospectives: Basic Issues of Man,v.6, Athens, The U. of Georgia Press,1961,p.94

The New York Times,November 3,1967,p.50

Norris,D.E. "Programs in the Elementary Schools" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago,Ill., U. of Chicago Press,1958, pp.222-62

Olstad,D. "The Pursuit of Excellence is not Elitism" Phi Delta Kappan,60, 3, November 1978,pp.187-8,229

Omans,A.C. "Provisions for Ability Grouping in Junior and Senior High School" American School Board Journal,45, October 1922,pp.55-8

Parrish,B.M. Education of the Gifted,N.Y.,Twayne Publishers,Inc.,1965, pp.18-23

Parsons,Talcott "Equality and Inequality in Modern Society or Social Stratification Revisited" Sociological Inquiry,40,Spring 1968, pp.13-72

Parsons, Talcott "The School Class as a Social System: Some of its Functions in American Society" Harvard Educational Review, 29,4, Fall 1959,pp.297-318

Passow,A.H. "The Nature of Giftedness and Talent" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,1, Winter 1981,pp.5-10

Passow,A.H. and Tannenbaum,A.J. "Differentiated Curriculum for the Gifted and Talented: A Conceptual Model" A paper prepared for the Office of Projects for Gifted and Talented,Montgomery County(MD.) Public Schools,N.Y.,Teacher College,Columbia U.,1978,p.14

Paul,J. "Educating the Gifted" in Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1980-81,Chicago,Ill. Marquis Academic Media,1981,p.327

Phenix,Philip "Equality as Uniqueness" Studies in Philosophy and Education, Winter,1964-65,pp.332-5

Plamenatz, John "Diversity of Rights and Kinds of Equality" in Pennock, J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.) NomosIX: Equality,N.Y.,Atherton Press, 1967,pp.81-9

Portland Public Schools, The Gifted Child in Portland,Portland,Oregon, Portland Public Schools,1959,p.13

Pratt,David Curriculum: Design & Development, San Francisco,Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich,Inc.,1980,490p.

Rawls, John A Theory of Justice,Cambridge,Mass., The Belknap Press of Harvard U. Press,1971,pp.5-511

Renzulli,J.S. "Myth: The Gifted Constitutes 3-5% of the Population!" Gifted Child Quarterly,26,1, Winter 1982,pp.11-4

Renzulli,J.S. "System for Identifying Gifted and Talented Students" in Connecticut State Dept. of Education Conn.Cept V, Hartford, Conn., 1978, revised edition,p.26

Renzulli,J.S. "What Make Giftedness?: Reexamining a Definition" Phi Delta Kappan,1978,60,3,pp.180-4,216

Renzulli,J.S. "What We Don't Know About Programming for the Gifted and Talented" Phi Delta Kappan,61,9, May 1980,pp.601-2

Renzulli,J.S. "Will the Gifted Child Movement be Alive and Well in 1990?" Gifted Child Quarterly, 24,1, 1980,pp.3-9

Renzulli,J.S. et al. "Book Reviews: Response by the Authors" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,4, Fall 1981,pp.188-9

Renzulli,J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Revolving Door: A Truer Turn for the Gifted" Learning, 9, 3, October 1980,pp.91-3

Renzulli,J.S. and Smith,L.H. "Two Approaches to Identification of Gifted Students" Exceptional Children,May 1977,43,8,pp.512-8

Renzulli,J.S. and Stoddard,E.P.(eds.) Under One Cover: Gifted and Talented in Perspective,1980,ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 192 501

Rickover, H.G. Education and Freedom,N.Y.,E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1959

Rippa, S.A.(ed.) Educational Ideas in America: A Documentary History,N.Y. David McKay Co.,Inc.,1969,pp.41-475

Roedell,W.C. et al. Gifted Young Children,N.Y.,Teacher College,Columbia U.,1980,pp.2-89

Roger,V.R. "A Sense of Purpose" The National Elementary Principal,53,4, 1974,p.8

Roger,V.R. "Openness and the Gifted - Tentative Connections" Gifted Child Quarterly, 25,4, Fall 1981,pp.175-8

Rubenzer,R. "Identification and Evaluation Procedures for Gifted and Talented Programs" Gifted Child Quarterly,23,2, Summer 1979, pp.304-15

Rugg,H.O. "The Curriculum for Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children,The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE,Part I, Bloomington,Ill.,Public School Publishing Co.,1924,pp.91-5

Sand,Ole et al. "Components of the Curriculum" Review of Educational Research, 30,3, June 1960,pp.233-4

Schaar,J.H. "Equality of Opportunity and Beyond" in Pennock,J.R. and Chapman,J.W.(eds.) Nomos IX: Equality,N.Y.,Atherton Press,1967 pp. 228-49

Schwebel,Milton Who Can be Educated? N.Y., Grove Press Inc.,1969, pp.3-224

Sears,P.S. "The Terman Genetic Studies of Genius,1922-1972" in Passow,A.H. (ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago, Ill.,U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.75-96

Sisk,D.A. "Issues and Future Directions in Gifted Education" Gifted Child Quarterly,24,1,Winter 1980,pp.29-32

Sisk,D.A. "What if Your Child is Gifted?" in Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79, Chicago,Ill. Marquis Academic Media 1979,p.427

Smith,B.O. and Meux,M. A Study of the Logic of Teaching, Research Project 258(7257),USOE,Urbana,Ill. U. of Ill.,1958,p.8

Stanley,J.C. et al.(eds.) The Gifted and the Creatives: A Fifty Year Perspective, Baltimore,The John Hopkins U. Press,1977

Stanley,J.C. "Test Better Finder of Great Math Talent than Teachers" American Psychologist,1976,31,pp.313-4

Sternberg,R.J. "The Componential Theory of Intellectual Giftedness" Gifted Child Quarterly,25,2,Spring 1981,pp.86-93

Stoddard,G. "Intellectual Development of the Child" School and Society, 51, April 27,1940,p.536

Strang,R. "The Nature of Giftedness" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE,Part II, Chicago, Ill.,U. of Chicago Press, 1958 ,p.69

Tannenbaum,A.J. "A Backward and Forward Glance at the Gifted" The National Elementary Principal,51,5, February 1972,pp.14-23

Tannenbaum,A.J. "History of Interest in the Gifted" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted,The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE PartII, Chicago,Ill.,U. of Chicago Press,1958,pp.3-38

Tannenbaum,A.J. "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate: Concern about the Gifted" in Passow,A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE,Part I, Chicago,Ill.,U. of Chicago Press,1979,pp.5-27

Tanner,Daniel and Tanner,L.N. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice, N.Y.,Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.,1975,pp.64-74,400-675

Tawney, R.H. Equality London,George Allen and Unwin Ltd.,1964, Fifth ed., pp.1-118

Taylor,C.W. "Multi-Talent Potential" in Project Implode, Igniting Creative Potential,Salt Lake City, Project Implode,Bella Vista - IBRIC, 1971,p.9

Terman,L.M. "The American Psychological Corporation" Science, 59, June 20, 1924, p. 548

Terman,L.M. The Measurement of Intelligence, Boston, Houghton Mufflin, 1916,pp. 95-104

Terman,L.M. "The Physical and Mental Traits of Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M. (ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington, Ill., Public School Publishing Co., 1924,pp.115-67

Terman,L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol.1: Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children, CA.,Stanford U. Press,1925

Terman,L.M. et al. Genetic Studies of Genius, vol.3: The Promise of Youth: Follow-up Studies of a Thousand Gifted Children, CA.,Stanford U. Press, 1930

Thayer,V.T. and Levit,Martin The Role of the School in American Society, N.Y.,Dodd,Mead & Co.,1966,pp. 72-97

Thomas,L.G. "A Model for Making and Testing Value Judgements" in Thomas, L.G. (ed.) Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research, The Seventy-First Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press, 1972, pp. 246-51

Thomson,Margery "Identifying the Gifted" The National Elementary Principal 51, 5, February 1972,pp.38-44

Torrance,E.P. "Training Teachers and Leaders to Recognize and Acknowledge Creative Behavior Among Disadvantaged Children" Gifted Child Quarterly, 1972,16, pp.3-10

Townsend,H.G. "The Democratic Idea and the Education of Gifted Children" in Whipple,G.M. (ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington,Ill.,Public School Publishing Co.,1924, pp. 145-54

Treffinger,D.J. "Myth: Your Sample Must be the Same as the Population!" Gifted Child Quarterly, 26,1, Winter 1982,p.16

Tunnell,D.R. "Equality Opportunity Revisted" in Fenstermacher,G.R.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1978, Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting, The Philosophy of Education Society, Champaign, Ill., U. of Ill.,1979,pp.304-15

Walberg,H.J. and Bargen, Mark "Equality: Operational Definitions and Empirical Tests" in Kopan, Andrew and Walberg, Herbert (eds.) Rethinking Educational Equality, Berkeley, CA.,1974,pp.11-13

Wallach,M.A. "Tests Tell Us Little about Talent" American Scientist,64, 1976,p.57

Weiler,D. "The Alpha Children: California's Brave New World for the Gifted" Phi Delta Kappan,60,3, November 1978,pp.185-7

Whipple,G.M. "Historical and Introductory" in Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington, Ill.. Public School Publishing Co.,1924,pp.8-15

Williams,Bernard A.O. "The Idea of Equality" in Bedau,H.A.(ed.) Justice and Equality,Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,Prentice-Hall Inc.,1971, pp. 118-37

Williams,R.M.,Jr. "Values and Modern Education in the U.S." in Barrett, D.N.(ed.) Values in America,Notre Dame,Indiana, U. of Notre Dame Press,1961,pp.57-81

Wilson, John Equality, London, Hutchinson of London, 1966,pp.10-216

Wise,A.E. Rich Schools, Poor Schools: The Promise of Equality of Educational Opportunity, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press,1968,pp.146-58

Witty,P. "Evaluation of the Nature-Nurture Controversy" School and Society, 53, September 6, 1941,pp.105-6

Witty,P. "Nature and Extent of Educational Provisions for the Gifted Pupil" Educational Administration and Supervision, 37, February 1951, pp.65-79

Witty,P. "Some Considerations in the Education of Gifted Children" Educational Administration and Supervision,26,October 1940,pp.512-19

Witty,P. "Who Are the Gifted?" in Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, Ill., U. of Chicago Press, 1958,pp.41-63

Woods,R.G. and Barrow,R.St.C. An Introduction to Philosophy of Education, London, Methuen & Co., 1975,pp.36,165-83

Zais,R.S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations, N.Y.,Thomas Y. Crowell Co.,1976,pp.105-6,205-6

Zettel,J.J. Gifted and Talented Education from a Nationwide Perspective, Reston,VA.,The Council for Exceptional Children, December 1980, pp.3-22

Zettel,J.J."State Provisions for Educating the Gifted and Talented" Exceptional Children,48,2, October 1981,pp.124-31

Dissertations

Collins, Clinton "The Concept of Equality in the Context of Educational Policies of Desegregation and Ability Grouping" Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970

DeFaveri, Ivan "Equality of Educational Opportunity" Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley,1972

Dittami,P.J. "An Analysis of Selected Concepts of Equality and Equal Opportunity as Reflected in Specific Educational Issues" Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University,1973

Hildenbrand,Susan "Democracy's Aristocrat: The Gifted Child in America, 1910-1960", Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley,1978

Martin, D.W."American Education as Seen in Periodical Literature,1956-1958" Doctoral Thesis, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1959 (Dissertation Abstracts 20:2102-103, no. 6,1959)

Guidelines

Atlanta Public Schools "Programs for Exceptional Children: Criteria and Placement Procedures for the Challenge Program" Atlanta, GA.,1982

California State Department of Education Educating the Gifted in California Schools, Sacramento, CA..1975

California State Department of Education Education Code Sacramento, CA., 1979

California State Department of Education The Gateway,Sacramento, CA., February 1981

Chula Vista City School District "Gate Program", Chula Vista, CA.,1982

Chula Vista City School District Gifted and Talented Education Program, Chula Vista,CA. 1982

Connecticut State Department of Education Conn.Cept I: Practical Suggestions for Gifted and Talented Program Development ,Hartford. Conn.,1979, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 179 042

Connecticut State Dept. of Education "Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, and Prior Approval Application for Gifted and Talented Program", Hartford, Conn.,Revised Edition,Fall 1981

Georgia State Dept. of Education Program for the Gifted and Talented: September 1,1976 through August 31,1979 Office of Instructional Service, Atlanta,ERIC Document Reproduction Service,ED 223 061

Georgia State Dept. of Education State Plan for the Education of the Gifted Atlanta, Office of Instructional Services, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 192 502

Hillsborough County Public Schools "Hillsborough County's District Procedures for Gifted" Tempa, Florida,1982

Norwalk Board of Education, Academically Talented Program Curriculum Guide Grade 3-8, Norwalk, Conn.,1982

Ontario-Montclair School District, "Programs for the Gifted", Ontario,CA., 1982

Ontario-Montclair School District "Program Guide for Gifted and Talented Education" Ontario,CA., September 1981

Pennsylvania Dept. of Education Guide for Organizing and Operating Programs for the Mentally Gifted and Talented,Harrisburg, PA.,1982

Pennsylvania Dept. of Education "Special Education Standards Issued by the Commissioner for Basic Education, Section 341.1" Harrisburg, PA., April 1977

Richmond County Board of Education Program for the Gifted 1981-82, Augusta, GA.,1982

State Dept. of Public Instruction "Identification of Gifted and Talented" Raleigh,N.C.,Division of Exceptional Children, July 1980

State of Florida Dept. of Education A Resource Mannual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students, Tallahasee, Florida, March 1981

State of Florida Dept. of Education A Resource Mannual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students,V.II-G: Gifted, Tallahasee, Florida, October 1980

Wake County Public School System, "Gifted and Talented Program" Raleigh, N.C.,1982

Wake County Public School System "Gifted and Talented Program: Resource Program Model",Raleigh,N.C.,1982

Yearbooks

Fenstermacher,G.R.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1978, Proceedings of the Thirty Fourth Annual Meeting, The Philosophy of Education Society, Champaign, Ill, U. of Ill.,1979

Gordon,C.W.(ed.) Uses of the Sociology of Education, The Seventy-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, U. of Chicago Press,1974

Greene,M.(ed.) Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Soeiety, Lawrence, Kansas, The University of Kansas, 1965

Henry,N.B.(ed.) Education for the Gifted, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Chicago, Ill., U. of Chicago Press, 1958

Henry,T.S.(ed.) Classroom Problems in the Education of Gifted Children, The Nineteenth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part II, Bloomington, Ill., Public School Publishing Co.,1920

Levit, Martin (ed.) Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Lawrence, Kansas, University of Kansas, 1963

Macmillan,J.C.B.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1980, Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society, Normal,Ill.,1981

Passow,A.H.(ed.) The Gifted and the Talented: Their Education and Development, The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I,Chicago, Ill., University of Chicago Press,1979

Soltis,J.F.(ed.) Philosophy and Education, The Eightieth Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago,University of Chicago Press, 1981

Steinberg,I.S.(ed.) Philosophy of Education 1977, Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting, Urbana, Illinois, Educational Theory, University of Illinois, 1977

Thomas,L.G.(ed.) Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research, The Seventy-First Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press,1972

Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79, Chicago, Ill., Marquis Academic Media, 1979

Thompson,G.R.(ed.) Yearbook of Special Education 1980-81, Chicago, Ill., Marquis Academic Media,1981

Whipple,G.M.(ed.) Report of the Society's Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, The Twenty-Third Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, Bloomington,Ill.,Public School Publishing Co.,1924