Commonwealth of Kentucky

EDUCATIONAL BULLETIN

EDUCATION FOR THE GIFTED

A Report of
the Conference Held January 16
Louisville, Ky.

Published by
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ROBERT R. MARTIN
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Frankfort, Kentucky

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered as second-class matter March 21, 1933, at the post office at Frankfort, Kentucky, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

POSTMASTER: SEND NOTICES OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS ON FORM 3579

Vol. XXVII MARCH, 1959 No. 3

BLANK

PAGES

THROUGHOUT

FOREWORD

In January, 1959, the Department of Education sponsored a conference dealing with the education of gifted children. Since the future welfare of our state and nation largely depends upon the identification and maximum development of the potentialities of our citizens, it was felt that this conference should be called for the purpose of creating an awareness on the part of the public of the importance of this phase of education.

The conference was also planned to give citizens of the state an opportunity to express themselves concerning our present school program and discuss ways of better challenging all of our students, and, particularly, those who are academically talented.

Approximately two hundred and fifty interested citizens from all parts of the state and representatives of various phases of life in the Commonwealth served as delegates to the conference.

It is hoped that this report of the proceedings of the conference will be of assistance as we continue to plan and work to more adequately provide for the needs of the gifted students in our several communities.

ROBERT R. MARTIN
Superintendent of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER AND INTRODUCTION OF THE KEYNOTE SPEAKER

by

ROBERT R. MARTIN
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Ladies and Gentlemen, the First State-wide Conference on Education for the Gifted is now in session.

As we all know, the schools of today are called upon to meet the educational needs of a wide variety of youth. Sometimes in attempting to accomplish the tremendous task of educating all of our population, schools may neglect to challenge the group with special abilities or gifts. With the increased pressures brought on education in recent months, it is imperative that we take time to insure that our educational programs are planned and implemented in such a way as to do an adequate job of caring for all segments of our school population.

There is growing concern today that many of our talented youth do not continue their education beyond the high school. In this day of increased emphasis on technical skills, it is essential that we find ways of preventing this waste of human resources. Since we need more and better trained personnel in every walk of life, it is highly desirable that we pause to evaluate our educational program in order to insure the type of curriculum that will provide not only for the average, but will also provide a means whereby the able student will benefit to the maximum of his potentialities.

It is with this aim in mind that we have called this conference sponsored by the Department of Education. You, who are serving as delegates, represent various organizations, professions, and groups interested in education. We appreciate your willingness to take the time from your varied activities to examine with us the status of the gifted youth in Kentucky schools.

If we are to adequately provide for the gifted child, it is most important that he be identified as such at an early age. We are fortunate to have with us today a person outstanding in the field of identification of the gifted.

Dr. Barbe of the University of Chattanooga is a native of Florida where he had his early education and in which state he taught briefly in the public school system. Dr. Barbe received his B. S., M. A. and Ph. D. Degrees from Northwestern University. In his full period of college and graduate training, he has concentrated in the fields of education, social science, and educational and clinical psychology.

In his doctoral program, he specialized in child development and clinical psychology including major study in guidance and psychological problems of reading. His doctoral training in these areas was enriched through his services as an assistant in the Psycho-Educational Clinic of Northwestern University.

Since completing his professional training, Dr. Barbe has been Instructor in Psychology and Director of the Baylor University Reading Clinic, and Assistant Professor of Education at Kent State University. Presently he is Professor of Education at the University of Chattanooga, and Director of the Chattanooga Junior League Reading Center. He is also a practicing psychologist licensed by the State of Tennessee.

Dr. Barbe is listed in *Who's Who in American Education*, *American Men of Science,* and *Leaders in Education.* He holds membership in several professional organizations in the fields of education and psychology, and is President of the National Association For Gifted Children.

It is a great pleasure for me to present to you Dr. Walter Barbe who will speak on the subject of "Problems in the Identification of the Gifted".

PROBLEMS IN IDENTIFICATION OF THE GIFTED

by

WALTER B. BARBE

Interest in the gifted child has skyrocketed in the past decade. Beginning in 1947 with the appearance of Lewis Terman's monumental work, *The Gifted Child Grows Up,* and continuing with the 1951 presentation of the American Association for Gifted Children, *The Gifted Child,* the beginning in 1952 of the National Association for Gifted Children, and, of course, the advent of the Space Age in 1958 when the Russian Sputnik appeared on the scene, the need for early identification of gifted children has become more and more apparent.

More frequently heard has become the plea, "let's do something for our gifted children." In spite of the urgency of this plea, identification still remains the first step. This is a first step which is sometimes forgotten. The success or failure of any type of provision for gifted children depends largely upon how effective the identification process has been. Certainly, identification alone is not enough. Merely identifying gifted children, however, assures a certain amount of special attention for them. The very awareness that a particular child is gifted will alert teachers, parents and school administrators to the need for doing something for this particular child. The problem of identifying gifted children is only a small part of the larger problem; that of identifying all children, both those with superior ability and those with average ability.

The educational world appears to be particularly susceptible to band wagons. Only a few years ago the band wagon dealt with methods of teaching reading. Such books as, *Why Johnny Can't Read,* quickly became best sellers and spearheaded the drive against public education. Undoubtedly such attacks on the public schools serve one purpose. They make us more aware of the fact that problems do exist, and while everything which the critics say is not true, instruction nevertheless improves. Attention has now shifted to the gifted child. More and more people have become interested in doing something for this child. We must be certain that the provisions which we are making, and the types of identification procedures being followed, are ones which are educationally and psychologically sound. They must be of

the type that will truly benefit the child, and not merely meet the demand that something be done. The hope is that from this great interest in the gifted child will come permanent provisions for identifying and better educating these children who have been called "our most neglected natural resource."

Another point which needs to be emphasized in any discussion of gifted children is that it is the children in whom we are interested, and the gifted label is only a means of helping us better understand these children. The methods of identification which we use and the provisions we make for these children must not in any way deny the fact that first of all these are normal children. Their gifts, as wonderful as they are, do not any way negate the fact that physically, emotionally and in some ways mentally they are normal children.

A recent publication of the Association for Childhood Education was entitled "All Children Have Gifts." This is an important point, which we as professional people must never forget. All children are gifted in some ways — at least to a parent his own child is gifted. To deny this fact is to assure failure for any special program for children whose gifts are of a particular type. It has been said that all children have gifts: we must look harder into some children to find what their gifts are.

Definition of Giftedness

The greatest problem in identification of the gifted is the ambiguity of the term "gifted." Fortunately, the term genius has become obsolete. Genius implies international eminence for achievement, and is the result of ability, drive and opportunity. The gifted children about whom we are speaking have not had the opportunity to demonstrate their potential ability, or in some instances, to give much indication of the amount of drive which they possess. The term "gifted" has also been occasionally questioned along these same lines, so that Paul Witty is now calling these children "potentially gifted." The commonly accepted definition of the gifted is that given by Dr. Witty in which he states that the gifted child is "one who is consistently superior in any worthwhile line of endeavor." This is intentionally a very broad and inclusive definition. The purpose is to include as many children as possible in the ranks of the gifted, rather than to make the gifted group a highly selective, and therefore extremely limited, number of individuals.

The term "academically talented" has come into use primarily since the Carnegie Foundation supported a conference on this topic

in the fall of 1958. This term generally implies high academic achievement, and is used primarily at the secondary school level. The term gifted, when applied to children possessing a high level of mental capability, usually refers to the individual with an I.Q. of 120 or above. Rarely has the label "gifted" been applied to individuals with I.Q.'s below this, although it is not uncommon for the lower limit to be higher — in some instances even as high as 140.

An important point to remember in defining giftedness is that the definition must be determined primarily by the purpose for which we are identifying. If the goal is to provide an enriched or accelerated program in a particular subject area, then those children who are to be included should be either those who are potentially superior in this particular area, or who have demonstrated higher achievement in this area. If it is to provide enrichment in the fine arts, then the identification procedures must be entirely different.

The terms gifted, talented, very superior, able, accelerated, rapid learner and bright are being used interchangeable in current literature. There is, however, a difference in the meaning of some of these terms. Basically, the distinction must be made between innate ability and achievement, between talents in such areas as art and music and talents in academic subjects, and between the above average child and the highly gifted child.

Problems in Identification by the Use of Tests

For want of any better means of identification, standardized tests are often relied upon heavily. Those children scoring in the upper ranks are labeled "gifted" and are given the benefit of special provisions. This upper rank includes the upper 15 per cent in programs following the recommendations of James Conant, while the upper 10 per cent is more commonly used. The upper 7 per cent are selected in the program in Quincy, Illinois, under the guidance of staff members at the University of Chicago and in Cleveland, Ohio, where the oldest organized program in the country for gifted children operates, the group is limited to the upper 1 to 2 per cent.

Let us assume for a moment that group achievement testing and group intelligence testing is completely valid and reliable. How, then, can we use these tools to identify giftedness?

Reliance upon achievement tests alone to determine the gifted individual is fraught with dangers. It is certainly true that how much an individual produces should be one indication of how well he is

capable of producing. However, drive is the factor being overlooke when achievement tests are used for identifying the gifted. Ver few, if any, individuals achieve at the top level of their potentialit Some are achieving under existing programs close to their top leve of performance. This type will undoubtedly score high, althoug usually not the very highest, on an achievement test and ma therefore be identified as gifted and placed in a special program i which they cannot possibly hope to succeed. Drive alone, witho adequate innate ability, is not sufficient to get this particular stude through an accelerated or enriched program. In instances whe achievement testing alone has been used to identify the gifted, th program has usually met with disaster. The student of perha slightly higher than average ability, but with great interest an drive, has achieved in the heterogenous class with much succes When placed in the homogeneous class, however, he is unable t succeed and often never regains his former position even whe returned to the regular class.

Reliance upon intelligence testing, remembering that we are fo the moment assuming that such tests are both valid and reliable, als presents problems. Merely because a child receives a high score o an intelligence test does not assure that he is a superior student i all subjects. While it is true that the gifted individual appears t be best in such subjects as English and reading and poorest i spelling, handwriting and arithmetic fundamentals, this is becaus the intelligence tests most frequently used measure primarily th skills necessary to achieve in the verbal areas.

In the Major Work Program in Cleveland, reliance is place almost entirely upon the ability of the child as measured by a intelligence test. Achievement test results play little, if any, part i identifying the gifted child. The reasoning behind this is that th child who has the potential ability, when he is challenged, wi produce at a high level. Therefore, even though the child might n be the one who would ordinarily be chosen as a superior student, h is nevertheless placed in the Major Work Class if he has a high I With something more than thirty years of experience following thi procedure, the Major Work Program has a remarkable recor of successes with children who would otherwise be labele underachievers, if they had even been identified in most situation

The point must be, therefore, that achievement tests alone a perhaps indications of some of the gifted youngsters. They do n

identify all of the children, nor are all of the children with high achievement, gifted. Intelligence tests, if they are valid, are a better measure. Using a combination of both types of tests, while it does follow the currently popular middle of the road philosophy so prevalent in most of American life, only makes the problem greater and does nothing for the underachiever who is, after all, the individual whose gift is truly being wasted.

The biggest problem connected with the use of tests to identify the gifted is that neither a high I.Q. or a very superior academic record is a guarantee of success in later life. While either of these, or both, are probably strong indications that the individual will be successful, the attitude of the American public is only to the point where they are only too willing to remember the straight "A" student who is now out digging ditches, or the high I.Q. who is in a mental institution. There are still too many intangible factors which contribute to the success or failure of an individual, many of which he has no control over, for any testing in early life to measure in such a way that any definite success or failure pattern can be predicted. For this reason, identification of the gifted cannot be 100 per cent perfect, if the measuring stick is to be the latter success of those identified in childhood as gifted. The justification for early identification, however, must be that there are some successful individuals who would not have been successful had they remained unidentified.

Another major problem connected with identification by the use of tests is the manner in which test results are interpreted. It has often been stated that no test is any better than the person who interprets it. In identification of the gifted this is particularly true. Those responsible for identifying the gifted are in a key position and must understand the limitations of any testing program.

Because identification is so closely related with scores, and particularly I.Q. scores, let us examine some of the ways in which I.Q. scores should be used. As a label the I.Q. has great limitations. Its greatest danger is that it becomes a label, a hole from which the child cannot escape. If he is tested in the area of his true ability, then the label may not be harmful. But if, somehow, his score is not indicative of his true ability, then great harm can be done. Saint Exupery, in *The Little Prince,* states this clearly when he discusses why he has called the Asteroid from which the Little Prince came Asteroid B-612. He says that he merely gave the Asteroid a number, "because adults

love figures.'' And how true Saint Exupery was about us, even though he wasn't specifically talking about I.Q.'s.

The I.Q. then, assuming still that the test is both valid and reliable, gives some idea of the general area in which the child is capable of achieving. Most I.Q.'s should reveal far more than just an I.Q. in points, but this other information is usually either never recorded or ignored if it is recorded. For example, the difference between verbal and non-verbal I.Q. is often very important. In identifying gifted children any great difference becomes particularly important in planning school programs for them. There may also be clinical significance to the difference. On the Stanford-Binet, the highest age level at which the child can successfully pass all of the items is called the Basal Age. This score alone is vitally important, and could probably be used better to identify the gifted youngster than the I.Q., and yet the term "basal age" is rarely heard and is almost never recorded on the child's record. Also from the Stanford-Binet should come the range in the child's abilities, beginning at the age level where he could pass all of the items and continuing on up through the level where he fails all of the items. The child with a smaller range at a level above his chronological age is more likely the all-around superior child than the child with the widespread of success and failures, although they may both have the same I.Q. The strength and weaknesses as determined by the test would also be an aid in identification, but is seldom even mentioned in identification procedures. The mental age is, of course, a more important score on the Stanford-Binet, but the I.Q. is talked about more.

With the appearance of so much literature on the gifted child, indicating that the child must have an I.Q. of 130 or 140 and above, some classroom teachers have come to feel that they have no gifted children. A reminder that they have as many gifted children as they have retarded children, for statistically this is what giftedness and retardation is, may serve to point up the presence of some gifted children. The problem is basically that group I.Q. tests have a lower ceiling than individual tests, and therefore do not identify the child with high potentiality as readily. In Cleveland, Ohio, where they are searching for children with I.Q.'s above 125 for their Major Work Program, all children who receive an I.Q. of 116 on a group intelligence test are screened on an individual test. Through the past thirty odd years they have discovered that often the child who

receives an I.Q. of 116 on the group test will score over 125 on the individual test. The teacher who feels that she has no gifted children because none are receiving group I.Q. scores in the 120's and 130's may be underestimating the ability of some of her students. Group I.Q. tests are best when they are measuring scores around 100. They are less valid for measuring the abilities of either superior or below average children.

Another problem in identifying gifted children by means of tests is the dependency placed upon reading ability in order for the child to score on a group intelligence test. Academic retardation immediately influences the results obtained on a group measure of intelligence. This means that the gifted underachiever has little chance of being identified on any group measure of his mental ability. One authority has stated that a poor reader should have at least eight points added to the score he receives on a group I.Q. test.

A problem which we in the South face particularly is that of either poor vocabularly, or pronunciation different from that used on oral tests. Even such slight changes in pronunciation such as "*ar*range" and "*or*range" may change the results of even the best tests. Carelessness in pronunciation, choice of words and definitions of words will result in an actual penalty for many Southern children.

While individual testing is better than group testing as a means of identification, testing alone is not an adequate means of identifying gifted children. Observation, by parents and teachers must play a large part in any identification procedure.

Problems in Identification by Use of Observation

Perhaps no problem in identifying the gifted is greater than the attitude which has been prevalent so long that everyone is equal mentally, and the difference between one child and another is only in how hard they each try. We, as teachers, have helped perpetuate this by urging students to work harder, when in some instances no amount of work will make the child capable of achieving at a high level. On the other side, however, it is true that children do have an ability to achieve much better when more is expected from them. The adage holds much truth: "What you think of me, I'll think of me; and what I think of me, will be me."

Fortunately, the attitude of parents that they do not want a gifted child is changing. What was formerly considered bad about

the superior child has been so competely disproved that the usual parent comment, "All I want is an average child," is rapidly changing. There are still some remains of this long-held attitude, however, and this often stands in the way of identification procedures.

Another hindrance to observation as an identification procedure is that both teachers and parents can, at best, only compare the child with other children in the same classroom. Little, if any, attention is given to the child's chronological age. The brighter child more often enters school sooner than the average child, or by one means or another is ahead of his age group. When compared with his classmates, he is not particularly superior. This is undoubtedly the reason that teacher judgment was found by Terman to be such a poor means by which gifted children could be identified. Today, teachers know more about testing and understand better mental abilities so that they are better judges of mental superiority.

Check lists can assist in identification by observation only if they are carefully prepared, and are adjusted to the particular group with which they are being used.

Comprehension, particularly listening comprehension, has been mentioned many times as a possible informal method by which classroom teachers can identify gifted youngsters. The danger in using such aids to supplement observation is that the teacher will look for only one facet of intelligence—memory—and will overlook such other factors as reasoning and actual creative thinking.

What Can Be Done to Overcome These Problems?

The first major step in overcoming problems in identification of the gifted is to recognize that problems exist. Classroom teachers have been the first to recognize that something needs to be done for the gifted. Now that the general public has come over to this same line of thinking, the next step must be to understand that identification of the gifted is more complex than merely saying this child is gifted and this one is not. The very complexity of the problem hinders progress toward its solution. Remembering that the purpose for which the child is being identified must influence the identification procedure simplifies the problems greatly. Using tests of all types to aid in better understanding the child is essential, and from this better understanding will come better provisions for him

INTRODUCTION OF THE SPEAKER

by

ROBERT R. MARTIN

Superintendent of Public Instruction

In the excellent morning address by Dr. Barbe we were given helpful suggestions on ways of identifying the student whom we term gifted. After the person has been identified as one who possesses these special abilities or gifts, the problem then becomes that of finding a program which will not hamper but challenge him during the time he acquires his education.

The person who is with us this afternoon comes ably prepared to discuss with us possible programs for educating the gifted.

Dr. James J. Gallagher, Associate Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, received his Bachelor's Degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1948. His graduate work was pursued at Pennsylvania State University where in 1951 he was awarded a Ph.D. in Child and Clinical Psychology and in Speech Correction. While pursuing his doctoral studies he was an intern in psychology at Southbury Training School for the Mentally Retarded.

Upon the completion of his graduate study, he became Director of Psychological Services at the Dayton Hospital for Disturbed Children. After a period of successful experience in this position, he went to Michigan State University as Assistant Professor of Education and Assistant Director of the Michigan State Psychology Clinic.

For the past four years, Dr. Gallagher has been a member of the staff of the University of Illinois, where he first held a position with the Institute for Research on Exceptional Children. He now is an Associate Professor of Education at the University. He also heads a committee on graduate training in special education for exceptional children.

Dr. Gallagher is recognized among his colleagues both in the fields of psychology and education, as an authority in problems of exceptional children—both the retarded and the gifted. He has done extensive research on gifted children and on brain-injured children.

Reports of this research have been published in two monographs in t
leading psychology journals. He has also written some 15 artic
for the professional journals on problems in the field of exceptio
children and on the prediction of success in psycho-therapy.

It is a pleasure to present to you, Dr. James J. Gallagher wh
will talk on the subject of, "Programs of Education for the Gifted

PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION FOR THE GIFTED

by

JAMES J. GALLAGHER

If I can sense the tenor of the country, educators are no longer in a position where they can defend the methods of the past 20 years for educating gifted children in a heterogeneous mass with all other students. The choice that they have to make is to which of the many new ideas, or old ideas dressed in new clothes, they will subscribe. The air is filled with educational panaceas. The characteristics of a good educational panacea is that (1) it must cost the public nothing, (2) it must contain one simple change which will at one swoop eliminate all of the school's problems. Examples of such panaceas would be teaching reading by phonics, the reinstitution of algebra and geometry in the high schools and others of such ilk.

Some strange alliances have been formed here. One of these alliances seems to consist of the classicists on one hand and a group of admirals and generals on the other. A friend of mine once succinctly summed up their educational recommendations as follows, "Teach the best and shoot the rest."

Fortunately these ideas have had limited appeal but the public is still waiting and if the educators do not give leadership in this area we can count on some other group filling the gap.

One of the most remarkable developments on the educational scene in the past decade has been the rapid growth of public interest in the educational programs of the gifted child. This interest is manifested in the unusual amount of attention given the subject by popular magazines, TV and radio panels, seminars, and meetings such as ours today.

We need not dwell too long upon the obvious reason for this interest. Quite bluntly we are afraid, and we now come to the, not unreasonable, conclusion that our intellectually superior children seem to offer our best long-range investment and protection for the future.

I think it would be fair to sum up the conclusions of the many magazine articles and discussions of this topic as follows: First, our educational system is the obvious place for us to strengthen our

potential for the long-range ideological battle that seems to lie ahead of us. Second, our intellectually superior children are our most important resource for this coming battle. Third, our public educational system has not done the most efficient job possible for these children in the past.

While it is hard to remain indifferent to the sharpness and unfairness of much of the criticism of our educational system, it is hard for us not to agree that there is sizeable room for improvement in planning for the intellectually superior child.

How best can we respond to this challenge? We can first take stock of the state of our present knowledge concerning the nature and needs of intellectually gifted children and the attempts that have been made to adapt school programs to their unique needs. This is what I wish to discuss today.

There are a bewildering variety of special programs that are available throughout the United States in educating gifted children. Indeed, as I stand here talking to you there may be some new programs opening. An attempt to catalogue these programs would be almost a waste of time. They would not fit your needs in Kentucky because many of the variations between programs seem to be based on local needs. I would like to go back to what I think is a more fundamental question and talk about the needs of gifted children that these programs are trying to meet. If we can understand the problems that they face, we can then design a program that can fit both the children and the local conditions.

In talking about needs, we can use two major areas of evidence; one, observations of people who have been in contact with these children for many years; and two, the organized research which is relevant to the subject.

Problems of the Child

The humorist, the late Robert Benchley, was asked once during his college career to write a paper on the 19th century Russian-American dispute over salmon fishing rights. Benchley wrote that he knew little about either the Russian or American point of view on the argument so would discuss the problem from the point of view of the fish. Sometimes it is very useful for us to discard our talk of programs and administrative devices and return to the point of view of the child. According to the reports of those who have worked

closest with these youngsters many gifted children in a regular program must face eventually the problem of reining in his intellectual skills and interests to fit a curriculum which is being directed to the average student in the classroom. From the teacher he must accept systematic presentation of material long known to him and, too often, must learn to deal with the fact that the class can not go into interesting side issues because they have not yet mastered the basic concepts which are a part of the "must curriculum" for the teacher.

Another serious area of adjustment for the gifted child is his relationship with other children. As Hollinworth put it, the gifted child must learn to suffer fools gladly, and must inhibit spontaneous and natural statements such as, "Don't you know that? Do I have to explain it again? You must be pretty stupid not to have heard of that," and similar statements which can only draw the antagonistic fire of his less intellectually endowed classmates.

In many situations the gifted child must decide whether to risk his social status with continued high intellectual expression, especially true in the secondary schools, or deliberately put a damper on his class contributions so he will not hear such socially chilling statements as "You must think you're pretty smart," or "Well, Mr. Egghead, what's the answer this time?" Another serious decision that the gifted child is forced to make in our school program is whether he should seriously press for presentation of his atypical or unusual ideas. Does he risk the interruption of orderly classroom procedure by suggesting that some kinds of water can be wetter than other kinds of water? Will he risk teacher disapproval if he suggests that there really is another experiment that better illustrates the principle of air pressure than the one for which the teacher has so carefully prepared for two nights? Will he volunteer to read an original poem about life and death that may produce uneasiness in both the students and the teacher? We must understand the calculated risks that each gifted child takes in our present school programs by the flexing of his intellectual muscles. Understanding this I think will bring us a long way towards comprehending the needs of gifted children.

Problem of the Teacher

Impressive as the problems facing the gifted child are in our present school systems, they seem to pale into insignificance when

one considers the problems of the teacher. The first major proble that each teacher must deal with is the impressive intellectu heterogeneity in the classroom. This is a concept that we have neve been able to effectively get across to the public and sometimes believe we have not even been able to get it across to our own teache and administrators. By the fourth or fifth grade in the averag elementary school a teacher can almost count on facing a situatio wherein some children in her class are still puzzled by the process of simple addition and subtraction while others are capable o understanding the advanced intricacies of algebra and geometry While some children are barely able to get through the first an second grade readers, some of the gifted children are reading i advanced scientific manuals, interpreting the Bible, or arguing abou the meaning of passages in Shakespeare. These differences naturall increase as children grow older.

The second major problem that we face is the teacher's lack o important information about the children in her classroom. Despit the fact that psychologists have been concerned for years about th problems of motivation for example, most teachers have litt knowledge of the motivations of the children in their clasroom. Fo example, it is often said that children who are gifted are bore in school. But there are a dozen or more major reasons for a chil being bored. Until we know which is the one in each case we canno intelligently plan for the individual child.

Another area which is sometimes poorly understood by th teacher is the social structure of her classroom. She doesn't reall know which are the influential friendships and which are of passin importance. In some way the school system must get these pertine pieces of information into the teacher's hands and also aid teache in acquiring the background of ability and knowledge necessary t properly use this information.

Research Information

I would like to briefly sketch for you some of the results of ou own research carried on in the Champaign-Urbana school syste beginning in the Pre-Sputnik era of 1954. We wished first to answe the question: What kinds of problems do gifted children face in th regular elementary schools? Second, we wished to know whether w could design a program of enrichment within the framework of th regular class program which would improve the child's statu

academically, socially, or emotionally. In order to discover if high intelligence in itself causes specific problems, we chose the very highest level of intellectual ability. In this case these were children who had Stanford-Binet IQ's of 150 or over, a score presumably obtained by only 1 out of every 1000 children. This does not mean we consider as gifted children only those with 150 IQ or over, it means we considered this selection a useful way of finding out what kinds of problems children with the highest level of intelligence will show. Each one of these children was identified by his Binet after having been referred by teachers or high group intelligence or achievement test scores. The child was given a very extensive battery of achievement, personality, self-rating scales. A sociometric devise was taken in the classroom, and parents and teachers were interviewed. Once this total body of information was obtained, a staff meeting was held in which school personnel and our research staff tried to come to a decision as to what problems this child faced in the regular school program and what kind of additional action might be taken to improve the child's adjustment. The teacher and the principal were important members of this meeting and operated as a touch of reality upon the expansive notions of what could or could not be done.

Over a period of three years we were able to identify and staff 54 children of this high level intelligence in grades 2 thru 5. The actual range of problems was quite extensive and certainly pointed out the absurdity of trying to develop one plan for gifted children. For example, I can point to four youngsters of the same IQ level. First, a boy we will call Zed. He comes from a gifted family in which both the mother and father have attained tremendous achievement and accomplishment in intellectual areas; the father is an outstanding professor at the University; their two other children are also highly gifted. The parents have, for a long time, spent much intelligent planning in nurturing the intellectual abilities of their children and this child now is very well-adjusted academically and socially. Second, a child we can call Ben. While Ben is of the same level ability as Zed, he didn't care a hang for academic activities, but instead, was extremely interested in sports and was good enough to achieve some state recognition in the particular skill in which he had talent. He was, however, the despair of his teachers who could not get him interested in anything outside of the sports area. Furthermore, the boy's father couldn't care less about the school's problems as the boy was fulfilling the father's

needs as a "frustrated athlete." The third we may call Wanda. Wanda was a willing but unimaginative girl whose problem was one of relatively low achievement and distinct lack of creativity in her performance at school and a very non-cooperative set of parents at home. The parents did not believe in this modern idea of girls being allowed to show their intelligence. Fourth, we have a boy, Ned, who has an extremely close relationship with his mother. He has been brought up as an adult and hence does not accept the idea that he should behave as other children in the classroom, but instead attempts to take on the role of assistant teacher and attempts to tell the other children what it is they are to do and to deny that the real teacher has much authority over him. Obviously anybody that says that one kind of administrative arrangement, special classes for instance, will settle these problems is whistling in the dark. In pointing out major problem areas revealed by this group it is worthwhile talking about the kinds of problems they do *not* have. Generally speaking, they are not antisocial or behavior problems and there is probably little danger of them becoming delinquent even if the schools do absolutely nothing for them. Although their academic achievement often falls far short of what they seem to be capable of, it is adequate enough in practically all instances to be acceptable at their grade level. Of course, a youngster with an IQ of 180 who is in the fifth grade and only doing fifth grade work is certainly considerably behind his potential from an achievement standpoint.

It was possible to subdivide the gifted group into three major problem classifications and these classifications can lead to educational recommendations. The first classification could be called, "Well-Adjusted and Intellectually Stimulated" children. This group represented happy and productive children who were a major asset to the school and who needed little additional assistance. About one-fourth of the children studied could qualify for this classification.

Second, "Well-Adjusted, Not Intellectually Stimulated." These were children whose personal adjustment was relatively adequate, who were not laboring under any unusual social handicaps, and yet were not responsive to the teacher's encouragement for additional or original work. Although they were fine at collecting reams of facts, they did not reveal the expected qualitative excellence in problem solving, creativity, leadership or originality that one would expect of these high level children.

The third group could be classified as "Poorly Adjusted and Not Intellectually Stimulated." About one-third of the children we saw had diverse personal or social problems of adjustment of a mild or moderate nature and thus were not able to respond with full energy or effectiveness to the school program. Thus, if we are planning for a total program for gifted children we must have, within that program, the facilities to deal with each of these three broad groups of children falling in the intellectually superior range.

Provisions for Gifted Children

To review for a moment: the general need of this group is to have a more stimulating and appropriate curriculum in an atmosphere where learning is valued. There are four major ways in which this problem has been met. *Acceleration* is one of the most well known. Although most of the general public thinks of this as *grade-skipping* it actually is accomplished much more often by other means. This can be done at the beginning of his school career by early admittance to school, by taking junior high school in an accelerated two years program; by early admittance to college, by taking college credit courses while still in high school; by obtaining credit for courses through examination, etc.

To Accelerate or Not to Accelerate, That is the Question

For many years the term "Acceleration" has been a nasty word in the vocabulary of many school administrators and parents. The mental picture of the little boy in short pants in the Harvard classroom surrounded by tolerantly smiling upper-class men has become abhorrent to almost everyone. Such early attempts to place children with their intellectual peers without regard to their social, physical, or emotional maturity have undoubtedly left their scars. I recently reviewed the literature on Acceleration while doing a pamphlet for the AERA entitled "What Research Tells the Teacher about Gifted Children."

There are two general reasons for accelerating a child in the school program. First, acceleration represents an attempt to bring the child into a group that is more similar to his own mental development. Second, acceleration may be used as an attempt to shorten the total amount of time that the child spends in school. For those children who are planning to go into professional work, the reduction by a year or two from the almost twenty years of

training is a worthwhile goal in itself. To have a physician start his career at age 27 instead of 29 can mean much to him, his family and his community . . . . if such shortening of the educational program can be accomplished without inflicting harm of some sort to the social and emotional development of the child.

While the majority of acceleration procedures have been employed at the secondary level and beyond, there have been a number of school systems that have been involved in systematic attempts to practice acceleration in the elementary program. One method of accelerating the child has been to allow him to enter school, at an earlier age than the average child. Worcester and many other writers have noted that the strict chronological age requirements for beginning first graders have little to recommend them from a research or rational viewpoint. These standards appeared to be adopted originally on the basis of some studies which indicated that a child was not ready to read until he reached a mental age (not chronological age) of over six years. Such arbitrary chronological age limits as do exist do not take into account either new advances in teaching reading or the wide range of individual intellectual differences in children with a chronological age of six.

Evaluation of early admittance programs in such widely separated places as Brookline, Massachusetts; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and numerous towns in Nebraska have shown consistently favorable results. In all instances the early admittees as a group were superior or equal in all characteristics to those children admitted at the regular age. A most extensive survey of the Nebraska program has found that the group which obtained early entrance to school were better on achievement and social acceptance at the end of primary grades than the average group, and at least the equal of the average youngster in health, coordination, leadership and emotional adjustment.

Perhaps the major barrier preventing school systems from adopting this procedure has been the administrative difficulties that it creates. This means that a great many children have to be given tests at the life age of five years and beyond, and this is a major undertaking for many school systems which do not have adequate psychological services.

At the other end of the academic scale there has been an extensive long-range study in eleven colleges varying in size and geography, of what happens to high school youngsters who enter

college one or two years early. The results of the Early Admission Program is contained in a booklet obtainable from the Fund for the Advancement of Education entitled, *They Went to College Early.* In comparing the performance of these students in colleges with students of similar abilities but who had entered college at the regular time, it was found that the accelerated groups did equally well and in most instances a little better in academic work than the comparison group of students of equal ability. But, did this acceleration of one or two years drastically affect the social and emotional adjustment of the group? Over a four year period on the basis of faculty ratings, psychiatrists reports, and a wide variety of information, it was found that only a very small proportion of the group that was accelerated had made a poor adjustment. In only one of four years did the poor adjusters measure over 10 percent of the total sample, and many of these youngsters had the majority of their problems to face in their Freshman year and were reduced as their college career was extended. These temporary adjustment problems were more often suffered by the boys who had some understandable dating problems when at the age of 15 they tried to enter the college social picture.

An interesting side study worth noting was the investigation of the characteristics of the failures of this group. The psychiatrists concluded that the early admission to college was not the underlying reason for failure. Coming to college a year earlier merely precipitated their difficulties into the open. "It is difficult to believe that these students would have succeeded in college anyway had they not entered the early admission program, as this would have necessitated their remaining another year in their difficult home situation."

Finally we had the overall judgments of the students themselves. We come to the basic question, would you advise a friend to enter college early? Twenty-seven percent would say "Yes, Definitely" and another 61 percent said "Yes with Reservations," and only three percent said "No, Definitely not." It was clear that early admittance was, in general, a success. It seems that for the overwhelming majority of them a good adjustment was made.

Grouping

Another major procedure used to aid gifted children is to group them with other bright youngsters for at least a part of the day. This grouping is done in a variety of ways in different communities.

In Cleveland there are special classes, in Pittsburgh there is a half day grouping program, in University City outside of St. Louis there are interest groups which meet for one or two half days a week.

In general these programs can be said to be adopting a policy of meeting strength with strength to get the teachers with the most skill and knowledge to deal with the most challenging students. Grouping the gifted children together also allows the teacher to add things to the curriculum, such as a foreign language, and to put more emphasis on interpretation of events and less on mere fact gathering. There is more emphasis on creativity and less on skill learning.

Special Classes

(a) Each of these programs has accepted the philosophy that the regular classroom teacher needs additional help in instructing gifted children.

(b) This help may take the form of:

1. Grouping the gifted children together for some of the day with a specially trained teacher.

2. Hiring curriculum specialists to aid the classroom teacher in subject areas where he feels he needs help.

3. Making more diagnostic services available to help with difficult problems.

4. Providing more advanced training opportunities for teachers in subject matter areas.

While the classroom teacher should not despair over his own capabilities to teach gifted children in the classroom, all of these programs do recognize the value and wisdom of additional professional aid to supplement the teachers' present skills.

Is it democratic? If you will pardon the expression—keeping all children together in the same educational mold smacks more of Communism than Democracy. We are really afraid of gifted children and their potential to change the world and a little jealous that our own children are not endowed such as they. This is the real reason for the objection.

In regard to the special programs in the secondary schools I think one could do not too much better than to merely repeat many of the recommendations that were made by Dr. James Conant, President emeritus of Harvard University who has been studying

the American High Schools at the request of the Carnegie Corporation for the past one or two years. Let me sketch briefly what he has suggested.

1. He suggests *ability grouping*. Three groups will be enough, one for the more able, one for the middle group and one for slow learners.

2. He believes that diversified talents require diversified elective programs, that the upper 3 percent of the pupil population intellectually should probably have special individualized programs planned for them. The academically talented, which he would call the top 15 to 20 percent, would have a strong academic program of 4 years of mathematics, 3 years of science, 4 years of a foreign language and required courses in social studies.

3. Dr. Conant believes that one of the things that could make a sizeable improvement would be to have one full-time counsellor for every 250 to 300 students in the high school. The counsellor should have teaching experience, and professional training in counseling.

4. English composition to insure the development of ability to write English. Half of the time devoted to English should be given to composition. Pupils should average one theme a week and themes should be corrected by the teacher and discussed with the pupils. No more than 100 pupils per teacher. That is still very high and I suggest Dr. Conant has not read 100 theses in a week or he would not recommend this.

5. He recommends that high schools should offer 4 years of a foreign language no matter how few students enroll in the third or fourth year.

6. Class rank should be abolished since class rank is calculated by averaging the grades in all subjects. Bright pupils often elect easy courses in order to insure high grades and high class standing.

7. *Academic honors list.* Each year a list should be published of the graduates who elect the recommended sequences for academically talented and make an honor's average. This achievement might be indicated by a seal or notation on the diplomas of these pupils.

8. *Supplement to the diploma.* In addition to the diploma each graduate should receive a durable record of all courses studied and grades obtained. The existence of this record should be so well publicized that employees ask to see their record of courses rather than the diploma when questioning a job applicant.

9. A high school of a graduating class of less than 100 is too small to offer the diversified curriculum to meet the needs of all the pupils and the needs of our nation. He suggests that 30 percent of our high school pupils are now attending high schools too small to do an adequate job and that this small high school should be eliminated by district reorganization.

But the most exciting new adventures have been in the curriculum adaptations for gifted children. Several experimental instructional programs in science and mathematics are challenging the appropriateness of curriculums in secondary and elementary schools for gifted children.

Critics of present methods of teaching science feel that it is wasteful to relate the concept to be taught with the functioning of familiar objects in the child's environment. In this method, the concept of pressure is taught by demonstrating how a refrigerator works; the properties of sound waves taught by watching ripples in a pool of water.

This approach, the critics contend, provides the student with limited associations and prevents him from obtaining the higher abstract conceptual system basic to the study of physics or other sciences.

The alternate approach is to describe the *fundamental* ideas or concepts of a field of scientific endeavor and then allow the students to make their own applications based upon their wider understanding of the field. An example of how this approach changes curriculum can be seen in a unit of astronomy. Instead of studying the solar system as one would do by following the first method, the teacher might discuss the creation of matter, a concept most astronomers feel is much more basic to the understanding of astronomy than the study of the solar system. In physics it would mean that instead of studying sound waves and how they function, the more basic concept of *wave motion* could be introduced so that the student could see the interrelationship between sound waves, light waves and radiation, and gain a broader understanding of the matter which constitutes our universe.

Some experimental approaches to mathematics also stress the teaching of a basic conceptual framework of mathematics rather than the mastery of individual processes. The inductive method is used and the lessons are so arranged that the pupil discovers that the basic mathematical principles for himself without having to be told

by the teacher or the text. The inductive method counteracts the all too frequent problem of students memorizing the principles in the text without any basic mathematical understanding or ability to apply the principles.

It is hoped that such an approach would reduce the need for drill, which most gifted children detest, since the student would be able to observe the interrelationship between processes and principles through the careful planning and systematic presentation of the new curriculum.

While teaching the "basic concepts" appeals to gifted children at the elementary level, there is some question as to whether these high level abstractions could be understood thoroughly by the pupil of average intelligence. Therefore, it is likely that this method will be used primarily when gifted children are grouped together for study.

The "basic concepts" approach also places a heavier burden on the teacher who has to have a wide background of understanding of the subject matter to be able to answer the thorny questions that this approach stimulates. These experimental programs therefore have found it necessary to retrain teachers in these new curriculum approaches.

Who Should Teach the Gifted?

The research evidence in this area is conspicuous mostly by its absence. It is characterized by questionnaires given to administrators, or by interviews and questionnaires given to gifted children who have attended special programs. These investigations have been singularly unproductive of useful information concerning any unique characteristics of such teachers. The list of desirable characteristics have such old favorites as "good sense of humor," "must be interested in the child," and "highly motivated" and so on through a list of most of the virtues of mankind. Since these are the characteristics which one would like to have in a teacher of the mentally retarded or social worker or nursery school attendant, they do not differentiate effectively for someone interested in teacher selection.

Two of the characteristics one hears about most frequently are the ability to admit mistakes, and a broad experiential background. Certainly no teacher could exist very long with a colony of gifted

children who felt she had to pretend that she was the fount of
knowledge. The ability to say "I don't know," coupled with
ability to direct the child to proper references certainly would be
common sense characteristic expected of a teacher of gifted childre
A broad background of experience and knowledge is needed to ma
the children's learning more alive and personal.

Many experts in this field have been saying that you do n
have to be gifted to teach the gifted. This statement is n
accompanied by evidence which indicates how many successf
teachers of gifted children are of average intelligence or below. Th
writer suspects that at least superior intellectual endowment
desirable before a teacher should consider undertaking to teac
groups of gifted children.

The reason for the general lack of information about teache
of gifted children is that there are few such teachers and few trainin
programs *exclusively* devoted to the education of gifted children. Th
general philosophy of most school systems is that the basic instructio
of gifted children should be the same as that of the averag
child. If the special curriculum programs described here woul
be adopted for the gifted but not for the average child, the
special teachers would be needed for the gifted. With mor
special teachers of the gifted there would be more opportuni
to study their unique characteristics.

If we accept the implications of the information give
then there is another question that we must answer. Can w
afford it? Make no mistake about it, all of the suggestions an
recommendations that have been made; smaller classes, mor
counsellors and psychologists, more highly trained curriculu
specialists, all cost money.

I think that it goes without saying that the American public ca
afford anything it is convinced it needs.

The great challenge of educational leadership is to interpr
these needs to the public and show how these needs of these childre
coincide so closely to the personal welfare of each citizen. There ar
worse things than going into debt over education.

A new attitude on how much needs to be spent upon it seem
to be developing slowly throughout the country. The noted historia

Toynbee has suggested that Russia may well be America's hairshirt and may force us to make many changes and reforms in the name of *defense* that should have been made long ago in the name of our *culture*. Let us hope that we have the courage and imagination to create new programs that need to be developed not only for gifted children but for all of our children.

SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Twelve groups of approximately twenty people each met fo approximately one hour during the conference to discuss variou problems encountered in attempting to improve education for th gifted.

Much of the discussion centered around the remarks of the tw speakers. However, it was also evident that there were man individuals who had very strong convictions concerning variou phases of working with gifted children and youth. The lively discussions contributed much to the conference.

Most groups covered a great range of topics. Often times ther was no general consensus reached. The following summary of th group discussions represents things which seemed to be brough up most frequently or which seemed to be problems the group felt needed further attention. In no measure does this summarizatio cover all of the aspects of the discussion, but it does attempt t "hit high points."

I. WHO ARE THE GIFTED?

1. Most groups limited their discussion to the academically talented. Some groups defined the gifted as the upper 5 per cent in general intelligence; others as the upper 15 to 2 per cent.
2. Although the feeling was that it was difficult and often expensive to identify and plan for the gifted, all seemed to believe that more definitely needed to be done.
3. More than one criteria should be used to identify—not IQ alone, but among others, teachers observation, parent assistance, and achievement tests.

II. PROGRAM OF EDUCATION FOR THE GIFTED

Acceleration:

1. There is a need for those who are gifted to take more subjects —subjects to be taught in a way to challenge the child.
2. Allow some high school students to work with college classes where facilities and availability of teachers make it practica

3. Some groups expressed fear that acceleration might turn children out of school too immature in some respects.
4. Advanced College Placement Plan seemed good to several.

Enrichment:

1. Several groups seemed to prefer enrichment within the regular school room for the gifted in elementary grades with possibly different arrangements for the high school.
2. To truly enrich a program, the teacher must provide more depth, demand creative thinking in the solution of problems. It was felt by some that this could be done but that there was a need for smaller classes.
3. Teachers must help the gifted child to have his goals raised commensurate with his ability. She must expect and demand better performance from him than from others.
4. Teachers need to encourage a child gifted in certain areas to go beyond them in knowledge of certain subjects or aspects of the subject.

Special Grouping:

1. There must be some parent education, particularly in smaller communities before special grouping for the gifted should take place.
2. Several groups decided that some special grouping of gifted children was good, but that they should be grouped with other children for some phases of the school program.
3. Any grouping done should be for the purpose of better educating all students involved—not just for emphasis on one group only.
4. It is impossible to have perfect homogeneous grouping, but some grouping narrows the span of ability with which the teacher deals, affording more time for coping with individual needs.
5. Larger high schools are needed in our State in order to divide various class sections according to ability levels in certain subject areas. The size of the school system has a definite bearing on whether or not gifted children could be grouped in special classes for instruction.
6. At least one group felt there should be different diplomas for the different school programs.

7. Some groups had reservations concerning special grouping, feeling that possible ill effects to social adjustment might be brought about through such grouping of the gifted — other groups seemed to feel that any ill effects would be negligible and that the good effect would outweigh the bad.

Specific needs in building better school programs

1. There is a definite need for an expanded and improved counseling program in Kentucky schools.
2. All regular classroom teachers need more training in guidance, counseling, administration of, and interpretation of results of tests—both group and individual.
3. There is a need for all schools to put more stress on the value of intellectual achievement.
4. A recommendation that a twelve month school term be made possible for gifted students was made by one group.
5. The need to more fully understand all children in order to better teach all, including the gifted, was mentioned by several.
6. Some of the groups looked to the day when trained psychologists will be available to the majority of Kentucky schools for assisting the regular classroom teacher or the special teachers of gifted.

III. TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED

1. Most groups realized the need for better teachers in all classrooms, and, especially was this need pointed up for teachers dealing with gifted children.
2. Teachers of the gifted need to be able to stimulate while, often times, regular teachers may need more ability to elaborate for the benefit of the group.
3. The need for better pay in order to attract and retain good teachers was recognized, along with the idea that money alone, without a true understanding of and interest in children and the knowledge necessary to be a teacher, will not get the job done.
4. It was felt that the teacher of the gifted needs thorough training in fundamental skills and a broad cultural background provided by the teacher-training institution.

5. A need exists for good principals and supervisors to assist in developing young teachers into outstanding ones.
6. In order to get better quality teachers for gifted students, some gifted students need to be encouraged to become teachers themselves.
7. There is a need for more experimentation in planning programs for the gifted on the part of regular teachers, special teachers, and administrators.

IV. ROLE OF THE PARENT IN EDUCATION OF THE GIFTED

1. More understanding between teachers, administrators, and parents is needed as to what the school program should actually do for the child.
2. Parents need to know when their child is not working near his ability level and need to share information concerning him which might assist the teacher in challenging him.
3. Parent-teacher conferences on a regular basis will aid both home and school to coordinate their efforts in working with any child—especially the gifted.
4. The home has a great responsibility for the early development of the child's attitudes, his ability to make adjustments, and the rate at which he has matured.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

by

HERMAN E. SPIVEY

Words are both fascinating and aggravating, as you kn They simply won't stay put, and so you can't rely on them to me the same thing all the time. Take the word "recorder," for instan which I won't discuss, or the word "summarize," which I will thought "to summarize," for example, means "to condense," distill," "to find the essence of;" but I'm obviously behind the ti or else I haven't been keeping the same company as Dr. Robe Martin. He assigned me to the role of summarizing the discussi of this Conference and in the same breath scheduled twelve differe discussion groups meeting simultaneously in twelve different roo and concluding their deliberations only moments before t summary is to be given. Even in this Space Age, I haven't been a to find a way to be in twelve rooms listening to twelve discussi groups at the same time. So I'll have to do to you the same thi Lytton Strachey did to Queen Victoria, and with the same defe when asked why he did it. In the last pages of his biography of t queen, he tells what passed through her consciousness in the l hours of her life. When a critic attacked his psychographic meth and sarcastically asked Mr. Strachey how he could know that those things passed through the dying queen's mind, he s innocently, "If that isn't what the queen thought about it, it's wh she ought to have thought about." Pleading your awareness of m dilemma and trusting your tender mercies, I make bold now summarize what you may have thought or said today—or what y ought to have.

The program says we two hundred and forty people (shor have spent by this time) about two-thirds of this day thinking a talking about two related questions: (1) Whom are we thinki about and planning for when we discuss "gifted children" and h do we find out who they are? (2) What special opportunities a programs can we provide in our schools which will encourage th young people of unusually large academic talent to develop fully as possible their capabilities to become their highest selv It is their intellectual potentialities which are our most import

asset in preserving and further developing the ideals of our democratic way of life, never before so seriously jeopardized. However, as is so often true in human communications, what the program implies is more important than what it explicitly says. The call of this Conference implies, for instance, that we have an uneasy conscience in relation to this matter; we doubt we've been doing enough. I have no doubt that many of us believe that we thoroughly deserve our guilt in spite of Dr. Barbe's reminder that some major programs (like the Cleveland experiment) have been in operation for 35 years, and that research has been intensified since the 1940's. (And, if we do have a sense of guilt, an uneasy conscience might be good for a country which for over a century now, until a few years ago, has been conspicuously provincial and complacent, a country suffering from a bad case of superiority complex). The call of this Conference implies, furthermore, that we believe the first step toward improvement consists of alerting ourselves to this problem as a major challenge in education and that we believe the schools belong to the citizens, from whom it is possible to receive many helpful suggestions and whose understanding and cooperation are necessary for great improvement, anyway.

The Conference began when the Planning Committee unanimously decided, about two months ago, that this is a topic we ought to dramatize with a statewide conference and then follow up and develop under the impetus of a special division within the State Department of Education. When letters of inquiry about this Conference went out to several hundreds of our citizens all over Kentucky, the two most characteristic responses were words to this effect: "It's high time we were doing something special about this," or "I can't imagine anything more important in connection with our schools."

But when we get here and start exploring this topic, we find, typically, that it is more complicated than some of us thought. For a highly pragmatic people in an age of advanced technology, this discovery is discouraging and doesn't seem quite right. There ought to be a formula for it, of course, or a law, or, at the very least, the identification of the gifted ought to be amenable to programming for an electronic computer—but there isn't, it appears, and we resent it, because we are in a hurry and we dearly love short-cuts. With all our testing and other analytical instruments, we still don't know for sure how to identify "the gifted," and if we go about this

too superficially we run the risk, as Dr. Barbe implied, of narrowing the definition of giftedness as to eleminate potential superior individuals. In the use of identifying devices, and in the development of new means, he reminded us this morning, we must always keep in mind that the purpose determines the definition and the identification-techniques to be used. In our search for improved ways and means of discovering something so subtle and elusive as talent, we are not likely to succeed by concentrating on techniques for quality is not measurable in terms of quantity.

No doubt the great national interest in improved counseling services and the enlargement of well-trained counseling personnel stimulated by the National Defense Education Act of 1958, will result eventually in the development of better identifying instruments, techniques, ways of thinking about the problem, and more properly trained people to make use of these. Who knows but that tomorrow we may be talking about inner space (that is aptitudes) almost as facilely as we now talk about outer space — and I hope with a great deal more understanding, even if with less excitement!

A few of the points emphasized by Dr. Barbe in his live address are as follows — mentioned here without attention to connectedness: "The time to do something about the gifted is now and the place is wherever he is." Because of imperfections in our identifcation techniques and procedures, many a gifted child is lost between primary school and college. In designating special programs for the gifted, we need to keep in mind also the needs of all the children and try to do something that will benefit all and therefore may last, in the opinion of Dr. Barbe. "The gifted child is one who is consistently superior in any line of endeavor," as Dr. Witty insists. If we provide for the academically gifted, as is desirable, we should realize that we are not providing for all gifted children, but only for the academically promising—a very valuable group. The great hope for success is the experimentally proved fact that the child of large potentialities generally performs well when challenged along with others of large potentialities as demonstrated by the 3 year Cleveland program for the academically gifted.

As for tests, it is not enough to rely on achievement tests. The I.Q. score alone is not enough; even more meaningful is the basic age score on the Binet test. The mental age factor is more under-

standable than the I.Q. score by itself and observation is an excellent supplement to tests. Anyway, no test is better than the interpreter.

Dr. Gallagher, our second speaker, called attention to the favorable public climate of opinion now for doing something really important in behalf of the intellectually superior and at the same time improving our programs for the other children, too. The gifted child is "generally not challenged by the school program and will resist doing more than others around him," he reminds us.

As for special programs Dr. Gallagher points out that "research is unequivocal in its endorsement of one or two years acceleration for those children who have the requisite social and emotional maturity" and that grouping of gifted children for at least a part of the day "permits us to challenge them with materials which are at the level of their intellectual potential;" the newest and most exciting developments, however, have been the new curricula for the intellectually superior.

One of the encouraging results derived from the study Dr. Gallagher reported is the fact that students, parents, and teachers, generally raised their expectations as a result of recognizing superior ability.

Both of our main speakers emphasized the need not to forget the other-than-superior student in pursuing this interest in the superior. What is good for the superior is, it is implied, good for all. In my own behalf, I want to turn this emphasis over on the other side and interpolate a warning on this point: In our nervous concern to protect the democratic ideal of equal opportunity for ALL, let us not remain so absorbed with the ALL that we forget the academically gifted, in behalf of whom this conference is called.

As well as I can judge from brief visits to the conference rooms this afternoon, we generally believe, rightly or wrongly, such things as the following, which have implications for our educators and parents. For convenience I have tabulated these convictions, but there is no significance in the order of the numbering:

(1) Parents may be more committed to the value of learning than many educators believe, and they would probably support higher standards than our schools now maintain.
(2) If teachers hold high expectations of their students, especially their most talented ones, the students are more

apt to hold high standards for themselves, and *vice versa*. Teachers' ideals and expectations are contagious to their students.

(3) We have more brains than we have learned how to use wisely. There are more bright students than we know and provide for, and there are more potentialities for higher achievement within our so-called average students than we recognize. That is, our students are probably able to learn more and understand more deeply than they now do, or are expected to do.

(4) Our education may be better than some of our current critics are suggesting, but we are probably not as good or as nearly adequate as we thought we were a little while ago.

(5) We feel a little irritation and resentment over the extent to which recent and current Russian achievement is affecting us, and some anxiety lest Russia influence us in ways and degrees we don't want to be affected. We don't want to make over ourselves or any of our institutions in the image of Russia or sacrifice anything vital about our way of life. I admit that I, too, share some of this irritation and anxiety, but by and large I personally am grateful to Russia for shaking us out of our characteristic complacency and over-confidence about ourselves and causing us to experience a wholesome sense of challenge, which is conducive to progress and growth. It's possible, as you know, to learn something from your enemy as well as from your friend—maybe more from your enemy.

(6) Finally, I believe, we believe that, good as our education may be, it isn't nearly as good as it could be, and, in any case, it is not good enough for tomorrow.

If this isn't what you thought and said today, or else what you ought to have, please forgive me, or else blame Dr. Martin. He can take it on his broad shoulders.

APPENDIX A

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The following persons served on the Planning Committee for the Conference on Education for the Gifted:

Dr. Robert R. Martin, Chairman, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Frankfort

Mr. Earl Adams, Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Frankfort

Dr. R. B. Atwood, President, Kentucky State College, Frankfort

Mr. Don C. Bale, Head, Bureau of Instruction, State Department of Education, Frankfort

Mrs. Barry Bingham, Glenview

Mr. Rexford Blazer, Ashland Oil Refining Company, Ashland

Dr. Omer Carmichael, Superintendent, Louisville City Schools, Louisville

Dr. Philip G. Davidson, President, University of Louisville, Louisville

Dr. Frank G. Dickey, President, University of Kentucky, Lexington

Mr. J. Marvin Dodson, Executive Secretary, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville

Rev. John Elsaesser, Diocesan Superintendent of Schools, Covington

Mr. Donald Elswick, Director, Division of Instructional Services, State Department of Education, Frankfort

Dr. W. R. McNeill, Superintendent, Bowling Green City Schools, Bowling Green

Mr. Alton Ross, Superintendent, Oldham County Schools, LaGrange

Mrs. James Sheehan, President, Kentucky Council for Education, Danville

Dr. H. E. Spivey, Dean, Graduate School, University of Kentucky, Lexington

APPENDIX B

Copy of Program

CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION FOR THE GIFTED

January 16, 1959

9:30-10:30 A.M. Registration.... Sheraton-Seelbach Hotel Lobb

10:30-11:45 A.M. General Session .....Grand Ballroo

Presiding—

Dr. Robert R. Martin, Superintendent of Public Instructi

Invocation—

Rev. John Elsaesser, Diocesan Superintendent of Schoo

Address—Problems in Identification of the Gifted—

Dr. Walter Barbe, Director, Junior League Reading Cente
University of Chattanooga

11:45-12:30 P.M. LUNCH

12:30- 1:30 P.M. Address—Programs of Education for the Gift

Dr. James Gallagher, Associate Professor of Educatio
University of Illinois

1:30- 2:45 P.M. Discussion Groups

2:45 3:00 P.M. Conference Summary—

Dr. H. E. Spivey, Dean Graduate School, University of K

3:00 P.M. Adjournment

APPENDIX C

Persons Accepting the Invitation to Serve as Delegates to the Conference:

Charles Acuff
O. A. Adams
William J. Allen
R. C. Almgren
James T. Alton
Mrs. Charles W. Anderson, Jr.
Joe H. Anderson
Francele H. Armstrong
A. B. Arnold
Mrs. Warren Ash
Mrs. Charles Asher
Charles S. Atcher
Virginia Atkinson
R. B. Atwood
Mrs. Garnett Bale
Harry A. Banks
Mrs. Malcolm L. Barnes
Henley V. Bastin
M. L. Beere
Ed Belcher
Russell R. Below
Maurice D. Bement
Mrs. Raymond H. Bennett
Guy Billington
Mrs. Barry Bingham
James F. Bleakley
Mrs. Raymond Bolton
J. M. Boswell
Mildred Bott
Mabel Bowen
David H. Bradford
Thomas Brantley
Mrs. Harry Braun
Mrs. William R. Bridges
Mrs. Martin Broadbooks
Ernest Broady
Mrs. Jesseye H. Brown
Joe Brown
Martha Jane Brunson
J. W. Bryan
E. T. Buford
G. C. Burkhead
F. T. Burns
Mother Callexta
Owen F. Cammack
Mrs. G. W. Campbell
G. W. Campbell
Omer Carmichael
John M. Carter
James A. Cawood
J. A. Caywood
Mrs. W. M. Christopherson
C. T. Clemmons
Donald E. Cline
H. A. Cocanougher
Nancy Collins
Dan F. Conley
Fred W. Cox
Mrs. Katherine M. Cox
A. B. Coxwell
Leslie H. Dause
Philip Davidson
Mrs. Lawrence Davis
Mitchell Davis
Elizabeth Dennis
J. W. Dennis
Charles De Weese
Thelma Diamond
Mae Dixon
J. M. Dodson

Roy Dorsey
J. C. Eaves
Amos H. Eblen
Howard Eckel
Rev. John S. Elsaesser
Betsy Worth Estes
Samuel C. Evans
R. G. Eversole
J. C. Falkenstine
C. H. Farley
Gene C. Farley
James E. Farmer
D. T. Ferrell
Mrs. Leopold Fleischaker
Mrs. Beulah Fontaine
Robert Forsythe
Sister Clara Francis
Ben Freeman
Dorine Geeslin
Sister Margaret Gertrude
Mrs. Lurene Gibson
Lyman V. Ginger
Mrs. James W. Gladden
Mrs. H. D. Glenn
Nancy Goodin
R. L. Goodpaster
Charles C. Graham
James B. Graham
Mrs. H. P. Gratton
F. C. Grise
Bobbie R. Grogan
Ruth M. Guenther
P. L. Guthrie
J. G. Hamburg
Mrs. Jewel Hamilton
W. Paul Hampton
Carrol Hanberry
Ova O. Haney
H. H. Harned
Luther R. Harris
Charles W. Hart

Earl F. Hays
Jessie Heath
Frank H. Heck
John E. Heer, Jr.
Mrs. A. Hill
Alma D. Hill
Rev. R. G. Hill
Mrs. Minnie J. Hitch
Rev. W. J. Hodge
Clayton Hood
V. P. Horne
James Merle Howard
Joe Howard
W. E. Howard
Sister M. Immaculata
Sister M. Irmina
Mrs. W. T. Isaac
Gerald Jaggers
F. S. Jennings
Ivan Jett
Rev. Reggie H. Johnson
Stanley Johnson
E. G. Jones
Lee Francis Jones
Luther C. Jones
George Joplin
E. M. Josey
Gladstone Koffman
Mrs. John W. Koon
Mrs. H. S. Krumpelman
Mrs. Joseph Landau
Frances A. Lashbrook
Clyde T. Lassiter
O. M. Lassiter
Mrs. William J. Latten
Naomi Lattimore
Dave Lawrence
Mary L. Lawrence
Jesse D. Lay
Bergman S. Letzler
Mrs. Edna Lindle

Clyde Linville
A. D. Litchfield
Rev. John T. Loftus
Sister Frances Loretto
Bernice Eisman Lott
John B. Lowe
Omega Lutes
Ora Cecil Mackey
Mrs. Frederick Mayer
Charles E. McCormick
Heman H. McGuire
Josephine McKee
W. R. McNeill
M. G. McRaney
L. E. Meece
James Melton
Sister M. Merici
Joda Milburn
Melbourne Mills
John Moloney
W. J. Moore
George Alice Motley
Mary Cyril Mudd
Virginia Murrell
Mrs. W. B. Nalle
David Neustadt
John W. Nienaber
R. Noback
S. V. Noe
E. M. Norsworthy
Carlos Oakley
W. F. O'Donnell
Mrs. Effie Oglesby
Dan O'Niell
J. J. Oppenheimer
Dawson Orman
W. B. Owen
A. D. Owens
Roy H. Owsley
Samuel B. Peavey
Golda D. Pensol
Sara Moss Phillips
Everett L. Pirkey
Rev. Felix N. Pitt
Tate C. Page
James V. Powell
Sister Mary Ransom
Wayne Ratliff
Willie C. Ray
Sister M. Raymond
Chester C. Redmon
Sister Agnes Regina
W. Edwin Richardson
J. K. Robb
D. A. Robbins
J. Lee Robertson
Mrs. E. W. Roles
Alton Ross
Nora Lee Rowland
Joe E. Sabel
Mrs. A. B. Sawyer, Jr.
Margaret Walker Shaper
W. C. Shattles
Mrs. Ben Shaver
O. L. Shields
Frank B. Simpson
H. F. Skidmore
Earl P. Slone
H. S. Smith
Roy B. Smith
Tom Smith
C. V. Snapp
J. Foley Snyder
Hugh C. Spalding
Harry M. Sparks
Marguerite C. Sparrow
Herman E. Spivey
Frank Stallings
Bernadine Steele
Leona W. Stewart
T. W. Stewart
Talton K. Stone

Harrell Tague
Eugene Tallent
Eugene Tate
Leonard C. Taylor
Octavia Taylor
Lynn D. Thompson
R. Case Thomasson
Millard Tolliver
Mark M. Tucker
Virgil O. Turner
Richard Van Hoose
Mrs. John F. Van Slyke
Mrs. Elizabeth Vessels
Mrs. K. P. Vinsel
J. V. Vittitow
Marlin M. Volz
Ewell E. Waddell
Barkley Walker
Helen W. Wallingford
Mrs. John H. Walls
George Walsh
C. V. Watson
Mary C. Watson
B. H. Weaver
Anne B. Weeter
W. P. Wheeler
V. E. Whitaker
Francis Whitney
Walter Wilhelm
Dorcas W. Willis
Atwood S. Wilson
Mrs. Robert Winder
Opal P. Wolford
Ralph H. Woods
Mrs. M. L. Worthington
Mary May Wyman
Mrs. Marcus Yancey
A. F. Young
Hortense H. Young
Whitney M. Young