

**Record: 1**

**Title:** Conceptual Foundations For Gifted Education: Stock-Taking.  
**Authors:** Cohen, LeoNora M.<sup>1</sup> *cohenl@oregonstate.edu*  
**Source:** Roeper Review; Winter2006, Vol. 28 Issue 2, p91-110, 20p, 1 Diagram, 8 Charts

**Document Type:** Article

**Subject Terms:** \*SPECIAL education  
\*COMPENSATORY education  
\*EDUCATION  
\*INCLUSIVE education  
\*INDIVIDUALIZED education programs  
\*MAINSTREAMING in education  
NAICS/Industry Codes611710 Educational Support Services  
611699 All Other Miscellaneous Schools and Instruction  
923110 Administration of Education Programs

**Abstract:** Conceptual Foundations are the theoretical conceptual philosophical and historical aspects; perspectives from outside the field; trends, issues, and future directions; and social political, and economic facets that underlie our field. This paper attempted to capture these foundational aspects, taking stock of accomplishments and suggesting future directions. The last 16 years of Conceptual Foundations program abstracts from NAGC Conventions were analyzed quantitatively (numbers/types of presentations) and qualitatively, using grounded theory, for patterns in each of the seven Division missions. An historical overview of Division development, each of the Division's missions and how close we have come to their accomplishment, and luminous presentations were discussed. Suggestions were made for future efforts in each mission area, particularly related to more dynamic, organismic approaches. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

*Copyright of Roeper Review is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use. This abstract may be abridged. No warranty is given about the accuracy of the copy. Users should refer to the original published version of the material for the full abstract. (Copyright applies to all Abstracts.)*

**Author Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Associate Professor in the School of Education, Oregon State University

**Full Text Word Count:** 21000

**ISSN:** 02783193

**Accession Number:** 19508231

**Database:** Academic Search Complete

## **Conceptual Foundations For Gifted Education: Stock-Taking**

Conceptual Foundations are the theoretical conceptual philosophical and historical aspects; perspectives from outside the field; trends, issues, and future directions; and social political, and economic facets that underlie our field. This paper attempted to capture these foundational aspects, taking stock of accomplishments and suggesting future directions. The last 16 years of Conceptual Foundations program abstracts from NAGC Conventions were analyzed quantitatively (numbers/types of presentations) and qualitatively, using grounded theory, for patterns in each of the seven Division missions. An historical overview of Division development, each of the Division's missions and how close we have come to their accomplishment, and luminous presentations were discussed. Suggestions were made for future efforts in each mission area, particularly related to more dynamic, organismic approaches.

This paper is an attempt to capture big-picture exploratory thinking in the field of gifted education, with the aim to clarify, expand, and integrate aspects of theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the field. An analysis of the Conceptual Foundations presentation strand of the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) over the history of the Division is a way to capture such thinking because its mission directly addresses this purpose and most of the leading, innovative thinkers in the field use it as a forum for testing their latest insights.

I describe the methodology used; review the founding and offer a brief history of the Division; and discuss each of the Division's seven missions, providing an overview of sessions held and considering important contributions and possible directions. Finally, I take stock of where we are and where we might go.

### Methodology

Abstracts from convention programs for the Conceptual Foundations strand and special sessions specifically listed as from that strand from the beginning of the Division in 1989 through 2004 were analyzed qualitatively for content and quantitatively, counting numbers of presentations by mission category and by lead author (totaling 360 presentations, not including annual business meetings. Author counts are in Table 1). First, tables were created to loosely categorize presentations by year and by mission. Next, broad themes were derived using grounded theory. Deeper analysis of each presentation was completed, working within each mission area; classifications of themes were revised, sub-themes constructed, and presentations reclassified. Information in sub themes is presented in tables (see Appendices) to provide the gist of key interests over the years. Evaluations were made based on my perceived value of the contributions, with attendance at many of these sessions also being a filter.

### Division History

At the NAGC Convention in Cincinnati, 1989, a group of theorists (LeoNora Cohen, Hans Jellen, Harry Passow, Michael Piechowski, and Virgil Ward) organized an interest group on theory and

other foundational issues in a session sponsored by the Research Division, entitled "To Get Ahead, Get a Theory." Following our packed presentation, we circulated a petition to establish a division of our own, collecting 44 signatures that year, enough to initiate the division-establishment process. We felt the need to do so because none of the other divisions had as their mission the making of a theoretical framework for, or the understanding of the conceptual underpinnings or the 'big picture' issues for the field. There was no guarantee of slots on the program for presentations in these areas, nor was there the opportunity for those interested particularly in the theoretical-conceptual aspects to work with each other regularly. In addition, many experts in the field had decried the lack of a theoretical framework. Only by the largess of other divisions could any such sessions be held.

The following year, NAGC President James Curry and Program Chair, Barbara Clark, gave the fledgling ad hoc committee a theory strand at the 1990 NAGC Convention in Little Rock, "as an opportunity to demonstrate its viability as a division" (J. Curry, personal communication, March 7, 1990). A business/organizational meeting was held, by-laws developed, the name, Conceptual Foundations Division selected, a six-part mission established, officers elected, 178 signatures collected, and plans made for the 1991 Convention in Kansas City. With approval from the NAGC Division Steering Committee, the Conceptual Foundations Division became formalized on September 1, 1991.

The Division mission includes the following areas: theory; definitions and conceptions of giftedness and talent; philosophical foundations; trends, issues, and future directions for the field; historical perspectives; and perspectives from outside our field in order to provide the longitudinal, conceptual, and structural frame from which our field can build appropriate curriculum, identify students, and do research (Cohen, Jellen, Passow, Piechowski, & Ward, 1990). In ensuing years, ethical issues were connected to philosophical foundations, and social, political, and economic considerations were added to the mission. We envisioned the Conceptual Foundations Division as the base for all the other divisions (see Figure 1).

I will address each of the Division missions and briefly review presentations in tables (see Appendices) for each area; discuss some luminous elements, which are ideas that shed exceptional light, truth, and usefulness and that sing or resonate aesthetically (Cohen, 1992); and consider issues and future directions. The starred items in each table were particularly illuminating, I believe in the importance of holistic, integrative theory; therefore, I focus more on presentations friendly to this approach. This is my own take on where we stand, as we view the world through our own conceptual lens.

### Theory

The mission of the Conceptual Foundations Division related to theory, as set out in proposed guidelines, and submitted to the NAGC President, was to work together to develop a metatheory or theories from the works already done and from other fields that best explains the extraordinary development seen in gifted/creative individuals (Cohen, Jellen, Passow, Piechowski, & Ward, 1990).

The state of our field at the inception of the Conceptual Foundations Division was captured by Fetterman (1988):

One of the least discussed but most glaring holes in gifted and talented education is the lack of a theory. No overarching theoretical framework exists for the development of gifted and talented programs. The absence of a theoretical base makes the development of gifted and talented programs a vulnerable and shaky proposition at best. (p. 62)

Both theories and models were disseminated pertaining to gifted individuals. Theories are unified explanations for complex, observed phenomena that systematically describe the underlying relationships or principles of those phenomena. Theories should account for extant research and provide guidance for future research, accommodating new data to the extent possible. Models are simplified representations of a system or phenomenon that focus on practical applications, based on central concepts that link one aspect to another without necessarily getting at the core explanations that underlie giftedness and education of gifted children. They are not modified as empirical evidence is accumulated and are either retained or abandoned, depending on whether new data confirm them (Ary cited in Cohen & Ambrose, 1993a).

One hundred and two presentations were given focusing on theories or models (see Appendix A). Four major themes emerged--theory importance, construction, issues, and testing; imported theories or aspects of these theories; theories specific to gifted education; and models and principles. Some important work on how to look at theories based on their worldview, scope and scale, and criteria, as well as ways of bringing varied theories into coherence through considering possible linking mechanisms were proposed, particularly in the early years of the Division. Many sessions focused on theories imported from outside the field that have relevance to understanding gifted children and their curriculum, grouped by focus on personality, cognition and intelligence, and context. Other sessions described extant or emergent theories specific to gifted education. Several presentations focused on models and principles, grouped as intra-individual, instructional, and integrative. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of presentations by category or subcategory. Where more than one author is listed in a section, the key ideas are ordered in the same sequence.

Outside of the models of Gagné, Milgram, Moon, and Van-Tassel-Baska, several models commonly used in gifted education have not been shared in the Conceptual Foundations strand. Betts' Autonomous Learner Model, The Parallel Curriculum Model of Tomlinson, Kaplan and Renzulli, Piirto's Talent Development Model, and Renzulli's Schoolwide Enrichment Model, among others, have been described in the literature, special sessions, or other sessions. The developers of these and emerging models are encouraged to share presentations in the Conceptual Foundations Division.

Certainly, progress has been made in theory development. There have been some attempts at theory building specific to the field. The most exciting to me is Ambrose's dynamic Theory of

Aspiration Development that describes varied life trajectories relative to socioeconomic barriers: a contextual theory with real explanatory power. It has also been valuable to observe the development of Gagné's thought. The framework for his model remains and may evolve into a theory, as he studies and integrates specific aspects.

However, the very hard work of trying to build a metatheory from the varied theories that might best explain extraordinary development is elusive and has been subsumed more recently by simpler approaches that typically explain one aspect or occur on one level of analysis, such as the intrapersonal.

My own theory may serve as a theory integrator. I proposed (Cohen, 1984; Cohen & Frydenberg, 1996) that the gifted individual has eight internal interacting systems (universal cognitive, non-universal cognitive, physical and perceptual systems, and systems of affect, purpose, intuition, and spirituality) resting on a biological base that work together in an ever-widening spiral and interact with the social, cultural, and physical environment. I viewed these systems as pulling on and enhancing development, or at times, diverging from each other causing difficulties, much like more recent thinking about asynchrony. This dynamic systems view may be useful in linking specific theories into a greater whole. For example, the various theories, models, and conceptions related to each of the interacting systems or contexts might be brought into this theoretical framework, a developmental systems approach within the organismic metaphysical lens.

I also suggested criteria for a theory for gifted education (Cohen, 1988), the first criterion being that the theory needs to address differences in thinking of the gifted child. I proposed (Cohen, 1984) that Piaget's equilibration theory helps to clarify these differences in thinking and explains the cognitive system so evident in gifted children; as well as providing an alternative to IQ tests to identify giftedness, especially among underserved populations (Cohen, Sheperd, & Balzer, 1990). Gifted children construct and organize their structures differently from typically developing children, leaping ahead in several domains before they have stability of thought (Cohen & Kim, 1999; Kim & Cohen, 1999). For example, the typically developing six-year-old conserves number but not other domains, while the gifted child at six conserves number, and simple examples of discontinuous quantity, continuous quantity, substance, and length, but is fooled by harder examples. This child recognizes that a ball of clay made into a snake or pancake is the same "because you can make it back into a ball," but errs when the ball is made into six little bears, stating, "There's more clay because there are so many bears" (Roberts, 1981, p. 228). Gifted children anticipate possibilities; yet simultaneously they experience greater disequilibrium because the rules they build (reciprocity, identity, and reversibility) to try to explain all events are overcome by perception part of the time. The child is both more and less equilibrated, the "balance uneasy." This difference in equilibration explains the curiosity, ability to predict, and to construct relationships evident in gifted children.

#### Conceptions of Giftedness and Talent

The Conceptual Foundations Division guidelines (1990) state, Provide a forum for sharing and

discussing various conceptions and definitions of giftedness and for coming to synthesis or agreement to accept differences. One hundred and ten presentations were given in this area. Two big groupings emerged: conceptions and definitions. Within the conceptions, five sub themes focused on individual characteristics (affective, intellectual, and thinking aspects), interactivity with the environment, the context (social, political, and diversity), practice, and issues and directions.

Definitions, meanings, and constructs of giftedness and related terms also had multiple presentations (see Appendix B). The four sub themes included changing perspectives and acknowledgement of conflicting definitions; focus on specific terms, such as intelligence, creativity, or talent; individual difference definitions; and domain definitions.

The various conceptions have helped to extend our understandings of the nature of gifted individuals, aspects about their education, and the context in which they function. Sessions that focused on contextual and interactive aspects were highly instructive and are suggestive of more work in these areas. Of particular value were sessions that addressed perspectives from practitioners, popular media, and diverse populations, as these help us to see our field as others see us. Also useful were sessions that raise questions about our directions, because we must constantly question our assumptions.

However, we have not reached consensus on the nature of giftedness, nor, with a few exceptions, have we considered how giftedness, talent, intelligence, creativity, and prodigiousness are related. We are still struggling to figure out what the various terms mean and how to communicate these to others; particularly those who may not share the same worldview, who come from other fields, or who learn about giftedness from the popular media. Even within our field, we talk at cross-purposes. Recognizing the metaphysical framework of each other's definitions and conceptions will be central in finding common ground. Presenters in this area of mission should become more steeped in the philosophical aspects at this highest level in order to acknowledge their own lenses.

We have a better understanding from the mechanistic worldview (world as machine-like, static, stable, and measurable--see Cohen, 2003a), with the bulk of presentations sharing this perspective, in spite of shifts to more dynamic paradigms. For example, Gagné's work over the years on his Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent (DMGT) considers the entities of giftedness and other variables, although he acknowledges intrapersonal and environmental catalysts and chance, in the talent development process. Natural abilities or gifts are viewed as static, while talents are developed from interactions of these abilities with the other catalysts. However, there appears to be some recent shifting in his thinking towards more organismic perspectives. On the other hand, Morelock (1996) and Dai (2001), among others, proposed dynamic views of giftedness and intelligence, based on the organismic metaphysical worldview (world as a living thing, ever growing and changing--see Cohen, 2003a). Morelock proposed a developmental framework, while Dai's functional definition that intelligence is what intelligence does in interaction with specific environments and demands, is a dynamic view. From my

conceptual lens, we need to work toward more organismic views of these constructs.

### Philosophical and Ethical Foundations

The philosophy mission was added in 1991, expressing the need for the field to focus on metaphysical and ethical concerns. No mission statement could be found for this area. The three main branches of philosophy: metaphysics (nature of reality), epistemology (how we know), and axiology (what is right and beautiful) have been addressed in 41 presentations (see Appendix C). These branches are related to each other, with metaphysics focusing on the broadest issues, such as worldviews, paradigm change, and ideology. Epistemological perspectives are derived from the metaphysical level and are expressed through educational theories and reasoning. These are largely addressed in the theory section (see Appendix A). The axiological branch has to do with ethics (morals, values, character) and aesthetics.

The metaphysical level is central to our views of all other aspects of gifted education and needs to stay at center stage. Progress has been made by acknowledging that there is a possible downside to current ideologies that focus too strongly on making the gifted child a successful worker or creating a meritocracy. Recognizing how worldviews and root metaphors shape and constrain our views of theory, curriculum, research, and even students is critical to understanding our reality. We presently have two dominant paradigms in our field, talent development and asynchrony, as well as considerable vestiges of older measurement and needs-based ones that continue to compete and pull on each other (Cohen, 1998). These competing paradigms are related to current world and national ideologies, advancing or receding with the prevailing winds. Whether we have arrived at a final destination regarding paradigms is debatable, as is our ability to resist political pressures in considering what is good and right for gifted children. With the exception of a single presentation by Rudnitski (1993) there have been no other presentations in our Division on aesthetics. This is a connection we need to make, perhaps with the Creativity or Arts Divisions. We have had some thought-provoking sessions on ethics. With all the problems evident in our world, clearly our field needs to continue to work on theories and approaches that help young people become ethical, caring, aesthetically sensitive, and socially-just individuals who will take action to ensure fairness and peace.

### Historical Perspectives

According to the Conceptual Foundation Division guidelines (1990), the division should review early works on giftedness, talent, and creativity, consider the implications, and use these as sources of inspiration for present and future directions.

We stand on the shoulders of giants. Some 44 presentations focusing on historical perspectives were made since 1990 (see Appendix D). Many excellent presentations have focused on individual contributions by legends within the field and influences of historical figures outside the field. Some sessions have focused on particular eras or places that spawned gifted practices or historically rooted constructs. Several dealt with positive and negative legacies and on historical views of prodigies.

Kearney's work on historical perspectives is luminous, particularly in three areas. Her presentation on historical research methods (Kearney & LeBlanc, 1993) set the standard for "sleuthing" in our field. Her search for researchers who studied gifted African-American children and her analysis of why these studies were all but forgotten (1997; 2002) are central to our understanding of under-representation of African Americans in gifted programs. Finally, she bravely analyzed the dark historical aspects of our field, particularly in the presentation with Rudnitski (1996), where they courageously took "A Walk on the Other Side," acknowledging the roots of eugenic, racist, and anti-Semitic views in the writings of our field's founders. At the same time, they recognized that we must be wary of judging the past with today's knowledge and perspectives. Facing the past with all its warts helps us to understand and address the criticisms that continue to plague our field today. Such presentations (and publications!) are encouraged.

I believe a needed area of our historical mission is the capturing of perspectives from eminent individuals while they can still share them. Much like the interview with Virgil S. Ward, by Betts and McCree (1992), creating videotaped conversations with our senior leaders for NAGC archives would be a great service to future generations in the field.

#### Trends, Issues, Future Directions

As per the Conceptual Foundations Division guidelines (1990), the division should provide regular opportunities to take stock of where we are, consider relevant issues, and determine directions to be taken related to trends, issues, and directions for the field. Thirty-six presentations within the Division have taken this focus (see Appendix E). The themes of these presentations were projections into the future; issues analysis, myths and assumptions; trends and issues from journals and conventions; connections with general education; and questions/analysis of our direction. Our assumptions and the persisting myths surrounding our field continue to need both analysis and research. A key kernel from presenters on TAG journals was the power of the editor in shaping the focus of the journal.

A major theme was the relationship between general and gifted education regarding trends such as school reform or No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Luminous because of the consistency of focus and the clarity of her message, Folsom related the field of gifted education to forces of reform in regular education and the importance of connecting our field to general education and teacher preparation. Her Teaching for Intellectual and Emotional Learning (TIEL) model (1998) should be more utilized.

I believe that one of our failures has been a disconnect between our field and both general classroom practice and teacher preparation. We need to strengthen these connections. What principles and strategies from gifted education might be beneficial for all learners? How would these particularly assist impoverished and underrepresented youth? What would happen, for example, if a gifted education were the focus, rather than the gifted child? How could we recognize and support the needs of identified gifted children and make education a gift? How might we do so without dissipating energy to address educational problems in these critical

times where funding is so short?

A few outstanding presentations questioned our direction or suggested ways to analyze where we are and where we want to go. Such sessions, particularly when co-sponsored with other divisions on a hot topic, can be of great value to the field. Taking perspectives (and stands!) on what are the trends, the issues, and where we might project ourselves into the future is vital for all divisions at NAGC and is central to our Conceptual Foundations mission.

#### Perspectives from Outside the Field

As outlined in the Conceptual Foundations Division guidelines (1990), the division should provide a forum for individuals with views on education from outside the field and from different paradigms in order to enrich it. Twenty presentations have focused on outside perspectives with four themes: brain research and neuroscience; semantics and literature; depth psychology; and integration of several fields such as quantum physics, systems or complexity theory, and political science (see Appendix F).

Luminous because of her expertise as a neuroscientist, Henderson (1997,1998) discussed a different neurological basis for giftedness based on recent findings from PET, MRI, and LEG studies, suggesting that brain-based methods of identification might be advantageous over more traditional assessments. The perennial question remains, however; is giftedness attributable to genetic brain differences or environmental influences?

Because depth psychology is not traditionally applied to gifted education, it is an unusual perspective that should be considered. In a seminal piece reflective of her earliest writings and consistent throughout her later works about the gifted, Clark (1993) called for new views of reality, unity, and connectedness from physics; growth systems without hierarchies or dichotomies from systems theory; dynamic brain growth, interaction between heredity and environment, and the need for balance from the neurosciences; necessity for relaxed alertness, cooperation, and empowerment from psychology to transform education, develop new definitions of giftedness, and nurture intelligence.

Ambrose, a big picture thinker, has focused on integrating perspectives outside the field beginning with his earliest presentations at NAGC, in 1991. His work is brilliant in this area and it has been exciting to watch his growth as he evolves a contextual theory of giftedness that connects these fields, evidenced in his most recent work (see theory discussion). His earlier works focused more on the social sciences and macro social, political and economic trends. Later, he investigated possibilities in the hard sciences as well, continually spiraling back and forth to integrate these frames. Certainly, bringing together perspectives from outside our field will enrich it and may even change it. Individuals with interest and expertise outside of the fields of education or psychology are encouraged to present.

#### Social, Political, and Economic Considerations: Contextual Understandings

While there have been presentations on these the social, political, and economic aspects, typically as special or plenary sessions, only 11 Conceptual Foundations sessions had this focus (see Appendix G). Three themes emerged, starting with the broadest scope (contextual considerations) moving towards school policy applications, and finally, concerns about diversity in social, cultural, and economic perspective.

The understanding of these macro, systems and forces around us is critical for our field's survival. Additionally, the contextual aspects of gifted students, especially these broad frameworks, are much less studied. For example, do we know the potential economic value of providing educational programs for gifted students? Have we researched the political impact of gifted students who learn to take social action in their programs? Do the gifted have any political clout? This mission has not been listed in convention programs, although it was added during a Division meeting in the early 1990's. It needs to be listed, and more work in these three areas is essential.

#### Division Presentation Problems

Several presentations were not directly related to the Division mission, focusing instead on curriculum or research (not included). There were also abstracts that were identical or nearly identical to those presented in previous years. Proposal reviewers should keep the missions of the Division in mind and review programs from the past two or three years, or read this paper, to ensure all sessions add to our base of understanding. Program chairs should scan proposals and forward them to more appropriate divisions if they do not address Conceptual Foundation mission areas.

#### Conclusions

A major goal of the Conceptual Foundations Division guidelines (1990) is to provide the longitudinal, conceptual, and structural frame from which our field can build appropriate curriculum, identify students, and do research as well as to work toward development of coherent frameworks that can serve as foundations for the field of gifted education to promote validity, integrity, and authenticity.

Gifted Education has tended to be parochial, relying on individuals who are either educators or psychologists trained in the field to extend it. As Piaget (1972/1981) noted in his only presentation on creativity, the first principle for doing creative work involves reading around a field, rather than staying within it, in order to enrich conceptions and glean new perspectives. Bringing theories; economic, social, political aspects; and outside perspectives to our field is essential.

Piaget's second principle is to have an adversary in mind against which you react, to sharpen your arguments. For me, static, mechanistic approaches help me to think about more holistic, organic ways of considering the development of gifted children. I also react against the quick fix approaches, the bits and pieces of fragmented practices that lack a theoretical base, too often used as provisions for gifted students. A field trip, making a toothpick bridge, or playing a math

game is not a gifted program, although each of these might be a valuable aspect of a sound, theoretically-based one. For those active in our Division, consider what you react against, to sharpen your arguments.

Finally, Piaget said to trust yourself and distrust the naysayers, the influences from outside that try to inhibit or tear down your work. We have had some 360 presentations, often with several presenters, that took courage and self-belief to put forward. I congratulate you! To this end, I offer my own conceptions of giftedness, talent, creativity, and genius, and their relationships as an organismic perspective that might be useful in bringing together other conceptions and definitions of terms. It has taken me 20 years to trust myself sufficiently to put it forward, with some revisions, from the time I developed it for my dissertation. I call it the Arrow Conception as shown in Figure 2, based on the works of Howard Gruber, David Feldman, and Barbara Clark (Cohen, 1984).

Giftedness is optimal universal development. That is, gifted children demonstrate a somewhat early onset of a universal developmental stage and differential construction of their mental structures (see theory section). Gifted development occurs when the hereditary possibilities interact with the individual's eight internal systems and with the social, physical, and cultural environment in an optimal way. Talent is optimal non-universal development. From Feldman's perspective, the child shows great interest and promise in a specific, developed domain of endeavor to which he or she has been introduced, requiring mediation and instruction by caring and facilitating adults. Prodigiousness is very early demonstration of high levels of talent in a domain, such as music, chess, or mathematics. Creativity, doing something new or rare of value evidenced in products, performances, and in self-transformation, is a dynamic continuum of seven levels, from the universal creativity of childhood to the type of creativity that revolutionizes a field or fields, leading to self-transformation and construction of a point of view (Cohen, 1989). The purpose of gifted education is to support creative development so that the child can move toward the highest levels, developing both self and field. Individuals may be gifted or talented or both to move to high levels. They may also demonstrate extraordinary effort or interest and may reach high levels on the continuum without being identified as either talented or gifted. Finally, genius is a socially bestowed term for those at the highest level of the creativity continuum whose work or life is of such value that new learners learn a field in terms of this contribution. There is a space between creativity and genius on the figure, as very few reach this level, implications suggest different ways of childrearing that involve less channeling in specific domains and more generalized enrichment to support the highest level on this creativity continuum (Cohen, 1989).

This Arrow Conception offers a non-static view of giftedness and related terms, particularly when connected to interacting, dynamic systems, and differences in equilibration that I proposed earlier. It offers a direction for curriculum development, as well as suggesting how educators and researchers might potentially make sense of Division presentations over the years, possibly serving to integrate others' conceptions.

It is important for the reader to recognize that my metaphysical worldview is organismic, so theories and conceptions that share that central hard core (world as active, dynamic, changing) can fit without giving up their central notions. If attempts are made to integrate mechanistic approaches, their hard core (static, fixed, stable) would have to be negated (Cohen, 2003a).

In undertaking this analysis, I have become aware of how definitions and conceptions may grow into models, which may in turn evolve into theories, as well as the important part each of the missions of the Division plays in these dynamic processes. Recognizing that this analysis only focused on Division presentations and my own publications, readers are urged to consider published articles, chapters, and books in these seven areas of mission as well. It is time for us to again take on the task of trying to work together to integrate these Conceptual Foundations aspects into a more cogent whole that can provide the big-picture underpinnings for our field.

### Table 1 Number of References for each Lead Presenter

Legend for Chart:

A - Presentations

B - Presenters

A	B
21	Ambrose
19	Cohen
13	Pyryt
12	Kearney
9	Friedman
9	Meininger
8	Delisle
8	Gagne
7	Cash
7	Rudnitski
6	Ackerman
6	Folsom
6	Piirto
5	Coleman
5	Dai
5	Grant
5	Rogers
5	Schultz
5	Swassing
4	Haensly
4	Ward

4	Wellington
3	Bai
3	Buzzard
3	Clinkenbeard
3	Conceptual Foundations
3	Frasier
3	Garrison
3	Geiger
3	Kerr
3	Mendaglio
3	Piechowski
3	Robinson
3	Wilcove
2	Anthony
2	Bravmann
2	Bruch
2	Calic
2	Clark
2	Dettmer
2	Gallagher
2	Henderson
2	Heng
2	Horton
2	Katzenback
2	Leigh
2	Neihart
2	Peterson
2	Plucker
2	Rea
2	Renzulli
2	Ruban
2	Solow
2	Southern
2	Starnes
2	Sterling
107	Other Presenters

### **Figure 1 Role of the Conceptual Foundations Division with other divisions**

Arts

Computers & Technology

Counseling & Guidance

Creativity

Curriculum

Early

Global

Middle Grades

Parent & Community

Professional Development

Research & Evaluation

Special Populations

Special Schools & Programs

Conceptual Foundations

• Theory • Conceptions/Definitions • Philosophy/Ethics • History • Trends, Issues, Future Directions • Perspectives from Outside • Social, Political, Economic Aspects

DIAGRAM: Figure 2; Arrow conceptions of giftedness, talent, creativity and genius

## REFERENCES

*Ackerman, C. M. (1995, November). Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration: An Introduction. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Ackerman, C. M. (1999, November). Understanding the fundamentals of Dabrowski's theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Ackerman, C. M. (2003, November). What they never told you about Dabrowski's theory: Dabrowski's dynamisms, developmental levels, over-excitabilities, and more. Paper presented at the Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Ackerman, C. M., Cassone, G., & Daniels, S. (1996, November). Theoretical seeds and their contributions to gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Ackerman, C. M., & Haensly, P. A. (1997, November). Theories of development: How does*

- Dabrowski's TPD compare? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock. AR.*
- Ackerman, C. M., Moon, S. M., Gagné F., Ambrose, D., Monks, F., Renzulli, J. S. et al (2003, November). Connecting theorists, researchers, and practitioners: Discussing personal talent. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*
- Alexander, J., Schwanenflugel, P., & Carr, M. (1993, November). Metacognition in gifted children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.*
- Ambrose, D. (1990, November). Theories by metaphor: Using images of wide scope to unify theories of giftedness and creativity. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*
- Ambrose, D. (1991, November). World trends: Implications for gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Kansas City, MO.*
- Ambrose, D. (1992, November). Unifying theories of creative intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Los Angeles, CA.*
- Ambrose, D. (1993, November). The role of metaphor in theory building. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*
- Ambrose, D. (1994a, November). Panoramic scanning." Essential element of higher-order thought. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*
- Ambrose, D. (1994b, November). Paradigms, mind shifts, and the 21st century zeitgeist. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*
- Ambrose, D. (1995a, November). Developing conceptual foundations through collaborative metaphorical vision building. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*
- Ambrose, D. (1995b, November). Metaphorical influence in conceptual foundations for gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*
- Ambrose, D. (1996, November). A model for integration of conceptual foundations. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*
- Ambrose, D. (1997, November). World-view entrapment." Moral-ethical implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

- Ambrose, D. (2000, November). *Interdisciplinary insights: AHAS from beyond our field*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.
- Ambrose, D. (2001, November). *Aspiration development and self-fulfillment., Dimensions of talent development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Cincinnati, OH.
- Ambrose, D. (2002, November). *Egoism vs. altruism, aspiration development, and self-fulfillment," International comparisons*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Ambrose, D. (2003a, November). *Injustice, avarice, and self-deception: Additional barriers to aspiration development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Ambrose, D. (2003b, November). *Revealing dimensions of ability through interdisciplinary, exploration*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Ambrose, D., Ackerman, C. M., Ford, D. Y., Coleman, L. J., Kane, M., Cross, T. L., et al. (2004, November). *Aspiration development and self-fulfillment: Supportive and suppressive influences. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*
- Ambrose, D., & Cohen, L. M. (1998, November). *Expanding conceptual foundations: An interdisciplinary search*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.
- Ambrose, D., Cross, T. L., & Coleman, L. J. (2004, November). *The "edge-of-the-map" syndrome." Expanding our conceptual territory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Ambrose, D., Cross, T. L., Coleman, L. J., Clark, B., & Cohen, L. M. (2000, November). *Conceptual blocks in gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.
- Ambrose, D., Gallagher, J. J., Clark, B., Cohen, L. M., & Ford, D. Y. (1999, November). *Outside influences on gifted education: Contextual and interdisciplinary, exploration. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Albuquerque, NM.*
- Ambrose, D., Milgram, R. M., Rudnitski, R. A., & Tannenbaum, A. (1996, November). *Taking stock of theory, development in gifted education, part II*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

*Amend, E. R., Lind, S., Silverman, L. K., & Cross, T. L. (1999, November). Conceptual foundations of the psychology of giftedness Paper presented at he Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Anthony, K. V. (1998, November) Dueling definitions and theories of gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Louisville, KY.*

*Anthony, K. V. (2000, November). Concepts of giftedness: Conceptual constraints, connections, and curriculum. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Armstrong, D. C., Kay, S., Pyryt, M. C., Rudnitski, R., & Tannenbaum, A. J. (1994, November). Translating theory into research. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Bai, W. (2001, November). Toward a study of the philosophically gifted. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Bai, W. (2003, November). The development of philosophically precocious intellectuals. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Bai, W. (2004, November). From talent development to talent management. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Ballinger, N. L. (2001, November). Gifted and diversity: It's a two-way bridge. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Beghetto, R. A., & Plucker, J. (1999, November). Who is studying creativity, and how can you tell? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Benbow, C. P., & Lubinski, D. (1993, November). Optimally utilizing different kinds of intellectual talent. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Betts, G., & McCree, S. (1992, November). A discussion with Virgil S. Ward, Ph.D. Presentation at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Bravmann, S. L. (1993, November). Ulysses had a gifted child. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Bravmann, S. L. (1994, November). Moral giftedness: A Jungian perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Bruch, C. B. (1996, November). Creative thinking to creative consciousness: Everyday and notable development. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Bruch, C. B., Clark, B., Curry, J., Feldhusen, J. F., Frasier, M., Gensley, J., et al. (1994, November). A colloquy of past NAGC president. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Buff, F. (1991, November). Emerging value systems in gifted minds: A synthesis. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO,*

*Burruss, J. D. (1998, November). Constructivism: Blueprints and power tools. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Buzzard, S. D. (1995, November). Can we be equal and excellent too? John Gardner revisited 35 years later. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Buzzard, S. D. (1996, November). Academics: The other scarlet. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Buzzard, S. D. (1997, November). Can we be equal and excellent too? John Gardner revisited 35 years later. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Calic, S. (1994, November). Heightened sensitivities as an alternative approach to the study of creative potential. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Calic, S., & Frasier, M. M. (1993, November). Reconceptualizing Dabrowski's potential for the highest levels of human development. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Capuroo, M. L., Harsin, C., Delisle, J. R., & Pfeiffer, S. (2003, November). Profound intelligence: Exploring new definitions of extreme. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Carroll, K. L. (1991, November). The arts and the gifted: A theoretical approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Carson, A. (2003, November). Social giftedness and Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Cash, A. B. (1999, November). Values education for highly able learners. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

Cash, A. B. (2001, November). *Values education and the gifted: Revisiting the research*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Cash, A. B. (2002, November). *Values education, schools, and the gifted.*" What do we really value? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Cash, A. B. (2003, November). *Advocacy for gifted children: Exploring a paradigm shift*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Cash, A. B. (2004, November). *Character education, literature, and the gifted: Lessons learned, philosophy gained*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Cash, A. B., Rudnitski, R., Frasier, M. M., Kearney, K., Piechowski, M. M., Silverman, L. K., et al. (2000). *Conceptual foundations of the moral/ethical development of gifted learners in schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Cash, R. M. (2004, November). *Brain-based learning: Applications for gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Chandler, J. (2003, November). *The value of emotional and cognitive intelligence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Clark, B. (1990, November). *Using brain research as the basis for defining, identifying and nurturing giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Clark, B. (1993, November). *Nurturing intelligence for the nineties*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Cline, S., Bracken, B., Hopkins, R., McCoach, D. B., & Pyryt, M. C. (2004, November). *IQ-type tests: Uses and abuses*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Clinkenbeard, P. R. (1994, November). *Motivation and the gifted: Past research, future theory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Clinkenbeard, P. R. (1998, November). *In defense of individualistic goal structures: Balancing group and solitary learning*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.

Clinkenbeard, P. R. (2000, November). *Target as a model for motivating gifted students*. Paper

*presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1984). Towards a theory for gifted education. Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, UMO No. 8509318.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1988). To get ahead, get a theory. Roeper Review, 11, 95- 100.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1989). A continuum of adaptive creative behaviors. Creativity Research Journal, 2. 169-183.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1990a, November). A conceptual lens for looking at theories of giftedness and creativity. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1990b, November). Criteria for a theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock. AR.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1992). From ownership to "allship." Building a conceptual framework for education of the gifted and creative. In N. Colangelo, S. G. Assouline, & D. L. Ambrosion (Eds.), Talent development: Proceedings from the 1991 Henry B. and Jocelyn Wallace National Research Symposium on talent development (pp. 204-222), Unionville, NY: Trillium Press.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1994, November). A map of ignorance for gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1997, November). The balance uneasy: Constructivism and the gifted child. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Cohen, L. M. (1998). Paradigm change in gifted education: Developing the talent-Is this the optimal set of possibilities'? Conceptual Foundations Newsletter, 6(2), 3-5.*

*Cohen, L. M. (2002, November). Simplicity, in complex times: Principles for teaching tags. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver. CO.*

*Cohen, L. M. (2003a). A conceptual lens for looking at theories of giftedness and creativity. In D. Ambrose, L. M. Cohen, & A. Tannenbaum (Eds.), Creative intelligence: Toward theoretic integration (pp. 33-77). Cresskill, N J: Hampton Press.*

*Cohen, L. M., & Ambrose, D. (1993a). Theories and practices for differentiated education of the gifted and talented. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Monks, & A. H. Passow (Eds.), International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent (pp. 339-365). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.*

*Cohen, L. M., & Ambrose, D. (1993b, November). Toward theoretical syntheses for gifted education. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

Cohen, L. M., & Ambrose, D. (1999, November). *The killing of the teaching profession: Implications for gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Cohen, L. M., Ambrose, D., Castellano, J. A., Cross, T. L., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2001, November). *Ganging beliefs about giftedness II: Decision-making nodes and crystallizing experiences*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Cohen, L. M., Ambrose, D., Cross, T. L., Frasier, M. M., Neihart, M. P., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., et al. (2000, November). *Changing beliefs' about giftedness in the post-modern era: Transformational stories*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Cohen, L. M., Ambrose, D., Rudnitski, A., Tannenbaum, A., & Milgram, R. M. (1995, November). *Taking stock of theory, development in gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.

Cohen, L. M., Betts, G., Ambrose, D., Gallagher, J. J., Higgins, D., Rudnitski, R., et al. (1992, November). *Gifted education in the year 2002*. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.

Cohen, L. M., Betts, G., Higgins, D., Ambrose, D., & Sisk, D. (1991, November). *Education for the gifted in the year 2000*. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.

Cohen, L. M., Borland, J., Asher, W., Robinson, A., Sterling, A., & Friedman, R. (1991, November). *Paradigms for progress in theory and research*. Paper presented at the Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.

Cohen, L. M., Clark, B., Passow, H., & Smutny, J. (1991, November). *Change agents in tag education: Institutions and catalytic individuals*. Paper presented at the Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.

Cohen, L. M., & Frydenberg, E. (1996). *Coping for capable kids* (Rev. ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Cohen, L. M., Jellen, H. G., Passow, A. H., & Piechowski, M. M. (1990, November). *Issues in theory development for gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Cohen, L. M., Jellen, H., Passow, H., Piechowski, M., & Ward, V. S. (1990). *Proposal: New*

*Conceptual Foundations Division Guidelines--NAGC. Unpublished proposal.*

*Cohen, L. M., & Kim, Y. (1999). Piaget's equilibration theory and the young gifted child: A balancing act. Roeper Review, 21, 201-206.*

*Cohen, L. M., Maker, C. J., VanTassel-Baska, J., Kaplan, S. N., Borland, J. H., Ambrose, D., et al. (1999, November). Principles of teaching the gifted for general teacher training. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Cohen, L. M., Piechowski, M., Jellen, H., & Ward, V. S. (1989, October). To get ahead in gifted education: Get a theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Cohen, L. M., Sheperd, G., & Balzer, C. (1990). Identification: A suggested procedure for the identification of talented and gifted students K-12. (Technical Assistance Paper 1). Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education.*

*Cohen, L. M., Skenandore, O., & Rudnitski, R. (1997, November). A kaleidoscope of possibilities: Embracing a diversity of learners. Marketplace session presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Coleman, L. J. (1997, November). Studying the ordinary among the extraordinary: Theoretical rationale. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Coleman, L. J., & Sanders, M. D. (1994, November). Inclusion and gifted education: A Skrtician perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Coleman, L. J., Sanders, M. D., & Cross, T. L. (1991, November). Theory development and inquiry: How are they connected? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Coleman, L. J., Sanders, M. D., & Cross, T. L. (1992, November). Multiple approaches to inquiry: Hey, can you paradigm? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Coleman, L. J., Sanders, M. D., & Cross, T. L. (1993, November). Interpretive paradigms: Does changing the conceptual lens affect researchers? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Conceptual Foundations Division (1990). Guidelines for the Conceptual Foundations Division of the National Association for Gifted Children. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.*

*Conceptual Foundations Division (2001, November). International conceptions and support of giftedness: Comparing cultural and global perspectives. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Conceptual Foundations Division (2003, November). The ghosts of gifted past: A panel discussion of significant figures. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Cross, T. L. (1994, November). Power and the rules of evidence: Research in the new millennium. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Dai, D. Y. (2000, November). Issues and prospects of gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Dai, D. Y. (2001, November). Intelligence is what intelligence does: Toward a functional theory of intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Dai, D. Y. (2004, November). Beyond ability-centric conceptions of giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Dai, D. Y., & Kelly, K. R. (1996, November). Charting pathways to extraordinary career achievement: An integrative model of career development of talented individuals. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Dai, D. Y., & Renzulli, J. S. (2003, November). Three conceptions of giftedness and related educational and research strategies. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Delisle, J. R. (1997, November). Multiple intelligences: Convenient, simple, wrong. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Delisle, J. R. (1998, November). Howard Gardner's folly: Multiple intelligences and the demise of gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Delisle, J. R. (2000, November). The top 10 and the bottom 5: 771e most important events in gifted child education in the past 100 years. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Delisle, J. R. (2001, November). Reflections of a century: Gifted education's best and worst, 1900-2000. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Delisle, J. R. (2002, November). Once upon a mind: 100 years of gifted vision. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Delisle, J. R. (2003, November). Gifted education's leaders and legends: 1900-2003. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Delisle, J. R. (2004, November). The gifted garage sale: Relinquishing our field's focus. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Delisle, J. R., Piechowski, M. M., Robinson, A., & Silverman, L. (1990, November). Gifted education pioneers: Their continuing legacies. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Little Rock, AR.*

*Dettmer, P. (1993, November). Social theory for enhancing development of gifted behaviors. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Dettmer, P. (1997, November). New blooms for contemporary, fields: Recasting the taxonomies. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Dixon, F. (2004, November). One level above formal operations: Dialectical thinking. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Dobbs, S. (1992, November). Giftedness, talent, and the conventional wisdom. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Eide, F., & Eide, B. (2004, November). Brains on fire: The multimodality of gifted thinkers. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Elmore, R. F., Frasier, M. M., & Walker, J. (1993, November). Southeastern contributions to gifted education: Historical and theoretical perspectives. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.*

*Estes, F., & Estes, H. (2004, November). Applying cognitive task analysis to design advanced content. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Feldhusen, J. F., Treffinger, D. J., & Lawshe, D. (1994, November). Talent development and school reform. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Feldman, D. H. (1990, November). Universal to unique: Developmental domains of giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Fetterman, D. M. (1988). Excellence and equity. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albany, NY.*

*Fiedler, E. D. (2001, November). The art and heart of teaching: Beyond the "standards." Marketplace session presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Fierer, R. (1998, November). John Dewey/Lev Vygotsky: Gifted education "back to the future." Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Folsom, C. (1996, November). Taking a wider view: Historical and theoretical connections of Dewey, Guilford, and Vygotsky. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Folsom, C. (1998, November). Developing teacher talent. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Folsom, C. (1999, November). Connecting colors: Recognizing and repairing educational malpractice. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Folsom, C. (2000, November). Research in the midst of complexity: Teaching for intellectual and emotional learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Folsom, C. (2002, November). Ultimate summit: Changing the foundation of teacher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Folsom, C. (2003, November). Winning or losing: Conceptual connections to curriculum and instruction. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Ford, D. Y., & Harris III, J. J. (1992, November). Self-perception underachievement among gifted black students. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Fox, C. B., Reid, C., & Brighton, C. (1995, November). What's wrong with IQ tests: Changing perceptions of intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Frasier, M. M., & Finley, V. S. (1993, November). A developing theory of giftedness from a multicultural perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Frasier, M. M., Garcia, J. H., & Martin, D. E. (1992, November). Examining the giftedness construct in multicultural groups: A theoretical paradigm. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Frasier, M. M., Safter, H. T., Cramond, B., Bebb, E., Watts-Warren, B., & Tam, A. (1991, November). Theoretical perspectives: Issues that impact achievement (if minority populations. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Friedman, R. C. (1990, November). Describing "gifted" families from a family systems perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Friedman, R. C. (1992, November). Zorba's conundrum: Self-evaluation's connection to self-concept and giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Los Angeles, CA.*

*Friedman, R. C. (1994, November). Examining conceptions of gifted families: Theory/research implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Friedman, R. C. (1996, November). Expertise: How pertinent a construct for understanding talent? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Friedman, R. C., & Gallagher, T. (1993, November). Patterns of crystallizing experiences among eminent individuals. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Friedman, R. C., & Hendricks, D. (1997, November). Under-representation in gifted/talented programs: A social problem analysis. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Friedman, R. C., Sutherland, B., & Hendricks, D. (1999, November). Examining our lexicon for talent: 21st century implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Friedman, R. C., & Tollefson, N. (1991, November). Applying resiliency in cognition and motivation to giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Friedman-Nimz, R. C., Cohn, S., & Cash, R. M. (2002, November). Conceptualizing inclusivity: NAGC-GLBY task force ideas and issues. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Denver, CO.*

*Gabriel, P. A., DeYoung, A., & Bajema, S. (1994, November). Outcomes for gifted learners: An axiomatic approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

- Gagné, F. (1995, November). *Gagné model vs. the technical vocabulary of gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.
- Gagné, F. (1997, November). *My convictions about the nature of giftedness and relent*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.
- Gagné, F. (1998, November). *Why the environment is not that important to talent development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.
- Gagné, F. (2000, November). *The DMGT: Ever heard of it?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.
- Gagné, F. (2001, November). *Giftedness vs. motivation: Which influences talent development more?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.
- Gagné, F. (2002, November). *Preparing tomorrow's leaders: Mission impossible*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Gagné, F. (2003, November). *Self-management: A crucial catalyst*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Gagné, F., Cohn, S. J., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1991, November). *There is a difference between giftedness and talent*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.
- Gajdamaschko, N., & Kanevsky, L. (2000, November). *Viewing mathematical giftedness through a Vygotskian lens*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.
- Gallagher, S. A., Maker, J., Gallagher, J. J., Romanoff, B., & Thompson, M. C. (2002, November). *Hilda Taba: A centennial reflection*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Gallagher, S. A., Thompson, M. C., & Maker, C. J. (2003, November). *Making everything old new again: Hilda Taba*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Garrison, C. N. (1996, November). *Emotional development: A comparison of two theories*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Garrison, C. N. (1997, November). *Non-traditional options for gifted children: Past, present, and future*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Garrison, C. N., Kearney, K., Morelock, M. J., Silverman, L. K., Maxwell, B., & Swassing, R. H., Jr. (1997, November). *Asynchrony : A powerful description of the gifted*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Geiger, R. D. (1997, November). *Leaders of wisdom and compassion*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Geiger, R. D. (1999, November). *Insights into introversion from personality and temperament theory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Geiger, R. D., & Martin, R. P. (1993, November). *Temperament and giftedness: Research and hypotheses*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Gentry, M. (2001, November). *Widespread, successful, embraced gifted program? Barriers, myths, and solutions*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Gilman, B. J., & Kearney, K. (2004, November). *From conceptual to practical: Making gifted testing relevant*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Godwin, D. (2002, November). *Emotion, motivation, and conceptualization of giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Goldberg, D. (2000, November). *Brain research and the G/T student*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Graffam, B. (2003, November). *How to construct the who I am*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Grant, B. (1992, November). *The value of achievement in gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.

Grant, B. (1993, November). *A critique of needs claims in gifted counselling and education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Grant, B. (1997, November). *Through the glasses darkly: J.D. Salinger's wise children*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Grant, B. (1998, November). *Education without Compulsion: Toward re-visioning gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.

*Grant, B. (2003, November). Truth, justice, and gifted children: Questions about character education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Greene, M. (2001, November). Back to the future: Exploring patterns and implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Cincinnati, OH.*

*Guo, A. (2004, November). Role of deliberate practice in talent development in children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Haensly, P. A. (1998, November). Theory, research, practice: Gifted journals reflecting, beckoning, guiding? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Louisville, KY.*

*Haensly, P. A. (1999, November). Theory research, practice: Gifted journals reflecting, becoming, guiding? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque. NM.*

*Haensly, P. A. (2001, November). Year 2000 views about giftedness remain contentious. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati. OH.*

*Haensly, P. A. (2002, November). Addressing contentious giftedness views: Ability, effort or opportunity Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver. CO.*

*Haggerty, B. A. (1994, November). Exploring multiple intelligences theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Harris, C. R., & Cohen, L. M. (1990, November). Points of view: Perspectives from case studies. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Little Rock, AR.*

*Henderson, L. (1997, November). Toward a biological basis for identifying the gifted. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Henderson, L. (1998, November). Glimpses into the brain structure and function of intelligent persons. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Heng, M. A. (2001, November). Rediscovering purpose and meaning. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Heng, M. A. (2002, November). The soul of education and the courage to learn. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Higgins, D., Peters, K., & Borg, H. (1999, November). Skills for the future for the gifted person.*

- Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*
- Hollingsworth, P. L. (1990, November). Theoretical and research foundations of the University of Tulsa school for gifted children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*
- Hopewell, B. R. (1996, November). Giftedness and wonder. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*
- Horton, D. (1999, November). Fractals: A metaphor for intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*
- Horton, D. (2001, November). Alfred Binet: A method for understanding his genius. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*
- Hughes, C. E. (1998, November). Artistic teaching: Integrating creative and critical thought. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*
- Hunsaker, S. L. (1995, November). Public usage of the terms "gifted" and "talented." Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*
- Hunt, B. G., & Seney, R. W. (2002, November). Through the looking glass: Another approach to Dabrowski. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*
- Huntley, S. B., & Ambrose, D. (1999, November). Mentorship in the arts: An emerging paradigm. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*
- Jellen, H. G. (1990, November). Toward a defensible theory for differential education of the gifted: A taxonomical approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*
- Jeong, T. (2000, November). Pedagogy of patriarchy vs. matriarchy in gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*
- Joffe, W. (2002, November). Expanding what we know about meta-cognition. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*
- Johnsen, E. P., & Huber, J. (1991, November). Play, creativity, and problem solving: Searching for the effects. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*
- Jolly, J. (2003, November). The foundations of gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting*

*of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis. IN.*

*Julicher, K., & Mennebery-Kustus, K. (1999, November). Differentiation and home schooling. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Kanevsky, L. (1994, November). Understanding sources of individual differences in learning potential. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Katzenbach, M. (2003a, November). An original application of Moon's personal talent model. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis. IN.*

*Katzenbach, M. (2003b, November). Nature's prodigal daughter: The story, of Opal Whiteley. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis. IN.*

*Kaufmann, F. (2001, November). Mentorship's for gifted children: A critical re-examination. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Kearney, K. (1995, November). "Extra! Extra!": 100 years of prodigies in the popular press. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Kearney, K. (1996, November). Innate ability or "rational attention"? Prodigies and pre-Terman conceptions of giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Kearney, K. (1997, November). Jenkins' gifted African-Americans: Young researchers continue the excavation. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Kearney, K. (2000, November). From "monstrosity" to "relented": A social history of the nomenclature of giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Kearney, K. (2001, November). "Test all things": Assessment of the gifted in the early 20th century. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Cincinnati, OH.*

*Kearney, K. (2002, November). The roots of enrichment: Historical perspectives, 1900-1940. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Kearney, K. (2003, November). Understanding the Conceptual Foundations division. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Kearney, K. (2004, November). The demise of verbal intelligence? Paper presented at the*

*meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Kearney, K., & LeBlanc, J. (1992, November). Early research on gifted African-Americans: An excavation. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Kearney, K., & LeBlanc, J. A. (1993, November). Historical research: Beyond Terman and Sputnik. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Kearney, K., Silverman, L. K., & Revel, A. (1998). Back to the future: A century of perspectives on the Stanford-Binet. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Kearney, K., & Tolan, S. S. (1999). "Etiquette and ethics, " research and extreme giftedness: Reexamining conceptual foundations in the information age. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Albuquerque, NM.*

*Kendrick, C. M., & Sokas, M. B. (2001, November). Content analysis of four gifted education journals. Marketplace session presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Kerr, B., & Conn, S. J. (2004, November). Defending gifted education: Statistics and stories. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Kerr, B., Delaney, M., Merrill, B., & McAllister, J. (2002, November). New support for spiritual intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Kerr, B., Delaney, M., Noble, K., & McAllister, J. (2001, November). Spiritual intelligence in the classroom. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Kettler, T., & Cooper, T. (2004, November). Building a knowledge base: Gifted education research 1994-2000. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Kim, Y., & Cohen, L. M. (1999). The balance uneasy: Asynchronous development in gifted children. *Understanding our Gifted* 11 (3), 3-7.*

*Kogan-Frenk, E. (1995, November). The "reality-assessment approach" for educational service delivery for gifted bilingual children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Kokol, M. L. (2004, November). From motivational strategies to inspirational teaching: A theoretical model for the gifted. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Leader, W. S. (1998, November). Metacognition and giftedness: A review of the research. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Leigh, M. A. (2003, November). Shrinking thinking. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Leigh, M. A. (2004, November). Defending excellence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Lewis, B. A. (2000, November). Moral development for lower elementary, children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Lupart, J. (1990, November). Three cognitive theories and giftedness: Implications for education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Martin, D. E., Frasier, M. M., & Folsom, C. (2000, November). Teaching far intellectual and emotional learning: A wholistic approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Matthews, M. S., Flint, L., Kaskaloglu, E., Marker, A., & McBee, M. (2004, November). Emerging directions in the study of underachievement. Panel session presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1990, November). Grounded theory method in gifted theory development. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1992, November). Theoretical integration: Conceptual framework. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1993, November). Theory into practice. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1994, November). Using theory to inform practice and vice versa: An example. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1995, November). Theoretical integration of application. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Meininger, L. K. (1998, November). Theory informing practice. Paper presented at the meeting*

*of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Meininger, L. K. (2001, November). Theoretical integration and application. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Cincinnati, OH.*

*Meininger, L. K., & Phillips, C. (1999, November). Theory, informing practice. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Meininger, L. K., & Phillips-Cole, C. (2000, November). Theory, informing practice. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.*

*Mendaglio, S., & Pyryt, M. C. (1999, November). Self concept of gifted children: An integrated model. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Albuquerque, NM.*

*Mendaglio, S., & Pyryt, M. C. (2001, November). Theory of positive disintegration (TPD): A developmental perspective. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Mendaglio, S., & Pyryt, M. C. (2003, November). Heightened sensitivity and giftedness: Examining TPD and HMS. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Milgram, R. (1990, November). A 4X4 model of giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Miller, E. M. (2003, November). Studying giftedness: Lessons from cognitive psychology. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Monson, J. A., Plucker, J. A., & Runco, M. (1998, November). A web-based resource for teaching creativity and intelligence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Moon, S. M. (2002, November). Personal talent. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.*

*Morelock, M. J. (1996, November). Concepts of giftedness: Warring factions and common ground. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Moule, J. (1996, November). Creative problem-solving and chaos theory: Connection or chasm? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*

*Neihart, M. (1993, November). Disease theory, in education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.*

- Neihart, M. (1994, November). *The underachievement myth. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.*
- Nelson, K. (1991, November). *Meet Kazimierz Dabrowski: Theorist as role model. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*
- Nugent, S. (2003, November). *Emerging trends and patterns in gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*
- Parsons, J. L. (1992, November). *Giftedness in context: A social theory of gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*
- Passow, A. H., Clark, B., Cohen, L. M., Jellen, H. G., & Ward, V. S. (1990, November). *Toward an optimal development of mind. Paper presented at the Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Little Rock, AR.*
- Peckron, K. (1998, November). *Accelerated learning for gifted learner. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*
- Peine, M. E. (1998, November). *Practical matters. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*
- Peterson, J. S. (1996, November). *"Giftedness": Through whose cultural lens? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*
- Peterson, J. S. (2000, November). *Those who are missed: A conceptual problem ? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.*
- Piaget, J. (1972/1981). *Creativity: Moving force of society. Appendix to J. M. Gallagher & D. K. Reid, The learning theory of Piaget and Inhelder. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.*
- Piechowski, M. M. (1997, November). *Exceptions: A test of models of talent development. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*
- Piechowski, M. M., & Grant, B. (1996, November). *If I only had a theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Indianapolis, IN.*
- Piechowski, M. M., & Grant, B. (2001, November). *Talent development versus personal growth. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Cincinnati, OH.*
- Piirto, J. M. (1994, November). *The giftedness construct in the context of talent development. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

Piirto, J. M. (1995, November). *Teaching about curriculum orientation in talent-development education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Tampa, FL.*

Piirto, J. M. (1997, November). *Implications of postmodern curriculum theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

Piirto, J. M. (1998, November). *Twelve issues: Postmodern curriculum theory and the relearned. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Louisville, KY.*

Piirto, J. M., Howley, A., Howley, C., & Peterson, J. S. (2000, November). *Is the psychology of giftedness an ideology? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

Piirto, J. M., & Reynolds, F. C. (2001, November). *Depth psychology and giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

Plucker, J. A. (1997, November). *Enlarging concepts of creativity: A re-analysis of Torrance's (1981) longitudinal study data. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

Plucker, J. A. (2000, November). *Toward a uniform operational definition of creativity. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1990, November). *Formalizing theories in gifted education with mathematical models. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1991, November). *Paradigm wars in conceptualizing giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1993, November). *A triangular theory of eminence. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1994a, November). *Hugging geldings: Political correctness and gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1994b, November). *The legacy of William James: Implications for giftedness. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1995a, November). *Back to the fifties: Relevance for the nineties. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

Pyryt, M. C. (1995b, November). *Finding our intelligence: Carroll's three-stratum theory*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.

Pyryt, M. C. (1999, November). *Gifted education from a general semantics perspective*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Pyryt, M. C. (2000, November). *Thorndike's conception of social intelligence re-visited*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Pyryt, M. C. (2001, November). *The spurious curve: Long-term IQ achievement gains re-visited*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Pyryt, M. C. (2002, November). *Affective dimensions of giftedness: A Dabrowskian perspective*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Pyryt, M. C. (2004, November). *Whatever happened to developmental stage theory?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Pyryt, M. C., & Mendaglio, S. (2000, November). *Dabrowski's dynamisms: An integral component of TPD*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Ray, J. (1999, November). *Excellence, equity, and the philosophy of fairness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Rea, D. W. (1993, November). *A conceptualization of the optimal experience of giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Rea, D. W. (1995, November). *A motivational model for optimizing giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.

Renzulli, J. S. (2001, November). *Operation Houndstooth: Refining concepts and examining perceptions*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Renzulli, J. S., Schader, R., Sytsma, R., Koehler, J., Fogarty, E., & Hume, K. (2004, November). *Research on gifted students' social action projects*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Reynolds, F. C., & Piirto, J. M. (2002, November). *Depth psychology and giftedness, continued*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Roberts, C. H. (1981). *Equilibration and intelligence: individual variation in cognitive development as a function of CA, MA, and IQ*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr University, Philadelphia.

- Robinson, A. (2002, November). *A forgotten prodigy: Jean Phillippe Baratier*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.
- Robinson, A., & Clinkenbeard, P. (1992, November). *Cooperative learning mid theories of motivation*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.
- Robinson, A., Colangelo, N., & Shore, B. (1991, November). *Defining gifted education: Alternatives for describin the knowledge base*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.
- Rogalla, M., & Ruban, L. M. (2001, November). *Vygotsky and creativity: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.
- Rogers, K. B. (1992, November). *Is creativity in the arts a measurable entity?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.
- Rogers, K. B. (1993, November). *Is creativity hi the arts a measurable entity?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta, GA.
- Rogers, K. B. (1995, November). *Whatever happened to Terman's research assistants?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.
- Rogers, K. B. (2001, November). *Re-conceptualizing gifted "services": Matching program to child*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.
- Rogers, K. B. (2004, November). *Even gifted adults need a peer group!* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Roseberry, J., & Kaplan, S. (1994, November). *The legacy becomes the vision: Gifted programs past and present*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Rosselli, H. C. (1996, November). *Multiple intelligences theory: More than a trend?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.
- Ruban, L. M. (1999, November). *Creativity and Intelligence: Alternative conceptions and models of assessment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.
- Ruban, L. M., & Rogalla, M. (2002, November). *Vygotsky and Buber on creativity: A "theory-weaving" approach*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Rudnitski, R. A. (1991, November). *Leadership and gifted education theory: Implications for programs*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.

Rudnitski, R. A. (1993, November). *Changing conceptions of knowledge and conceptions of giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Rudnitski, R. A. (1994, November). *Can we achieve a worldview of giftedness?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Rudnitski, R. A., Baldwin, A. Y., Baum, S., Ford, D. Y., Keamey, K., Sing, D. K., et al. (1996, October). *Kaleidoscope of possibilities: Embracing a diversity of learners*. Special Conceptual Foundations Session at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Rudnitski, R. A., & Kearney, K. (1996, November). *A walk on the "other side."* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Rudnitski, R. A., & Rostan, S. M. (1999, November). *Toward a theory, of moral giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Rudnitski, R. A., White, W., & Kearney, K. (1997, November). *Our curriculum history: Leta Hollingworth at Speyer school*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Ruef, D. L. (2000, November). *EQ and the IQ connection*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.

Sabatini, L. (2003, November). *Conceptualizing emotion: Essentials from giftedness and emotional intelligence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Sandall, M. J., & Sachtjen, C. (1997, November). *Standards: Benchmarks for talented and gifted education*. Marketplace session presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.

Sanders, M. D. (1994, November). *Life histories: A constructivist methodology for the study of the gifted*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Schader, R., & Gagné, F. (2001, November). *The role of chance in talent development*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Schultz, R. A. (1999, November). *New millennium-new direction: Foundations and futures for gifted underachievement*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Schultz, R. A. (2001, November). *Honor the past, challenge the present' look toward the future*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Schultz, R. A. (2002, November). *Ascending new peaks: Talent development and/or giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Schultz, R. A. (2003, November). *Racing to the future: Talent development and/or giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Schultz, R. A. (2004, November). *Broadening vistas: Divining for philosophy in gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Salt Lake City, UT.

Senzee, K. (1998, November). *Beyond content' processes, and product: Another model for gifted*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.

Shore, B. M. (1999, November). *Inclusion, social contact, and gifted children's attitudes toward children with disabilities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Siegle, D. (2001, November). *Myths and realities hi gifted education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.

Silverman, L. K., & Haas, S. (2002, November). *Two ways of knowing: Sequential vs., spatial*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Denver, CO.

Sloane, E. (1999, November). *Gifted education's response to trends in general education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.

Sloat, R. S., & Hayes, M. L. (1992, November). *Gifted, creative, talented: Alike-but oh! How different!* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.

Soller, J. F. (2003, November). *The same questions about giftedness...again*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.

Solow, R. (1997, November). *Parents' concepts of giftedness*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Little Rock, AR.

Solow, R. (1999, November). *The cutting edge: Parents" thinking about giftedness*. Paper

*presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque. NM.*

*Southern, W. T. (1995, November). The gender of genius: The historical gender assumptions hi the gifted-child movement. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa. FL.*

*Southern, W. T. (1996, November). Schism: The origins of the enrichment/acceleration controversy. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis. IN.*

*Starnes, W. T. (2001, November). Multiple intelligence: Its contribution to gifted identification and instruction. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati. OH.*

*Starnes, W. T., & Tucker, V. (1998, November). Developing and implementing a gifted policy. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville, KY.*

*Sterling, A. T. (1990, November). Cbaos theory, creativity, and gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Sterling, A. T. (1991, November). Creativity and chaos theory: A clew world view. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Stroebel, J. T. (1998, November). Talent identification: An emerging paradigm in gifted education? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville. KY.*

*Swassing, R. H., Jr. (1995, November). Exploring the science of chaos in gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa. FL.*

*Swassing, R. H., Jr. (1996, November). Chaos: Implications for classroom and research. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis. IN.*

*Swassing, R. H., Jr. (1999, November). Reflections on profound creativity. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Albuquerque, NM.*

*Swassing, R. H., Jr. (2000, November). Individual differences: Understanding and educating gifted children. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Swassing, R. H., Jr., Kearney, K., & LeBlanc, J. A. (1993, November). The Chicago connection: Historical leadership from the Midwest. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Atlanta. GA.*

*Syer, C., & Shore. B. M. (2001, November). NAGC members" understanding of inquiry-based*

*learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati. OH.*

*Taylor, E. L. (2000, November). The development of three constructs: "Intelligence," "giftedness," and "talented." Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta. GA.*

*Terry, A. W., & Bohnenberger, J. (2001, November). A typology of service learning providing a hierarchical approach. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Cincinnati, OH.*

*Thompson, M. C. (2000, November). Everyone is gifted: True or false? Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Tran, J. (1998, November). Practical intelligence among successful business owners: Educational implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville. KY.*

*VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. F. (1997, November). An analysis of organizational and curriculum models in gifted education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Vaughn-Neely, E. I. (1995, November). An emergent model of instructional design. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Tampa, FL.*

*Voorneveld, R. B. (2003, November). Impact of "No Child Left Behind" on G/T. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Indianapolis, IN.*

*Walker, B. (1999, November). Constructivism and gifted students. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Ward, V. S. (1990, November). Educational meta-theory, Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Little Rock, AR.*

*Ward, V. S. (1991, November). Philosophic analysis of differential education for the gifted. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Kansas City, MO.*

*Ward, V. S. (1993, November). Differentiating education for the gifted from general education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta. GA.*

*Ward, V. S., Shore, B. M., Fisher, M. D., & Delisle, J. R. (1992, November). A symposium: Knowledge production and utilization in differential education for the gifted. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children. Los Angeles, CA.*

*Wellington, B. (1992, November). Critical theory, and gifted education: An introduction. Paper*

*presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles, CA.*

*Wellington, B. (1993, November). An introduction to critical theory. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Wellington, B. (1999, November). Seeds of change. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Albuquerque, NM.*

*Wellington, B. (2000, November). Minions of the dark side. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta, GA.*

*Westerhold, S., & Giesler, K. (1998, November). Designing comprehensive curriculum: The missing domain. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Louisville. KY.*

*Wilcove, J. (1992, November). Self-reflection: A means to empathy hi qualitative research. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Los Angeles. CA.*

*Wilcove, J. (1993, November). Qualitative research and its philosophical and pedagogical Implications. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, Atlanta. GA.*

## **Appendix A Theories of Giftedness and Related Constructs**

Legend for Chart:

A - Issue/Theory/Model

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Theory Importance, Construction, Issues, Testing  
(21 Presentations)

Theory importance and development (3)

Importance/need of theory

Cohen, Piechowski, Jellen, & Ward, 1989(\*)

Overarching theory needed to unite practices and explain relationships underlying gifted child's intelligence.

#### Criteria for theory development

Cohen, 1990b(\*)

Criteria for theory development in four areas: nature of child, education/identification, theory framework, and criteria.

#### Metaphors in theory building

Ambrose, 1993(\*)

Metaphors for theory building and interdisciplinary work. Implicit/explicit metaphors may illuminate or be blinders.

#### Theoretical stock taking (2)

#### Theoretical stock taking I & II

Cohen, Ambrose, Rudnitski, Tannenbaum, & Milgram, 1995; Ambrose, Milgram, Rudnitski, & Tannenbaum, 1996

Stock taking of major theories, scope and scale, context, missing pieces, luminous elements, road blocks, and questions. Connection of theory to research and practice.

#### Theory integration and unification (7)

#### Conceptual lens

Cohen, 1990a(\*)

Irreconcilable mechanistic and organismic lenses, each with a family of theories. Compromises suggested.

#### Towards a theory of optimal

## development

Passow, Clark, Cohen, Jellen, & Ward,  
1990

Vocabulary, rationale, neurological base, and practical implications of theory for optimal development of mind.

## Images of wide scope

Ambrose, 1990(\*)

Images of wide scope, pictorial metaphors, to unify theories by comparing and searching for common threads.

## Ways to unify theory

Ambrose, 1992

Additional ways for interdisciplinary theory unification.

## Strategies for theory synthesis

Cohen & Ambrose, 1993b(\*) (SS)

Differences in scope, scale, depth; worldviews; systems and chaos theories; combine perspectives.

## Practical relating of theories

Piechowski & Grant, 1996

Use Tannenbaum's five-factor model to relate theories and models, not integrate or synthesize them.

## Model for integrating conceptual foundations

Ambrose, 1996(\*)

3-dimensional model: a) hard sciences to uncertain

social sciences, b) levels of analysis, and c) barriers to integration.

Issues and blocks in theory building or unification (5)

Issues in constructing a unified theory

Cohen, Jellen, Passow, Piechowski, & Ward, 1990

Research/theory/practice connections; breadth/scope; how to combine; go outside field; giftedness or creativity.

Vocabulary of theory problems

Ward, 1990

A wide variety of meanings not sorted for discriminating/exact usage. Dearth of structures for thought construction.

Postmodern curriculum theory

Piirto, 1997, 1998(\*)

Interpret gifted self in context regarding 12 issues such as time, power, class, body, spirit, justice, diversity, and passion.

Conceptual blocks in gifted education

Ambrose, Cross, Coleman, Clark, & Cohen, 2000(\*)

Dead ends, misconceptions, wrong turns trap our field. Some as springboards for new conceptions/research.

Theories, research, and testing (4)

Mathematical modeling

Pyryt, 1990

Mathematical modeling to formalize theories of gifted.

#### Theory-research connection

Armstrong, Kay, Pyryt, Rudnitski, &  
Tannenbaum, 1994 (SS)

Translate theories related to gifted education, and  
qualitative and quantitative perspectives into research.

#### Ordinary day-to-day interactions

Coleman, 1997

Studied ordinary interactions of gifted in families,  
classes, and clubs--might bear on extraordinary  
development.

#### Exceptions as tests of models

Piechowski, 1997(\*)

Exceptions to models of conditions for outstanding  
achievement. Intrapersonal strengths most vital.

#### Theories imported/applied to gifted education (46 presentations)

Dabrowski's theory: understanding the gifted personality (17)

#### Dabrowski's life and theory

Nelson, 1991

His life informed theory. Personality development  
theory could account for social/emotional aspects  
of giftedness.

#### Affective dimensions and highest levels of giftedness/creativity

Calic & Frasier, 1993; Pyryt & Mendaglio,  
2002; Mendaglio & Pyryt, 2003

Heightened sensitivity and emotional development.  
Altruism, empathy, compassion, selfless love, and  
morality. Explains peak developmental level, and  
essence of giftedness.

Dabrowski applied to identification,  
counseling, teaching

Calic, 1994; Amend, Lind, Silverman, &  
Cross, 1999; Hunt & Seney, 2002

Need counseling and teaching to nurture emotional  
development. Heightened sensitivities useful  
for identification. Children's literature helps  
gifted with asynchrony.

Elements of Dabrowski's Theory

Ackerman, 1995, 1999; Pyryt & Mendaglio,  
2000; Pyryt 2002a; Mendaglio & Pyryt,  
2001 ; Ackerman, 2003

Theory of Positive Disintegration: overexciteabilities,  
levels, developmental context and potential,  
dynamisms, stages, and emotional development.

Comparisons with other developmental  
and psychological theories

Ackerman, Cassone, & Daniels, 1996;  
Garrison, 1996; Ackerman & Haensly,  
1997; Mendaglio & Pyryt, 2003

CF with Vygotsky & Gardner. CF with developmental  
theories: Freud, Jung, Erikson, Piaget, Kohlberg,  
and Maslow. CF Dabrowski's emotional development  
with Goleman's Emotional Intelligence.

## Non-universal development

Feldman, 1990(\*)

Extraordinary development in non-universal domains,  
developed fields of work requiring instruction.

## Curriculum and Constructivist Theory

Lupart, 1990; Burruss, 1998; Walker, 1999

Constructivist theories uni-directional, offered  
alternative. Constructivism as power tools for the  
doing. Theories of Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, and  
Gardner for deep understanding.

## Constructivism to Study Intellectual Development

Sanders, 1994

Constructivist methodology using life history approach  
study intellectual development of gifted students.

## Neo-Piagetian constructions of giftedness

Wilcove, 1995

Possibilities beyond formal operations & abstract  
reasoning, considering imagination, intuition, and  
affect.

## Differences in Piagetian equilibration

Cohen, 1997(\*)

The gifted build mental structures differently.  
Anticipate possibilities but have more conflicts,  
the "balance uneasy."

## Beyond formal operations

Dixon, 2004

A stage beyond formal operations, dialectical thinking, based on Hegel's process, relevant for gifted thinking.

Developmental stage theory

Pyryt, 2004

Gowan's stage theory based on Piaget and Erikson. Twenty years before asynchrony, his dysphasia was same.

Gardner's Multiple Intelligence Theory (5)

MI applied to gifted

Haggerty, 1994

How MI Theory applies to gifted.

MI and school restructuring

Rossell, 1996

Trend analysis re: MI Theory to school restructuring.

MI and demise of gifted education

Delisle, 1997, 1998

MI Theory shortchanges cognitively gifted. Shallow coverage re: social, emotional, and intellectual lives.

MI for culturally diverse

Starnes, 2001

Value of MI for culturally diverse/low SES.

Sternberg's Triarchic Theory of Intelligence (2)

## Sternberg's triangular theory of love

Pyryt, 1993

Intimacy, passion, commitment as model for understanding eminent achievement.

## Practical intelligence

Tran, 1998

Study of business owners' practical problem solving suggests how to succeed in real-world classrooms.

## Vygotsky's Theory of Mediation (4)

Zone of proximal development and Dewey

Fierer, 1998

ZPD with Dewey's democratic instrumentalism to transform classroom into liberation democracy.

Socio-cultural development & math talent

Gajdamaschko & Kanevsky, 2000

Role of experts, teachers, and learners in supporting ZPD in developing math talents.

## Theory weaving

Rogalla & Ruban, 2001 ; Ruban & Rogalla, 2002

Wove Vygotsky and Western and Eastern thinkers. Buber for explanation of creativity with practical implications.

## Chaos Theory (5)

### Chaos theory and creativity; brain

Sterling, 1990, 1991

Sensitive dependence on initial conditions, scaling, destructuring, non-linearity related to brain and creativity.

### Chaos theory and classroom

Swassing, 1995, 1996; Moule, 1996

Key elements (randomness) applied to student behaviors. Chaos Theory linked to creative problem solving.

### Other Theories (4)

#### Critical theory components; power

Wellington, 1992, 1993(\*)

Dynamics of power/control in cultural settings suggest research, curriculum, and teaching framed by dominant culture.

#### Work adjustment theory: gender differences

Benbow & Lubinski, 1993

Gender differences in engineering/phys science result of personal views on how to accomplish personal fulfillment.

#### Carroll's theory of intelligence

Pyryt, 1995b

Cognitive abilities factor 3 strata: narrow, broad, and general.

### Theories Developed Specifically for Gifted Education

(19 Presentations)

Ward's Differential Education for the Gifted Theory (5)

Taxonomy for DEG

Jellen, 1990

Classified DEG concepts into 7 clusters as summative matrix, with 32 key concepts, and 4 factors.

Model for DEG

Ward, 1991, 1993

Model related to philosophical thought for underpinnings for field. Relation of DEG to Lifetime Education.

Aspect of DEG

Ward, Shore, Fisher, & Delisle, 1992

Knowledge production and utilization.

Application to curriculum

Gabriel, DeYoung, & Bajerma, 1994

Applied DEG to differentiate curriculum, articulate district and learner outcomes, assessment strategies.

Frasier's Multicultural Theory (2)

Theoretical issues that impact achievement of minority students

Frasier, Safter, Cramond, Benn, Watts-Warren, & Tam, 1991(\*); Frasier & Finley, 1993(\*)

Theories of cultural deprivation, differences, and ecology to explain issues re: minority achievement.

Multicultural theory of giftedness: focus on exceptional performance.

Meininger's Grounded Theory (9)

Application of grounded theory to gifted

Meininger, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1998, 2001; Meininger & Phillips, 1999, 2000

Grounded theory applied to understanding intellectual giftedness, developmentally appropriate practice, identification and programming in set of propositions.

Ambrose's Contextual Theory of Development (3)

New model of aspiration development

Ambrose, 2001,2002(\*)

Socioeconomic barriers hinder self-fulfillment. New dynamic theory of aspiration development/life trajectories.

Aspiration development and self fulfillment

Ambrose et al., 2004(SS)

Reactions and suggestions for refinement to Ambrose's Theory of Aspiration Development.

Models/Principles in Gifted Education (16)

Intra-Individual Models: Motivation, Career Development, Personal Talents (7)

Motivation: TARGET

Clinkenbeard, 1994, 2000

Grounded theory on student motivation patterns in context. TARGET Model for motivation.

#### Motivational model

Rea, 1995(\*)

Optimal motivation = expectancy, value, and affect.  
Flow, undivided interest, optimal arousal applied to these.

#### Career development

Dai & Kelly, 1996

Achievement driven by personal-intentional, social-cultural, and developmental dimensions in contexts.

#### Personal talent model

Moon, 2002; Ackerman, et al., 2003 (SS);  
Katzenbach, 2003a

Extraordinary ability to select, orchestrate, and achieve hard goals. Dynamic model connected to research/practice. Applied to self-realization.

#### Instructional Models (2)

##### Instructional design model

Vaughn-Neeley, 1995

Cognitive, constructivist, and chaos theory applied to model for instructional design.

##### Systems theory for curriculum models

Van Tassel-Baska & Brown, 1997

Systems theory to analyze organizational and curriculum models for assumptions, interpretations, and propositions.

#### Integrative Models (5)

##### 4 X 4 model

Milgram, 1990(\*)

Conventional (IQ, grades) and unconventional (creativity, leisure) predict adult behavior. Unconventional more valid.

##### Sources of individual differences

Kanevsky, 1994

3 interactive sets of factors: intellectual, non-intellectual, and environment, which indicate differences of gifted.

##### Differentiated model of giftedness and talent

Gagné, 1995, 1998, 2000(\*)

Talent development model with 6 components: gifts, talents, intrapersonal and environmental catalysts, chance, and process. Environmental least significant. Transform gifts into talents.

##### Principles for Teaching Gifted (2)

##### Principles for general teacher training

Cohen, Maker, VanTassel-Baska, Kaplan, Borland, Ambrose, & Folsom, 1999 (SS).

Principles from gifted education applied to general teacher training, from theory, research, practice to help teachers find and enhance gifts in each student.

## Six principles for teaching gifted

Cohen, 2002

Focus on strengths, pacing in basic skills, grouping, depth in interests, mediation, and tools for lifelong learning.

Note. SS = Special Session; (\*) = particularly illuminating sessions.

### **Appendix B Conceptions and Definitions of Giftedness and Related Terms**

Legend for Chart:

A - Concept/Definition

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Conceptions about Giftedness (76)

Characteristics of the Individual: Conceptions about Affective Aspects (18)

Values

Buff, 1991

How and why value systems develop.

Resiliency

Friedman & Tollefson, 1991(\*)

Mastery orientation, self-efficacy, internal attribution orientation useful for promoting equity.

## Self-concept

Friedman, 1992; Mendaglio & Pyryt, 1999

Gifted construct self-perceptions from intellectual status through evaluative screen. Gifted self-concept complex.

## Temperament

Geiger & Martin, 1993; Geiger, 1999

Temperament concept re: Dabrowski; introversion.

## Wonder

Hopewell, 1996

Wonder as precondition of philosophy. Defines giftedness.

## Emotional intelligence

Ruef, 2000; Chandler, 2003; Sabatini, 2003

Emotional Intelligence and IQ; importance in developing EQ.

## Motivation

Gagné, 2001(\*)

Motivation as goal-defining and goal-reaching activities as causal in talent emergence.

## "Houndstooth" factors

Renzulli, 2001(\*)

Optimism, passion, courage, empathy, energy, and destiny.

## Spiritual intelligence

Kerr, Delaney, Noble, & McAllister, 2001(\*);  
Kerr, Delaney, Merrill, & McAllister, 2002

Perceiving universe and our place in it as interconnected whole. Spiritual giftedness an aspect of human potential.

## Courage

Hang, 2002(\*)

Giftedness as state of being in courageous search of meaning and purpose.

## Self-management

Gagne, 2003

4th element of interpersonal catalysts in DMGT model.

## Identity

Graffam, 2003

How to help learners construct "the who I am."

## Underachievement

Matthews, Flint, Kaskaloglu, Marker, &  
McBee, 2004

Emerging directions in study of underachievement:  
identification, prevalence, and patterns of behavior.

## Characteristics of the Individual: Conceptions about Thinking and Learning (7)

## Metacognition

Alexander, Schwanenflugel, & Carr, 1993;

Leader, 1998; Joffe, 2002

Differences in metacognition in gifted/non-gifted. Is multidimensional/complex. Metacognition ID instrument.

### Thinking

Dettmer, 1997; Leigh, 2003

Revised version of Bloom's Taxonomy integrating creativity. Five disappearing elements of thinking skills.

### Learning and knowing

Silverman & Haas, 2002; Syer & Shore, 2001

Spatial intelligence needs emphasis, not just sequential. NAGC members' perceptions regarding inquiry-based learning.

Characteristics of the Individual in Interaction with the Environment, Social or Physical (8)

### Play

Johnsen & Huber, 1991

Play/pretending related to creativity and problem solving.

### Crystallizing experiences

Friedman & Gallagher, 1993

Are crystallizing experiences definable, universal, and manipulable, causing focus of energies?

### Underachievement

Neihart, 1994(\*)

Focus on underachievement syndrome as harmful.

#### Chance

Schader & Gagné, 2001

Important role of chance in talent development.

#### Social giftedness

Carson, 2003

Social giftedness maps onto Cattail-Horn-Carroll hierarchical theory.

#### Beyond ability-centric conceptions

Dai, 2004(\*)

A developmental contextualist perspective viewing giftedness in the making, developing via experience.

#### Deliberate practice

Guo, 2004

Talent development requires deliberate practice.

#### Research on student social action projects

Renzulli, et al., 2004

Compared students who participated in service programs with those who did not, related to Houndstooth factors.

#### Conceptions about Climate and Context: Social, Political, Diversity Aspects (17)

#### Parents and families

Friedman, 1990, 1994; Solow, 1997, 1999

Family system perspective. Socioeconomic status bias. Resilience in low SES families. Parent concepts of gifted.

#### Patriarchal/matriarchal

Jeong, 2000

Binary taxonomy of societies for categorizing gifted programs.

#### Needs

Grant, 1993

Needs-based claims rest on unstated theories/values.

#### Anti-intellectualism

Buzzard, 1996

Hostile climate. Academics as the other "Scarlet A."

#### Mission impossible

Gagné, 2002

Focus on gifted as natural resource or future leaders is frustrating. Not enough room at top.

#### Diversity: multicultural

Harris & Cohen, 1990; Ford & Harris, 1992(\*); Paterson, 1996(\*); Paterson, 2000(\*); Frasier, Garcia & Martin, 1992(\*)

Giftedness in Asian Pacific cultures. Perceptions of Black students re: achievement. Cultural values differ between teachers and minorities. Underserved--poor, non-mainstream, abused, and at risk. Giftedness

operationalized.

#### Diversity: special populations

Rudnitski, et al, 1996 (SS); Cohen,  
Skenedore, & Rudnitski, 1997 (SS)

With Special Populations Division, two special sessions explored new definitions of giftedness embracing diversity for identification, and programming.

#### Diversity: gay/lesbian

Shank, Steinert, & Friedrichs, 2001(\*);  
Friedman-Nimz, Cohn, & Cash, R. M., 2002

Systemic barriers to meeting needs of GLBT gifted.  
Operationalizing inclusiveness to include GLBT in gifted.

#### Conceptions and Practice (19)

##### School curriculum

Hollingsworth, 1990

Theoretical basis for her school's curriculum.

##### Cooperative learning

Robinson & Clinkenbeard, 1992(\*);  
Clinkenbeard, 1998(\*)

Controversy for frustrated gifted re: cooperative learning. Individualistic or cooperative goal structures for gifted?

##### Mentors

Bravmann, 1993; Huntley & Ambrose,  
1999; Kauffman, 2001

Mentor/protégé association from classics.

Art mentor's decision-making strategies. Mentorship vs. good teaching.

#### Developing social skills

Dettmer, 1993

Cultivate social skills; theory of social functioning.

#### Teaching in domains

Hughes, 1998; Westerhold & Giesler, 1998

Teaching arts integrates critical/creative thought. Develop psychomotor domain for synthesizing concepts.

#### Teaching profoundly gifted

Senzee, 1998

Instructional approach for work with big picture thinkers who have mastered essence of a discipline.

#### Axioms in teaching

Stroebel, 1998

Teaching of gifted re: effectiveness of axioms in field.

#### Curriculum differentiation

Julicher & Mennebery-Kustus, 1999;  
Martin, Frasier, & Folsom, 2000; Terry & Bohnenberger, 2001

Differentiation in home-schooling contexts. Holistic approach for intellectual and emotional teaching and learning. Use of service learning as differentiation.

#### Emotions in classroom

Folsom, 2000

Connection of intellect and emotion in teaching/learning.

Low-cost provisions

Rogers, 2001

Researched, low-cost options for Talent Development.

School as racecourse

Folsom, 2003(\*)

Meaning of curriculum as a race can reward or punish.

Cognitive task analysis

Estes & Estes, 2004

CTA technology, applied in other fields, useful in gifted education in domain of ascending challenge.

From motivation to inspiration

Kokol, 2004

Motivation must give way to inspiration to keep gifted on trajectories, drawing from non-cognitive sources.

Conceptual Issues, Construction of Beliefs, Questions (7)

Knowledge base

Robinson, Colangelo, & Shore, 1991(\*)

Alternatives for describing knowledge base, based on expert handbook, and structure of recommended practices.

Theory/practice connection

Dobbs, 1992(\*) ; Peine, 1998(\*)

Practitioners' beliefs about conceptions of giftedness.  
Importance of linking conceptions to practice.

#### Personal convictions

Gagne, 1997

Described his personal convictions on gifted and talented.

#### Division mission

Kearney, 2003

Missions of CF Division and how to participate in it.

#### Category formation

Miller, 2003

How meanings are made via how people form categories.

#### Questions about giftedness

Soller, 2003

Questions from Ester Katz Rosen Center reappeared over time. How these affect program foundations.

Definitions, meanings and constructs of giftedness and related terms (34)

Changing Perceptions of Giftedness, Intelligence, Talent (5)

#### Plethora of definitions for gifted

Sloat and Hayes, 1992

Need acceptable definition for inclusion and diversity.  
Giftedness, talent, and creativity as interlocking concepts.

## Perceptions of intelligence

Fox, Reid, & Brighton, 1995

From Binet, to conceptions by Gardner, Sternberg, and Murray and Hernstein's Bell Curve.

## Century of giftedness

Friedman, Sutherland, & Hendricks, 1999

Shift from genius and eminence to talent, exceptionality, and giftedness.

## Evolution of terms

Taylor, 2000(\*)

Intelligence, giftedness, and talent are culturally loaded constructs related to given history, politics, and society.

## Social construction

Miller, 2003(\*)

Giftedness has no meaning outside social/cultural context.

## Conflicts in Definitions (6)

### Public usage of terms

Hunsaker, 1995(\*)

Periodicals of mass consumption have different views of gifted/talented vs. gifted education literature.

### Warring factions

Morelock, 1996(\*)

Evolutionary perspective based on developmental theory.

#### Dueling definitions

Anthony, 1998, 2000

Conceptual constraints, connections from other fields,  
connections between constructs and practice needed.

#### Contentious views on giftedness

Haensly, 2001,2002

Relation to ability, effort, and opportunity.  
Perspectives may devalue intellectualism, or view  
giftedness as elite.

#### Intelligence: Definitions and Constructs (6)

#### Fractal metaphor

Horton, 1999

Fractals for visualizing intelligence, non-linearity  
re: gifted intensities and flow.

#### Functional definition

Dai, 2001(\*)

Human sensibility and activity to specific opportunity  
and demands. Not static. Contextual, domain-related,  
and intentional.

#### Rising IQ

Pyryt, 2001

Worldwide IQ rise as challenging notion of fixed  
intelligence is spurious.

#### Extreme intelligence

Capuroo, Harsin, Delisle, & Pfeiffer, 2003

Functional definition of profound intelligence.

#### IQ-type tests

Cline, Bracken, Hopkins, McCoach, & Pyryt, 2004

Uses and abuses of IQ tests, considered controversial and emotion-laden, as gates that divide classes and races.

#### Making gifted testing relevant

Gilman & Kearney, 2004

Child-centered testing especially for at risk.  
Knowledge about giftedness rather than tests defining intelligence.

#### Creativity: Definitions and Constructs (5)

##### Creativity and consciousness

Bruch, 1996

Creativity important for all persons. Strategies are clues for exploring creative awareness and consciousness.

##### Torrance's data

Plucker, 1997

Countered criticisms about predictive validity of Torrance Tests of Creativity through reanalysis of data.

##### Creativity and intelligence

Ruban, 1999(\*)

Alternate conceptions of creativity and intelligence need "theory weaving" for integrated approaches to assessment.

#### Profound creativity

Swassing, 1999

Profound creativity/giftedness linked to complexity.

#### Operational definition

Plucker, 2000

An important component of problem solving, cognition, healthy social and emotional development, and adult success.

#### Talent: Definitions and Constructs (5)

##### Gifted/talent differences

Gagné, Cohn, & Feldhusen, 1991

Gifts are basic human competencies underlying development of talents in particular fields.

##### Talent construct

Piirto, 1994(\*)

Analysis of giftedness construct in light of talent concept as framework for talent development.

##### Concerns about talent development

Schultz, 2002(\*), 2003(\*)

Talent development focuses on production, competition, and social usefulness, not "being." Child's needs are ignored.

##### Talent management

Bai, 2004(\*)

Talent management, used to reach one's mission, is more than linear and technical talent development.

#### Individual Differences Definitions (4)

##### Optimal experience

Rea, 1993

Feeling and performing at peak level is optimal experience.

##### Expertise

Friedman, 1996

Expertise, what distinguishes outstanding individuals in a domain, as construct. Identify expertise potential in youth.

##### Asynchrony

Garrison et al., 1997(\*)

Asynchrony, internal and external, as definition of giftedness, especially for extreme gifted or creative.

##### Biologically diverse

Swassing, 2000

Individual differences as biologically diverse psychological construct.

#### Domain Definitions (4)

##### Arts

Carroll, 1991; Rogers, 1992, 1993

Arts as form of behavior, sheds light on giftedness.  
Creativity in arts is measurable. Observe work on  
projects.

### Leadership

Rudnitski, 1991

Parallels between theoretical literature on giftedness  
and leadership.

Note. SS = Special Session; (\*) = particularly illuminating  
sessions.

### **Appendix C Philosophical and Ethical Foundations**

Legend for Chart:

A - Philosophical Aspect

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Metaphysics (22)

Worldviews (3)

Two worldviews

Cohen, 1990a(\*)

Two incompatible worldviews, mechanistic and organismic,  
as lenses for theories and research.

Root metaphors

Ambrose, 1995b(\*), 1997(\*)

Root metaphors as powerful shapers of worldview. May entrap, especially mechanistic/positivist approaches.

#### Paradigms (11)

##### New paradigms needed

Cohen et al., 1991 (SS)(\*)

Need for new paradigms of research/theory building for the field of gifted education to advance.

##### Paradigm wars

Pyryt, 1991

Paradigm wars between internal traits vs. environmental conditions to explain high achievement.

##### Interpretive vs. positivist paradigms

Coleman, Sanders, & Cross, 1991, 1992, 1993(\*)

Is building deductive theories on natural sciences model beneficial? Alternative is interpretive paradigms.

##### Research paradigms

Wilcove, 1992, 1993

Philosophy shapes research. Qualitative researchers should attend to values vs. positivists' neutrality stand.

##### Positivist paradigm problems

Cross, 1994(\*)

Positivist research paradigm dominant. Relationship of power and rules of evidence for alternative perspectives.

## Paradigms and mind shifts

Ambrose, 1994b(\*)

21st Century gifted need to find big-picture patterns underlying conceptual maps.

## Talent development

Stroebel, 1998

Emerging Talent Development paradigm for all.

## New advocacy paradigm

Cash, A. B., 2003

Paradigm shift needed in advocacy for gifted children, emphasizing personal culpability.

## Ideology (8)

### Ideology change

Wellington, 1999, 2000(\*)

Need for discussion about gifted education/ideology; seeds of doubt as seeds of change re: purpose of schools.

## Gifted and meritocracy

Piirto, Howley, A., Howley, C., & Peterson, 2000(\*)

Do concepts of giftedness create a meritocracy?  
Positivist ideologies have negative effect on society.

## Belief changing

Cohen, 1998; Cohen, Ambrose, Cross, et al. , 2000(\*) ; Cohen, Ambrose, Castellano,

Cross, & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2001

Changing beliefs about gifted education is difficult but necessary for field advancement.

Edge-of-the map syndrome

Ambrose, Cross, & Coleman, 2004

Scholarly communities assume discoveries are complete, becoming stagnant without questioning this.

Divining for philosophy

Schultz, 2004(\*)

Considers whether field has a philosophical context and if it should be revised.

Epistemology (2) Most theoretical presentations fail in this category. See Appendix A.

Curricular orientations

Piirto, 1995

Train teachers to analyze own curricular orientations to become aware of biases.

Continuum of theories

Dai & Renzulli, 2003

Continuum from essentialist conservative, pragmatist, and social constructivist, most liberal regarding values.

Axiology (17)

Aesthetic knowledge

Rudnitski, 1993(\*)

Primary/intuitive processes vs. secondary processes  
expressed linguistically, abstractly, and consciously.

#### Ethics in research

Kearney, 1995

Ethics in researching extreme giftedness challenged by  
information-age issues.

#### Moral leadership

Geiger, 1997

Focus on leaders having wisdom and compassion.

#### Fairness

Ray, 1999

Fairness the issue in excellence/equity debates.

#### Theory of moral giftedness

Rudnitski & Rostan, 1999(\*)

Field should focus on altruism, pro-social actions, and  
extraordinary moral behavior, not only cognitive.

#### Values education

Bravmann, 1994; Cash, A. B., 1999, 2001,  
2002, 2004; Cash, A. B. et al., 2000; Lewis,  
2000; Grant, 2003

Focus on values education, moral development, and  
character education.

#### Shared moral purpose

Heng, 2001(\*)

Excellence within, through individual fulfillment vs.  
rewards from the outside to overcome existential angst.

#### Personal growth

Piechowski & Grant, 2001(\*)

Focus on personal growth, not talent development: too  
focused on outward recognition.

#### Moral precocity

Bai, 2001,2003

Philosophically precocious children.

Note. SS = Special Session; (\*) = particularly illuminating  
sessions.

### Appendix D Historical Perspectives

Legend for Chart:

A - Philosophical Aspect

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Individual Contributions Within and Outside the Field (17)

Legends within the field

Delisle, Piechowski, Robinson, & Silverman,  
1990; Delisle, 2003; Swassing,  
Kearney, & LeBlanc, 1993; Rudnitski,  
White, & Kearney, 1997; Kearney & Tolan,  
1999; Greene, 2001; Schultz, 2001

Hollingworth, Witty, and Terman, and their effects

on the future of gifted education.

"Termanites" and gender issues

Southern, 1995; Rogers, 1995(\*)

Study of the female researchers who worked on Terman's longitudinal study.

Historical figures outside field

Pyryt, 1994b; Buzzard, 1995, 1997; Horton, 2001; Gallagher, S. A., Maker, Gallagher J. J., Romanoff, & Thompson, 2002; Gallagher, S., Thompson, & Maker, 2003

Historical figures outside field of importance to gifted education: John Gardner, William James, Taba, Binet, McKinnon, and Guilford.

Galton vs. Terman

Southern, 1996

Explored diverging views of gifted child in writings. Enrichment/acceleration schism.

Ghosts of gifted past

Conceptual Foundations, 2003

Panelists in roles of key historical figures in gifted education.

Eras/Regions that Spawned Gifted Practices (10)

Historical time periods

Pyryt, 1995a; Monson, Plucker, & Runco, 1998; Greene, 2001; Kearney, Silverman, & Revel, 1998; Kearney, 2001, 2002; Jolly, 2003

Particular eras spawned constructs such as intelligence, and creativity or assessment and teaching practices.

#### Regions and history

Elmore, Frasier, & Walker, 1993; Swassing, Kearney, & LeBlanc, 1993

Specific cities/regions: their historical contributions.

#### 19th Century peer groups

Rogers, 2004

Studies of painters and poets indicated working together and changed aspects of each other's outputs.

#### Legacies Pro and Con (8)

##### Pioneers' legacies

Delisle, Piechowski, Robinson, & Silverman, 1990

The legacy of visionary pioneers, leaders and events in the field that shaped the field as a whole.

##### Three institutions

Clark, Cohen, Passow, & Smutny, 1991

Importance of Federal Office, N/S LTI, and the Richardson Foundation and the leadership within.

##### Virgil Ward legacy

Betts & McCree, 1992(\*)

Interview with Virgil Ward about his work in gifted education.

## NAGC presidents(SS)

Bruch, et al. 1994

Problems faced during NAGC presidencies as related to current issues/problems.

## Positives and negatives

Delisle, 2000, 2001,2002, 2003

Best and worst influences on the field, including individuals and political events.

## Prodigies in Historical Context (4)

### Myths of prodigiousness

Kearney, 1995

Examined myths, realities, and social contexts of prodigies in popular press.

### Prodigies as attention or innate ability

Kearney, 1996

Analysis of parenting books 1911 to 1914 of how to raise prodigious offspring.

### Baratier

Robinson, 2002

Jean Phillippe Baratier prodigious development.

### Whiteley

Katzenbach, 2003b

Opal Whiteley prodigious development.

Methods, Forgotten Studies, the Dark Side of Gifted Education (5)

Historical research methods

Kearney & LeBlanc, 1993(\*)

Historical research methods and "sleuthing" became standard for this type of research in field.

A walk on the other side

Rudnitski & Kearney, 1996(\*)

Acknowledging roots of eugenic, racist and anti-Semitic views in the writings of the field's founders.

Follow up of Jenkin's (1935) forgotten study

Kearney, 1997(\*)

Follow up of Jenkin's longitudinal research on African American gifted children by her fifth-grade class.

Social history of term gifted

Kearney, 2000(\*)

Traced social history of term "gifted" through scientific literature and popular press beginning in 19th century.

Researchers who studied African-American gifted

Kearney, 2002(\*)

Analyzed why these studies were forgotten, with implications for under-representation among gifted.

Note. SS = Special Session; (\*) = particularly illuminating

sessions.

## Appendix E Trends, Issues, Future Directions

Legend for Chart:

A - Philosophical Aspect

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Projections into the Future (5)

Gifted into the future

Cohen, Betts, Higgins, Ambrose, & Sisk,  
1991 (SS); Cohen et al., 1992 (SS)(\*)

Needed future skills of learners, perennial issues,  
future/research directions, and role of gifted education  
for all.

Experiences for future

Roseberry & Kaplan, 1994

Early experiences for TAG/administrators re: what we  
should do for gifted students now and in the future.

Options past, present, future

Garrison, 1997

Considered options for the gifted past, present and  
future.

Skills for future

Higgins, Peters, & Borg, 1999

Discussed skills needed by gifted in new millennium.

Issues Analysis, Myths and Assumptions (5)

Equal and excellent

Buzzard, 1995

Addresses issue of being equal and excellent, political correctness, and how this affects gifted education.

Process-product research

Schultz, 1999(\*)

Analysis of process-product research lead to deficit views of underachievement. Use qualitative methods.

Perennial issues

Dai, 2000

Nature of giftedness, nature-nurture debate, methods for identification, and various talent development models.

Myths

Siegle, 2001

Debunk myths in gifted education through use of research.

Barriers and myths to successful  
gifted programs

Gentry, 2001

External assessments, not ability grouping, parent issues, identification crisis, and separate gifted programs.

## What's "Hot" in Journals and Convention Programs over Time (6)

### Analysis of journals in gifted

Haensly, 1998, 1999

Overview of nine journals in gifted education regarding focus, directions, paradigm emergence, and future prospects.

### Journal of Creative Behavior

Beghetto & Plucker, 1999

Analysis of Journal of Creative Behavior from 1967 to 1998 for trends, and authorship.

### Journal content analysis

Kendrick & Sokas, 2001

Overview of four gifted education journals.

### NAGC convention programs

Nugent, 2003

Analysis of NAGC convention programs from 1998 to 2002 for patterns, trends, and burning issues.

### Gifted education research

1994-2003

Kettler & Cooper, 2004

Analysis of research published in gifted education past 10 years for trends, issues, and future directions.

### Connections with General Education (13)

### No victims

Neihart, 1993(\*)

Reevaluated standard wisdom about learning problems and school failure ("disease theory" of education).

#### Reform movement

Rudnitski, 1994

Trend analysis of the reform movement: Can we achieve a worldwide view of giftedness?

#### Inclusion movement

Coleman and Sanders, 1994

Considered how education practice works to thwart goals of equity, excellence, and individuality.

#### Talent development and school reform

Feldhusen, Treffinger & Lawshe, 1994(\*)

Talent development regarding school reform initiatives and minority/disadvantaged youth.

#### Gifted and educational reform

Folsom, 1996(\*), 1998(\*), 1999(\*), 2002(\*)

Relation of reform in gifted and regular education; standards for preservice teachers regarding gifted strategies (TIEL model); gifted leadership for school restructuring; and help with general teacher preparation.

#### Standards movement

Sandall & Sachtjen, 1997

Consideration of standards movement and suggestions for benchmarks for TAG education.

Bringing out the best

Wittig, Treffinger, Nassab, & Young, 1998(\*)

Talent development as a means for "bringing out the best" in all students.

Responses to trends in general education

Sloane, 1999

Responses of gifted education to trends in general education.

Everyone as gifted

Thompson, 2000

The "everyone is gifted" concept and merits/problems of this perspective for the future of education.

No Child Left Behind

Voorneveld, 2003

Relation of NCLB to the gifted, with focus on accountability and assessment aspects.

Questioning/Analyzing Our Direction (8)

Value of achievement

Grant, 1992

Questions value of achievement for gifted learners. Learning enjoyment vs. required courses.

Map of ignorance and knowledge

Cohen, 1994(\*)

Map of ignorance and knowledge should be applied to questioning trends and practices in gifted education.

Political correctness

Pyryt, 1994a(\*)

Impacts of political correctness on trends in gifted education, such as current focus on underserved.

Compulsory education?

Grant, 1998(\*)

Compulsory education unquestioned as foundation for gifted education. Provide more choices/self-direction.

Relinquishing field's focus

Delisle, 2004(\*)

Our field has been diminished by over-focus on student production and test scores. Focus on gifted children!

Demise of verbal intelligence?

Kearney, 2004

Historical views of intelligence based on verbal reasoning. Visually mediated world diminishes this.

Defending gifted education

Kerr & Conn, 2004(\*)

Decisions on gifted programs based on politics. Defending requires stories, persuasion, and accuracy.

Defending excellence

Leigh, 2004

Are politically correct concerns, such as NCLB  
destroying value of excellence?

### Appendix F Perspectives from Outside Our Field

Legend for Chart:

A - Philosophical Aspect

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Brain Research and Neuroscience (8)

Brain research

Clark, 1990

Brain research as applied to intelligence and human  
learning for defining, identifying, nurturing gifted.

Biological explanations for giftedness

Henderson, 1997(\*), 1998(\*)

Identification of gifted based on PET, MRI, and EEG  
studies.

There is a neurological basis for giftedness.

Understanding the brain

Goldberg, 2000

How the brain works has implications for teaching.

## Strategies for Brain

Wilkins, 2002

Instructional strategies that support and enhance brain function applied to teaching strategies for gifted.

## Brain, emotion, and motivation

Godwin, 2002

Trauma, neurology, crises, and experimentation reveal relationships among emotion, memory, and motivation.

## Brain-based learning

Cash, R. M., 2004

Brain research has implications for underperforming students; offers effective teaching/learning strategies.

## Brains on fire

Eide & Eide, 2004

Results from MRI and brain research suggest gifted are multimodal thinkers.

## Semantics and Literature (2)

### Giftedness in literature and media

Grant, 1997

The field's attitude towards social, philosophical, and religious deviance related to portrayals in media/books.

### Giftedness and general semantics

Pyryt, 1999

General semantics, the relationship between language, thought, behavior applied to concepts, and programming.

## Depth Psychology (2)

### Insights from depth psychology

Piirto & Reynolds, 2001

Individuation of gifts as blessing and poison, re: passion, integration through arts/dreams; archetypes, shadow, etc.

### Insights II

Reynolds & Piirto, 2002

Dream magnification, heart and intuition, and transcendent function of psyche are insights to giftedness.

## Integrative Approaches (8)

World trends, panoramic scanning, metaphors, human potential, and interdisciplinarity

Ambrose(\*), 1991, 1994a, 1995a, 2000, 2003b

Analyzed world trends for future worker/organization success. Panoramic scanning to grasp essence of macro-problems. Metaphorical vision building. Investigating human potential from many fields/paradigms. Exploring mind and contexts that support/suppress it.

## New views of reality

Clark, 1993(\*)

Use of new approaches from physics, system theory, neurosciences, and psychology to nurture intelligence.

## Interdisciplinary searches

Ambrose & Cohen, 1998

Concepts from quantum, neuroscience, and complexity theory promote creative ideas for Conceptual Foundations.

## Contextual and interdisciplinary influences

Ambrose, Gallagher, Clark, Cohen, & Ford, 1999 (SS)

Influences from sociocultural, economic, and political trends; cognitive science, complexity theory, and postmodern philosophy promise changes to conceptions.

Note. SS = Special Session; (\*) = particularly illuminating sessions.

## **Appendix G Social, Political, and Economic Considerations: Contextual Understandings**

Legend for Chart:

A - Philosophical Aspect

B - Author(s)/date(s)

C - Key Ideas

A

B

C

Broad Scope Contextual Considerations (3)

## Cultural and social forces

Parsons, 1992

Educators must understand social and cultural roots that affect schooling and may negatively impact gifted.

## Killing of teaching profession

Cohen & Ambrose, 1999

Social, economic, and political attacks on teaching profession affect gifted, regarding teacher-working conditions.

## Erosive forces

Ambrose, 2003a(\*)

Findings from social sciences and philosophy suggest global capitalism, ideological homogenization, self-destruction: all injurious to deep thought and ethics.

## School Policy in the Political and Social Context (4)

### Implementing policy

Starnes & Tucker, 1998

Implementation of policy on gifted in large, urban district with politically charged atmosphere.

### Accelerated learning

Peckron, 1998

Strategic policy for accelerated learning at elementary level with impact on education for all.

### Inclusion

Shore, 1999

Does inclusion practice lead to more favorable attitudes of gifted toward disabled?

### Malpractice

Folsom, 1999

Perpetuation of malpractice by educators through gaps in knowledge is not deliberate but needs remedy.

Diversity In Social, Cultural, and Economic Perspective (4)

Reality assessment approach

Kogan-Frenk, 1995

Fundamental philosophies on social, political, and economic issues must be addressed re: bilingual gifted.

Policies and under-representation

Friedman & Hendricks, 1997

Use Chamber's social-problem analysis to consider policies for addressing under-representation.

Diversity and gifted

Ballinger, 2001

Relationship of gifted education and big picture of diversity in general education re: changing population.

International conceptions of gifted

Division Special Session, 2001

Distinct cultural attitudes, values, and beliefs provide perspectives about how giftedness viewed/supported.

Note. (\*) = particularly illuminating sessions.

~~~~~

By LeoNora M. Cohen

LeoNora M. Cohen is an Associate Professor in the School of Education at Oregon State University. She has worked in the field of gifted education for almost 40 years, as a teacher,

parent, Coordinator of the Mentally Gifted Program for Philadelphia Public Schools, a university professor, and researcher. She has published over 50 articles, chapters, and books in the field. She was the founder of the Conceptual Foundations Division of NAGC. Her interests are in conceptual and theoretical issues, children's interests, creativity, thinking and metacognition, coping strategies, and practical applications relative to gifted children. E-mail: [cohenl@oregonstate.edu](mailto:cohenl@oregonstate.edu)

---

Copyright of Roper Review is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.