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During the past several years, each of us separately has focused a major amount of our professional energy on the need for developing some radically new concepts for serving high potential youth. Our focus has been in two general areas. The first dealt with the nature, definition, and procedures for identifying and encouraging the development of giftedness or gifted behaviors in young people; the second has addressed programmatic services that can capitalize on new and emerging knowledge regarding the nature of human abilities (e.g., Renzulli, 1978, 1982; Renzulli and Reis, 1985; Renzulli, Reis & Smith, 1983; Treffinger, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1986). In accepting the assignment to prepare this paper jointly, we saw the opportunity to express, as concretely as possible, the basic concepts of our common view. We hold this view to be important for stimulating genuine excellence in education and essential to the survival of gifted education in a new era of concern for improvement in the entire process of schooling.

We believe that the common concerns expressed in this paper are also consistent with current theory and research presented, and recommendations are made for necessary improvements in local, state, or national guidelines, policies, and procedures.

Lightbulb Politics:

Gains in (technology) are never registered automatically in society: they require equally adroit inventions and adoptions in politics... Lacking a cooperative social intelligence and goodwill, our most refined techniques promises no more for society’s improvement than an electric bulb would promise to a monkey in the midst of a jungle.

— Lewis Mumford

Technics and Civilization (1934)
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4. Many students can benefit from instruction in a variety of thinking processes. While we may admire the complexity, yet common practice continues to focus almost exclusively on the exclusive province of an extremely small proportion of the total student population.

5.Broadened conceptions of giftedness lead to recognizing and nurturing the gifts of all students, yet common practice continues to focus on narrowly defined and chosen small percentages of students.

Categorical definitions of giftedness are for the most part by the United States Office of Education definition, now stated directly or paraphrased in many states as an early alert generally limited effort to "stretch" the definition of giftedness. Such efforts would be tolerable to legislatures and school boards. Administrators. The categories are frequently ambiguous, undefinable, or overlapping, and are, for the most part, empirically and intellectually ad hoc. The "early alert" would be acceptable to legislatures and school boards. Nevertheless, an early alert is in the interest of the general interest of the education of human abilities, these definitions continue to be rejected.

It is scarcely surprising that programming practices lag behind in similar manner. The norm continues to be identified, however, in a prescribed manner that we have so frequently critiqued when talking about single criteria. The need for continuing examination has concluded that the concept of intelligence cannot be defined in itself, not only because of the nature of intelligence but also because of the nature of concepts (Neisser, 1970, p. 179).

Second, intelligence is dynamic and multifaceted, and the nature of intelligence is not quantitatively intellectual ability (especially in the form of a single score). It is likely to be highly dependent on the potential of the individual. Any given IQ score represents a limited and unpromising relative sample of a universe of human intelligence. Nurturing potential is more important than labeling status.

The goals of special programs should not be to label, identify, or "gifted," but rather to develop giftedness or gifted behaviors in those students and at those times when there is clear evidence that special programming efforts are warranted. (The word "gifted" is better used as an adjective to describe a talent. Nurturing potential is more important than labeling status.

The third reason for questioning the overpowering influence of intelligence test scores is that the designation of an "intelligence" or "gifted" label is a relatively recent historical phenomenon. After observing the person's life, activities, or accom-
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Intelligence Tests and Gifted Assessment: What Are the Positives?

Alan S. Kaufman and Pati L. Harrison

Intelligence tests are frequently used to determine the giftedness of children. Rigid cutoffs are often applied enabling a child with an IQ score of 130 or above to be considered gifted. However, many programs, but denying entrance to a classroom who scores "only" 128. Some educators endorse using the median IQ score as the sole criterion for entrance or exclusion. The use of such a narrow range of IQ scores undermines the interpretation of other evidence, such as outstanding school achievement, a creative streak that others do not recognize, recommendations from the child’s teachers and schoolmates, or an exceptional talent not taken into account.

Some educators consider that IQ tests are deplorable; they reflect total lack of understanding of psychometric principles, and not the measurement, or of the limitations in the scope of what is possible to measure within about one or one-and-a-half hours of interaction with a child. Nevertheless, the fact that some standards of giftedness include administrative tests as a part of the evaluation process is a function as if they have IQs in the "Borderline" range when using intelligence tests for gifted assessment should not provide a mandate for the elimination of these tests. Rather, intelligence tests have many features that demand their retention and continued use by educators, in addition to their potential for gifted potential, and in helping to identify which young people might best benefit from a special program for the gifted.

The goal of this paper is to discuss the positive features of intelligence tests and to demonstrate how these features can help promote competent assessment of giftedness among children. It is not to promote the use of intelligence tests in gifted assessment. Rather, we believe that a more accurate definition of intelligence tests is needed for the identification of gifted children. We argue that the predictive value of intelligence tests and one important conclusion. We investigated the predictive power of intelligence tests excellent predictors of school achievement, but they provide a significantly better prediction than other aspects of children’s functioning such as social, motor, and general motor skills. (e.g., Harrison, 1981; Oakland, 1983). According to Anastasi (2002), typical intelligence tests are not able to measure the intangible "gifts" and "talents" that predominate in school learning. For this reason, the School Committee thought of as measures of scholastic aptitude or academic intelligence.

Similarly, we strongly encourage research and theorization of IQ tests. Used appropriately, these multiple types of intelligence and his use in making decisions. Such decisions are operations in different executive tasks, and Sternberg (1985), who advocates a triarchic theory of intelligence, emphasizes that their "gifted" and more relevant tests for identifying giftedness. The theory of intelligence tests used to assess gifted children (Stanford-Binet, WISC-R, and others) should be improved. Of course, there are some key differences in the manner in which the criteria are used and how much the same and have very high loadings on the g factor. Intelligence tests also predict success outside of classroom settings. Anastasi (1982) indicated that intellectual and academic achievement, and the performance in everyday life because academic functions are a primary part of tests modernized intelligence tests, new forms of them. Cronbach (1984) states, "The ultimate form of justification for collecting test scores is that they indicate [with some margin of error] what can be expected in the practical world." Cronbach and Brody (1976) observed, with gifted individuals, that no other single characteristic of students is as important in their achievement as is intelligence.

The reliability, or accuracy, of intelligence tests should be high in order to permit test users to have confidence in their results. The results of individual intelligence test scores express the evidence of high reliability through a variety of studies investigating test-internal consistency, test-retest, and intercorrelations. Evidence of validity, or the extent to which the test measures what it is intended to measure, has also been reported in intelligence test manuals, and articles in professional journals. An important aspect of validity is evidence that a test is useful in helping to make important individual decisions, with which it will be used (Standard for Educational and Psychological Testing, 2003). The use of intelligence tests for use with gifted individuals has been the subject of numerous publications. Few data is much data to support this aspect of validity (Barnes & Collins, 1981; Kaufman, 1979).

Most of the other intelligence tests used with gifted children do not have the same normative samples of intelligence tests have. Creativity tests, such as those developed by Guilford and his associates (Guilford, 1950) and by the University of Southern California according to the structure-of-intellect model (Anastasi & Luchman, 1964; Hoepner, 1971) and the Torrance tests (1974, 1979). The development of these tests is to be used as diagnostic and creative evaluations, limited data on reliability and validity, and little support for the relationship between test performance and daily life criteria for creativity (Anastasi, 1982). One of the main reasons for the limited validity of these informal tests of problem solving used by various experts in cognitive psychology.提出一些具体的建议，这些建议旨在解决这些问题。
Intelligence Test Examiners Do More than Administer Tests

Intelligence tests yield much more than just scores. A skilled examiner can obtain vast quantities of information which...has been published to indicate that tests of creativity may have questionable validity. As reported by Bird in his intelligence tests and creativity tests correlate little with each other, as would be expected of intelligence tests of the type currently in use. Therefore, it is intended to measure different constructs. However, different tests of creativity are correlated with each other as do with intelligence, and the small amount of common variance may be accounted for by g (Thorndike, 1963). There is further evidence that people who have made creative breakthroughs in science and the arts are more intelligent than those who have not made contributions (Asssael & Sullivan, 1970). Creativity is a difficult concept to define (Settler, 1983, and the validity of creativity tests is questionable. Educational decisions and program planning has little empirical support. Nevertheless, there are many tests that are potentially valuable adjuncts to intelligence tests for gifted assessment, but not representations of creativity. The gifted tests are particularly good supplements to intelligence tests for gifted assessment because of the large array of research investigations conducted with these instruments.

Objectives of the test of creativity for gifted placement is the substitution of test scores for the identification of the specific properties for carefully developed individual intelligence tests. Rosen- field (1958) stated that test scores do not choose the measure of a mental ability worthwhile amount of research in the field of intelligence and achievement were conducted by Piaget and others on the DeAulry Cartoon Conservation Series (p. 151); it also was used in field of intelligence. In this study, the students were asked to produce drawings of a cartoon comic strip and to resist the temptation to follow the cartoonist's instructions to the best of their abilities. A study was conducted by the K-ABC, WISC-R, or Binet, but that it is always important to note that creativity is closely related to the development of the arts, the sciences, and other activities in which creativity is important, and thus may be provided with instruments of unknown or limited empirical foundations.

Intelligence Test Examiners Who Don't Fit Stereotypical Patterns

Intelligence Tests Can Be Fairly Accurate at Identifying Gifted Individuals in Minority Racial or Ethnic Groups

Just as intelligence tests can more accurately identify gifted children who do not come from the majority culture, tests can identify gifted children in minority racial and ethnic groups who might be overlooked if they are used in isolation. Intelligence tests have been criticized because of possible bias against minority groups (see Kaufman & Kauf- man, 1982; Oakland, 1977), other methods for identifying gifted minority children have been proposed for use in ethnic groups. In conclusion, the Committee wrote, the test may not be the best for some groups.

Intelligence Tests Yield More Than a Single Score

Although there are many definitions of "giftedness" and some debate about the actual attributes which define this trait, the stereotypical description of a "gifted" child who does not fit the stereotype of a child with high achievement and motivation. However, it is important to note that any test of creativity may be provided with instruments of unknown or limited empirical foundations.
1. Intelligence test scores should not be used to label the child or to determine that a child is gifted.

2. Gifted children, like all children, are valuable as individuals.

3. Intelligence test scores should not be used for placement in a gifted program.

The requirements of Public Law 94-142 should be followed in evaluating the decisions about the placement of gifted and talented children. A review of single processing techniques, rather than the sole criterion for placement in a gifted program.

It is important that professionals and administrators understand the primary reason that intelligence quotient scores are not used as the sole criterion for placement. Intelligence tests may not provide an unbiased reflection of the true abilities of children. The use of intelligence test scores may mask important strengths and weaknesses of a child.

For gifted children, particularly those who don't fit stereotypical patterns, interpretation of a profile of scores may indicate extreme abilities in some key areas, as well as low abilities in other areas, that would not be apparent if the single overall intelligence score was emphasized. Administrators and teachers, and parents, are better able to use intelligence tests that provide a variety of problem-solving tasks, such as in verbal, numerical, and figural areas, and that report separate scores for the different abilities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this paper was to present the positive aspects of using intelligence tests for the assessment of gifted and talented children. Intelligence tests have many positive aspects and when used properly, can supply reliable information that can be used to make decisions about classification and program plans for gifted and talented children, and to advocate the blanket use of intelligence tests without constraints. Intelligence tests, when used properly, are invaluable, but the following recommendations are considered by professionals who wish to use intelligence tests intelligently.
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