

The Training of Teachers for Gifted Pupils*

Bruce M. Shore

Cindy Kaizer

mcgill university

School programs and services for gifted children have grown substantially and this has led to a demand for new strategies in teacher training. The standards for professional education proposed by the Professional Training Institute of the National [USA] Association for Gifted Children invite criticism, partly because of their narrow view of graduate studies on giftedness, partly because of their doubtful relevance to Canadian practice. This paper offers an alternative to those standards.

Les programmes et les services offerts par les écoles aux enfants doués se sont nettement multipliés, ce qui a entraîné la nécessité de mettre au point de nouvelles stratégies dans le domaine de la formation des maîtres. Les normes en matière de formation professionnelle proposées par le Professional Training Institute de la National Association for Gifted Children aux É.-U. prêtent flanc à la critique en raison, d'une part, de l'optique étroite dont témoignent les études de deuxième et troisième cycles réalisées sur la douance et, d'autre part, de leur pertinence discutable eu égard à la réalité canadienne. C'est pourquoi l'auteur de cet article propose de nouvelles normes.

According to a panel of 21 experts in the education of the gifted, the most important element of a high-quality program for the gifted is the successful selection and appropriate training of teachers (Renzulli, 1975). We know little about how to do this, relying for the most part on consolidation of the general opinions of experts and, in some cases, of children who have benefited from such programs.

Does training teachers improve the education of the gifted? The balance of evidence is that it does. Trained teachers can better identify gifted children than untrained teachers. Several studies indicate that teachers who do not receive special training in the identification of giftedness overlook large numbers of students identified as gifted on the basis of IQ scores, while incorrectly identifying others as gifted (Borland, 1978; Ciha, Harris, Hoffman, & Potter, 1974; Cornish, 1968; Jacobs, 1972). This conclusion is somewhat

* Portions of this article were originally published in French in *Apprentissage et Socialisation*, 1983 September.

modified by new definitions of giftedness less dependent on IQ; teachers may respond to qualities not assessed by IQ or other tests. Teachers who know the qualities to encourage will make reliable and valid assessments. Gear (1978) shows that teacher effectiveness in identifying gifted students can be improved with specific training. He found that 24 randomly selected teachers taught the terminology of education for gifted learners—definitions of giftedness, selection criteria, the role of intelligence tests in the selection process, and the characteristics of gifted children—were twice as effective as a control group of teachers in identifying students considered gifted on the basis of various achievement and intelligence tests. This was achieved in five two-hour sessions and without increasing over-nominations.

Trained teachers are more supportive of gifted students and programs for the gifted. Teachers without special training have been apathetic and sometimes hostile towards the gifted (Sister Josephina, 1961; Wiener, cited in Martinson, 1972). Rothney and Sanborn (cited by Martinson, 1972) found that untrained teachers believe “the gifted will reveal themselves through academic grades, that they need all existing content plus more, and that teachers should add to existing curriculum requirements rather than delete anything” (p. 107). Research testifies widely to underachievement among many gifted children (cf. Whitmore, 1980), and to the need to replace—not merely add to—existing curriculum to serve adequately the gifted (cf. Gallagher, 1985).

Studies by Justmen, Rothney, and Wiener (cited in Martinson, 1972) found teachers experienced with special programs to be generally enthusiastic, and those lacking such experience, hostile. Martinson concludes that “Experience with programs and inservice preparation produces more favorable attitudes toward both gifted children and special programs” (p. 107). Further, studies reveal that 50% of teachers opposed acceleration despite overwhelming evidence such provision can be beneficial at all grade levels (George, Cohn, & Stanley, 1979). These surveys may be revealing a self-fulfilling prophecy—favourable teachers choosing to pursue training—but this qualification does not always apply. A favourable attitude, whether created or maintained by a training program, is to students’ advantage.

Teachers of the gifted are often confronted with students more knowledgeable and able learners than themselves. It is important that educators not feel threatened by such young people. Gifted pupils depend upon the honesty, maturity, humour, and personal development of a teacher (Bishop, 1968). A teacher training program can foster respect and understanding of others’ pursuit of excellence, and the ability to contribute to it. The world’s most outstanding athletes, musicians, actors, and other performers still have coaches and tutors, people who understand the processes underlying the performance and who are crucial to the successes we observe—although not as well known or as proficient themselves.

Trained teachers teach in ways they did not know before. A study by Martinson and Wiener (cited in Martinson, 1972) suggests that even highly competent teachers can improve their teaching skills through inservice training. "Changes in the quality of learning, communication, classroom content, and diversity of classroom experiences have resulted" (p. 43). Martinson found that teachers reported improved teaching skills, an increased knowledge of subject content, and a greater appreciation of gifted students needs after specialized preparation. Shiner (1986) reported that teacher saw similar improvements during an introductory course on the psychology of giftedness at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Despite these encouraging results, we still have to demonstrate conclusively that suitably changing teachers' behaviour enhances student learning.

Teachers of the gifted have responsibilities beyond curriculum development, instruction, and student nominations. As Lindsey (1980) points out, teachers must often fulfill an administrative role in the development, maintenance and improvement phases of a program:

The teacher of the gifted and the trainer of those teachers have to learn to be change agents in institutions that are often impervious to change, hostile to minority needs and threatened by critical and creative thinking. Educators must focus on training teachers of the gifted in the political strategies for overcoming the prevalent polarization between their ranks and the teachers in regular classrooms, between gifted students and their agemates, between gifted programs and the rest of the school, between the differentiated curriculum for the gifted and the regular district curriculum. However skilled teachers may be in specific classroom competencies, if they cannot generate support for their efforts, schools will not expand programs for gifted students. (cited in Richert, 1980, p. 64)

The last word on this topic belongs to the children:

We realize that personal relationships can provide a wonderful experience of closeness and understanding. This may not come about without special recognition for and insight into our needs. Loving parents meet those needs, even where they do not or have not perceived our giftedness; but recognition and help from our teachers is crucial to us. *These people who give of themselves, of their time and advice and large spirits, stretch us and help us to understand our bewildering selves.* This is no small gift; they deserve to be commended and recognized, too. (AAGC, 1978, pp. 64–65)

DIFFERENT MODELS OF TRAINING

The training of teachers for gifted pupils may occur in the bachelor's or master's degree, or in certificates or diplomas, in a preservice setting or in inservice courses during employment.

Very few institutions officially prepare teachers to teach the gifted during

initial teacher training. The argument in favour of doing so is that it enables a strong selection mechanism to operate, weeding out unsuitable teachers early. This "preventative" feature may be appropriate where prior certification is required to teach gifted children, but a majority of North American states and provinces do not yet have such restrictions. A much more powerful argument is that concern for individual differences and suitable pedagogy is best encouraged early in professional training, when it may encourage a positive attitude and approach to teaching that benefits all children. Unfortunately, the vast majority of "real" schools socialize teachers so trained into more common educational practice which, sadly, provides hardly at all for individualization.

Only a minority of Canadian faculties of education offer an undergraduate course on giftedness and the education of the gifted, though this minority has been growing steadily. Five years ago courses were on the books at the universities of British Columbia, Alberta, Calgary, York, McGill, and Concordia, and at the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education. These have since been joined by universities in Lethbridge, Regina, Ottawa, Montreal, and other institutions whose efforts have not yet received wide publicity. None, however, to our knowledge requires such a course as part of initial teacher training, though several compulsory introductory surveys of special education (for example, at Quebec universities) devote a lecture or two to the gifted.

Second, most institutions offering courses on the education of the gifted find that most registrants attend on an inservice basis. Experienced teachers are more likely appropriately to serve these children than do teachers-in-training. This is our recent experience at McGill, where an introductory class of 30 to 35 students on the gifted typically only have five or so full-time education students. The balance are from psychology or other programs. If teachers-in-training have difficulty fitting such a course into their schedules, this may be a sign of the course's priority.

Since research surveys show preservice teacher training is preoccupied with basic competence and classroom-management skills, since the training program bears only indirectly on education of gifted children, and since it may be sensible to spend more time on useful competencies and knowledge than on convincing people of the importance of the topic, it is increasingly the norm to train teachers of the gifted on an inservice basis after initial teacher training (National Association for Gifted Children, 1982).

The question how best to recognize such studies remains important. The NAGC proposals, suited to the American educational system, recommend basic training at the master's level, further training at a subsequent degree level that does not exist in Canada—the Specialist—and culminating in the doctorate for a few. The approximately corresponding levels in Canada

would be specialist diploma following a B.Ed. (or B.A. plus teaching certificate), a master's, and a doctorate. As will be evident in the details of the proposals outlined below, Canadians have not seriously considered training for different responsibilities and tasks. The Association for the Gifted of the Council for Exceptional Children is now beginning to discuss standards.

With allowance for the differences in nomenclature, is there justification for conformity in this regard? At this point there would seem to be one, convenience in the comparison of credentials. This facilitates exchanges, mobility, and an understanding of others' activities. In a minority educational interest, a sense of community is essential.

Should we have degrees in "gifted education"? How many of the greatest contributors to research and practice on giftedness have degrees as described above? Without intending offense to anyone whose name is omitted, few if any of the most cited authors of the last two decades—for example, Gallagher, Getzels, Gold, Gowan, Meeker, Passow, Sisk, Taylor, Torrance, or Ward, to name some of the most familiar—have a degree in the education of the gifted. Are they better served by having the strength of disciplinary training and applying their interests and talents to giftedness? To be fair, a small number of frequently cited experts have such training; the best-known example is Renzulli, who studied with Ward. Some of Torrance's and Gowan's graduates are also well known. It may be wise to maintain a balance and keep doors open.

Are there risks in regarding the training of teachers of the gifted as a graduate-level activity? To counterbalance the advantage of setting a high level of expected performance, there is a risk that the master's degree will be seriously or further devalued by the absence of specific prerequisites for study at this level. Various countries will see this differently; in the U.S.A., teacher training after a bachelor's degree commonly leads to a master's degree. In Canada it is a certificate, diploma or "B.Ed. after." Graduate study in most disciplines follows undergraduate specialization in the same or a related field, or, for students changing topics, an additional period of qualification. One of the tasks remaining, therefore, in teacher education for the gifted may be to become more specific about the prerequisite knowledge and skills for persons who undertake such study. Alternatively, we may just have to accept the premise that, as for other professional studies—perhaps law is a good example—there are few specific, definable academic prerequisites.

Should it be mandatory that teachers of the gifted be certified? The assurance of a minimum level of competence may guarantee only the minimum. Does a paper marked "Education of the Gifted" provide the only route to competence? Certification may protect a corps of trained and committed teachers from personnel cuts, but the category can be protected without certification. There is increasing pressure for certification, especially

in the U.S.A. It may also appear in Canada as a consequence, not necessarily intended, of Ontario's Bill 82 (now part of the *Ontario Education Act*), which mandates services for gifted learners, and has put them on an equal footing with other special education services since 1985 September. Other provinces are likely to copy Ontario's initiative. Our own view on certification is cautious:

Should we begin to list and cheer those jurisdictions that avoid it so outstanding individuals who have arrived by highly individualized routes may teach our gifted children (or any others)? Certification probably ossifies the familiar paths of least resistance and rarely leads to innovation. Certification should be a question mark, not a goal at this stage of the development of this art and science. (Shore, 1982; cf. Shore, 1979, 1983)

THE CONTENT OF A PROGRAM OF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The recently proposed standards of the draft Professional Training Institute Committee Reports (NAGC, 1982), here supplemented by our observations from subsequent meetings with the authors, consider five themes: (1) professional standards for programs of education for the gifted; (2) inservice training in education of gifted learners; (3) university course content; (4) certification requirements; and (5) master's and doctoral degree standards.

A sixth working group studied the issue of research and established a liaison with the graduate degrees group (point 5). This document remains a working draft of experts' recommendations with occasional mentions of Canadian practice.

General professional training standards. Institutions must establish explicit admissions criteria in any program. Although obvious, this is an essential step if programs at successive levels are to be cumulative and not repetitive. Standards also permit but do not guarantee candidates' breadth and depth of experience and previous training, likelihood of continuing self-improvement, and appropriate personality characteristics. Generally, tight controls on approval in Canadian provinces have forced the few Canadian programs that deal with giftedness to adopt explicit admissions standards. Some of these standards apply to previous education without considering matters of content, a defensible compromise.

The NAGC standards require that the teacher education curriculum include studies on the education of gifted learners and related topics, among them (a) identification and definitions, (b) curriculum models, (c) teaching methods, (d) program development and evaluation, and (e) child development. There should be a supervised practicum, written work, research (very broadly defined), and a comprehensive examination. The study of related

areas is loosely defined. This standard enjoys wide consensus among persons in charge of such programs and among those developing new programs.

Such programs should be offered only at the graduate level. In 1983 Canadian participants in the NAGC committees obtained agreement that in jurisdictions where the nomenclature is different, a post-bachelor's diploma could be regarded as meeting this standard (assuming the other criteria were met). The programs should also practice what they preach about (a) flexibility and individualization, (b) interdisciplinary approaches, (c) balancing theory and practice, (d) encouraging self-directed learning, (e) providing opportunity to conduct independent research, and the requirement of (f) relevant field experience and (g) developing content area mastery. Master's (or post-bachelor's degree diploma) programs should train practitioners in leadership, supervision, administration, and research, and retraining experienced educators already specialized in other fields. Doctoral programs are less explicitly prescribed.

Canadian universities such as British Columbia, Calgary, Lethbridge, Alberta, O.I.S.E., Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec Montreal, and McGill offer study at the master's or doctoral level in some subjects with an emphasis on the gifted. The field is growing almost too quickly to catalogue. Until recently, only the Diploma in the Psychology and Education of the Gifted and an option in the M.Ed. in Educational Psychology at McGill dealt explicitly with the gifted, although the situation is shifting quickly. It probably does not matter whether or not the word "gifted" is in the title; it is more important that suitable resources support the program. Programs that permit the study of giftedness within other contexts can also use the proposed standards as guidelines for development. If they do not, it will become increasingly difficult to defend the quality of what is done against one of the most important standards in academia, the judgment of peers.

The recommendations describe qualities of faculty members regularly involved in graduate programs on giftedness and we present these further on.

The standards propose that, in addition to the doctorate, faculty in any program should include at least three holders of doctorates in related fields. This is intended to assure an adequate level of support for doctoral study with a substantial research component. This is not generally a problem in Canadian universities, including faculties of education, at this stage in their evolution. The recommendation principally stems from faculty qualifications and size in small United States colleges. If there is an implication for Canadian institutions, it might be that teacher-training programs for the gifted should not be located at CEGEPs, CAATs, or other institutions where the research-based doctorate and an ongoing scholarly involvement is not a general requirement for employment.

Any program should be the object of regular review, an increasingly common event in university life. To be effective, a set of external standards

such as these can provide at least some useful bases for the collection of data.

Institutions must have the resources to implement the programs they advertise. In absolute terms, resources in Canada are modest; in relative terms they are good. There are more United States institutions offering programs, but many of these are in small colleges with limited research activity. Only a handful of American institutions have more than one person working in the field, and few other than Columbia Teachers College, the University of Connecticut, or Purdue University, have extensive library collections on giftedness. A consortium of universities, led by Teachers College, operated a promising doctoral program from 1976 to 1982 with U.S. federal support, and though the consortium ceased to function it stimulated development of several doctoral programs (Tannenbaum, 1982). The problem remains that graduates are absorbed primarily into high level professional positions; very few carry on to pursue the fundamental research they were trained to conduct.

In Canada a larger percentage of our universities now offer instruction on giftedness, and opportunities for graduate studies are increasing rapidly. Most institutions still have only one person active in the field, even if only on part-time, sessional, or limited-term appointments, but an increasing number have more than one (for instance, British Columbia, Alberta, Calgary, Ottawa, McGill). Since university budgets are unlikely to grow, those of us already involved in the field may encourage colleagues to add giftedness to their interests, thus expanding academic commitment. The topic lends itself well to such an approach. Research funds are increasingly available for projects on giftedness. Several good library collections exist and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada has provided a grant to the Education Library at McGill under its "Collections of National Significance" program to build a retrospective collection.¹ The goal is to maintain a world-class collection in Canada that also contains important Canadian materials.

Links between Canadian institutions offering advanced studies on giftedness are especially needful. Bilateral contacts (for example, in our case, with Lethbridge, Alberta, and Ottawa) have not yet led to ongoing collaboration. Canadian members of The Association for the Gifted (over 400 of TAG's 2000 members) have had a Governor-at-Large for Canada since 1985, and the TAG newsletter now includes regular information about Canada. TAG Canada, founded in 1978, fizzled after three or four years. A federation of healthy provincial associations, and an association of interested university persons—perhaps in the Canadian Society for the Study of Education and linked by computer through NetNorth—would lead to a national community of scholar-practitioners in the field. At a meeting sponsored by the Ontario Council for Leadership in Educational Administration in 1987 April, university instructors centrally concerned with giftedness and from across Canada

tried to establish a communications link.

Inservice education. In a report containing many proposals for action, the committee on inservice training argued this mode suitable not only for educators, but also for parents and the general public. The goals are generally affective rather than competence-oriented. To some extent, programs for the gifted are "high educational technology" and depend on well-conceived inservice programs.

In the early stage of development of programs, an inservice model is critical in publicizing the need for programs.

Course content. Courses on education of gifted learners fall into three categories: basic, advanced, and related.

Basic courses take five forms, introductory survey, program planning and development, creativity, pedagogy, and practicum. Related courses include reading for the gifted, learning styles and information processing, counseling, subject areas, measurement, and others. Advanced courses include, for example, research, independent study and practica.

The proposal for the introductory survey embraces the following content as a minimum: "history, major research, philosophies, definitions, characteristics and needs of the gifted. Identification procedures, general program approaches, curriculum development theories, program development issues, special populations, and teacher characteristics and competencies" (p. 13). The second course, on methodology, is proposed to include "skill in promoting higher cognitive thinking abilities and questioning techniques; skill in facilitating independent research and study skills; ability to develop creative problem-solving skills; ability to utilize computer technology; and skill in individualizing teaching techniques" (p. 13).

The proposals insist strongly on the practicum requirement. This presents a serious problem for institutions developing new professional training programs in anticipation of a growing need for such training in nearby schools. A practicum requires a place in which to practice. A small or nonexistent school program cannot support a training practicum. Demonstration summer schools, such as those now available at McGill, previously at York, and perhaps at Ottawa in the future, are useful substitutes. Even as school programs mature, the summer session provides opportunities carefully to select demonstration teachers, to assure a high concentration and a large number of extremely capable children for both training and research, and to bring together educators of the gifted from across the country for exchange.

The proposal for advanced practica also depends on an infrastructure not widely available in Canada.

Examples include assistant to a national, state, or intermediate agency consultant; teaching assistant at a college or university; research assistant in education of the

gifted; supervisor of basic level practica participants and developer of grants and proposals. These experiences are designed according to the individual career goals of the advanced student. (p. 13)

Subject-matter expertise contributes directly to teacher success with gifted children. Not only the content, but the teacher's enthusiasm, have substantial effects. Expertise might extend beyond the curriculum to include philosophy, anatomy, physiology, advanced mathematics, architecture, urban planning, and so on. A Charlie Brown poster asks "How can you do 'new math' problems with an 'old math' mind?" How can teachers help children extend themselves to the limits of the study of a topic, to recognize and ask questions that have not been asked before, if they have not done so themselves? The advanced study of a specific subject or of its pedagogy provides such an opportunity and, no less important, a test of the teacher's intellectual and creative mettle.

Certification. The NAGC proposes two groupings of courses into recognized programs. The first is a general program of (a) at least four single-semester courses on the basic content described above, (b) at least three courses in a content area, and (c) a practicum. The second is for teachers of the fine and performing arts.

Two certification routes are proposed, one through the 9-credit content block, and the other for persons with demonstrated records of achievement over an extended period of time as judged by a jury of recognized experts.

These minima are to be filled out by the additional requirements of a master's degree at a U.S. institution. In most Canadian universities this would mean a diploma or certificate, not necessarily at the nominal "graduate" level, though it might be part of a master's degree of, say, two years' duration.

Some states presently certify teachers with only a course or two and some inservice experience. This proposed standard is intended to ensure specific competencies and to make such certification, whether mandatory or not, an objective commensurate with the responsibility for educating the gifted. Although in Canada such a program is not sufficient for a master's degree, one might insist that students seeking certification offer work at a graduate or, to use another term largely foreign to the U.S.A., an "honours undergraduate level."

Certification in education of the gifted is not yet mandatory in any Canadian province. Ontario has offered a specialized certificate for several years. It is a minimal qualification requiring one introductory course. Two further courses with practica are also offered by the Ministry of Education at several institutions. Other programs available in Canada lead to recognition by a university but not to a provincial specialist certificate. A large specialist association of teachers of the gifted exists in British Columbia under the aegis of the provincial teachers' federation.

Graduate degrees. The NAGC proposals promote a general degree pattern resembling nonthesis or professional master's degrees at most Canadian universities. The NAGC Research Committee (prompted by a Canadian member) asked the newly combined Master's and Doctoral Committee to make explicit an alternative research-oriented master's route. The alternative would resemble a Canadian master's degree with thesis and would be especially appropriate either for persons not intending to teach but seeking a research or other professional career, or for trained teachers who wish to extend their research skills.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS

The NAGC's four requirements are as follows:

1. completion of at least three (3) courses in education of gifted learners,
2. publication of articles in the area of education of gifted learners and/or relevant research in progress or completed,
3. a minimum of two (2) years of successful teaching in a "regular" classroom setting and some experience working with gifted children,
4. membership and participation in national, state and local professional organizations focusing on education of the gifted.

Furthermore, the report cautions that teaching on education of gifted learners must not be completely assigned to sessional instructors. The idea of taking courses should be interpreted widely; an experienced professional can surely gain equivalent competence on a less formal schedule from a suitable combination of independent reading, attendance at conferences, and workshops.

Faculty members with major responsibilities in graduate programs should hold the doctorate with advanced study in gifted education, or have competence in the field as demonstrated by significant research, writing or leadership in gifted education. Faculty members who conduct the advanced programs should be engaged in scholarly activity that supports their specialization in the field, and have experience which relates directly to gifted education. . . . Institutional policy must reflect a commitment to gifted/talented education. (p. 2)

Additional requirements are enumerated later in the document:

5. Formal and informal post-doctoral study in gifted education to maintain professional qualifications.
6. Competence in the development, execution and review of advanced programs.

7. Evidence of effective performance, including modeling appropriate teaching strategies.
8. Wide intellectual interests beyond the field of education.
9. Communication skills appropriate to many populations; that is, with professional colleagues; with children; with undergraduate students; with graduate students; with parents, with community leaders; with legislators; with the media; orally and in writing.
10. Organization skills utilized to provide master's candidates with a variety of approaches to motivation and evaluation of gifted students.
11. Evidence of ability to encourage and recruit students of exceptional talents to prepare for careers in gifted education.

Some institutions may have difficulty meeting this standard. In Canada, most faculty members in leading graduate programs on giftedness do not have degrees in the area, but have other expertise. In almost all cases this is in educational psychology or a closely related field. A handful of recently graduated specialists are precariously located in "soft-money" limited term positions. The level of research involvement is modest but growing, and the dispersion of these resources across the country will remain a problem. There are few postdoctoral positions in Canada and little support for the intensive research activity that characterizes post-doctoral work in most disciplines. The NAGC recommendations do not allow explicitly for an established scholar who would move into the area of education for gifted learners. On the other hand, any institution that could attract a group of faculty who collectively met most of these criteria would be doing very well. Not all these roles may be easily filled by one or every person; some differentiated staffing would be consistent with the standards.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the NAGC standards are helpful to designers of new programs. They may be useful as guides to the evaluation of current practice. Only a handful of Canadian universities have programs that meet, or are on their way to meeting, most of these criteria.

They are in large measure "armchair" guidelines. Although concocted by eminent contributors, and representative of reputable programs, the impact of implementing part or parts of these standards, or failing to do so, is unknown. Canadian institutions could play a useful role in assessing that impact.

For many reasons—pedagogical, administrative, and psychological—training for teachers of the gifted will continue to develop in our universities and school systems, whether for teachers explicitly involved or for classroom teachers generally.

REFERENCES

- American Association for Gifted Children (AAGC). (1978). *On being gifted*. New York: Walker.
- Bishop, W. E. (1968). Successful teachers of the gifted. *Exceptional Children*, 34, 317–325.
- Borland, J. (1978). Teaching identification of the gifted: A new look. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 2, 22–32.
- Ciha, T., Harris, R., Hoffman, C., & Potter, M. (1974). Parents as identifiers of giftedness: ignored but accurate. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 18, 191–195.
- Cornish, R. L. (1968). Parents', pupils', and teachers' perception of the gifted child's ability. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 12, 14–17.
- Gallagher, J. J. (1985). *Teaching the gifted child* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gear, G. (1978). Effects of training on teachers' accuracy in the identification of gifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 22, 90–97.
- George, W. C., Cohn, S. J., & Stanley, J. C. (Eds.) (1979). *Educating the gifted: Acceleration and enrichment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1972). Teacher attitude toward gifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 16, 23–26.
- Lindsey, M. (1980). *Training teachers of the gifted and talented*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Martinson, R. A. (1972). *Education of the gifted and talented* (Vol. 2). Background Papers Submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Association for Gifted Children. (1982). *[Professional Training Institute] Committee reports*. St. Paul, MN: National Association for Gifted Children. (Available from the NAGC, 4175 Lovell Road, Suite 140, Circle Pines, MN 55014; US\$5 per set.)
- Renzulli, J. S. (1975). Identifying key features in programs for the gifted. In W. B. Barbe & J. S. Renzulli (Eds.), *Psychology and education of the gifted* (2nd ed.) (pp. 742–775). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Richert, S. E. (1980). [Review of *Training teachers of the gifted and talented*.] *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 4, 63–65.
- Shiner, S. M. (1986). Design and implementation of a humanistic, holistic training program for teachers of the gifted. *Gifted International*, 3, 64–77.
- Shore, B. M. (1983). La formation des maîtres affectés à l'enseignement pour enfants doués. *Apprentissage et Socialisation*, 6, 170–181.
- Shore, B. M. (1982). Reflections on educating teachers for the gifted. *Gifted International*, 1, 119–127.
- Shore, B. M. (1979). Teacher education for the gifted and major issues in gifted child education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 4(3), 75–88.
- Josephina, [Sister]. (1961). Teachers' reactions to gifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 5, 42–44.
- Tannenbaum, A. J. (1982). *Final technical report: Graduate Leadership Education Project, Gifted and Talented*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Department of Special Education.
- Whitmore, J. R. (1980). *Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

hat zu einer Nachfrage nach neuen Richtungen in der Lehrerausbildung geführt. Die vom US-amerikanischen Professional Training Institute of the National Association for Gifted Children vorgelegten Richtlinien zur akademischen Fachausbildung laden zur Kritik ein, und zwar zum Teil wegen ihrer engefassten Sicht von akademischer Forschung im Bezug auf Begabung, und zum Teil wegen ihrer zweifelhaften Relevanz für die kanadische Praxis. Diese Arbeit schlägt eine Alternative zu diesen Richtlinien vor.

Los programas escolares y los servicios para niños excepcionales han crecido sustancialmente lo que ha producido cierta demanda para nuevas estrategias de enseñanza. El criterio para la educación profesional propuesto por la Asociación Americana para Niños excepcionales tuvo ciertas críticas por la limitación de los estudiantes graduados en excepcionalidad, y por la dudosa aplicabilidad en la experiencia Canadiense. Este artículo ofrece una alternativa para dichos criterios.

Bruce M. Shore and Cindy Kaizer are in the Faculty of Education, McGill University, 3700 McTavish Street, Montreal, Quebec H3A 1Y2.