A STUDY OF PRACTICES IN TEXAS SCHOOLS RELATING TO GIFTED EDUCATION IN THE VISUAL ARTS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Elizabeth Netherland, B.F.A., B.S.Ed.
Denton, Texas
August, 1986

Netherland, Elizabeth B. A Study of Practices in Texas Schools Relating to Gifted Education in the Visual Arts. Master of Art (Art Education), August, 1986, 100 pp., 4 tables, bibliography, 43 entries.

The purpose of the study was to determine a definitive description of "artistic giftedness."

A questionnaire was sent to Texas art teachers to find what characteristics they attribute to the artistically gifted, how they determine this, and what program goals they set.

The wide variety of survey responses indicates the diversity of artistically gifted individuals. The high rating on all items indicates that all could be used as identifiers (higher rated characteristics identifying a larger population, lower rated ones, a smaller population). Responses to items dealing with identification indicate non-test methods to be most widely used. No connection was found between goals chosen and either characteristics or methods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Here's Johnny. . . . And his name really is Johnny. He's sort of a mixed-up kid; but he's too polite and considerate to tell anyone. Besides, he really does not know what the problem is. He is interested in so many things. He plays several musical instruments, speaks two languages, has made up his own television show, including plot, directions, and characters, and has actually followed through with it to the extent of talking to professionals about producing it. He knows he has some artistic abilities and loves to draw. He does not copy--he makes up his own. He has moved around frequently, and he is always interested in the things around him. In school, he is always the first to answer the teachers' questions, and the teachers always seem satisfied. But lately, his grades have started going down. He knows the answers, and makes excellent grades on tests. But his daily work has not been completed or turned in. His parents are horrified, because he is failing several courses. His parents do not understand; his teachers do not understand; actually Johnny does not understand. Johnny does not cause any problems in class. He is always responsive and well behaved--but he is not getting his daily work

turned in. His parents are loving and supportive, but Johnny knows that they are confused and disappointed. He is getting more nervous every day, and this does not help his attention span in class. He forgets to turn in work and forgets to do certain homework assignments. He has lost his sketchbook for art class. He was in honors classes, but now his grades are not good enough for those. To a seventh grader who cares, these are pretty big problems. The problem does not stem from watching too much television, his parents refuse to own one. He is not involved in sports at school, because he is too sensitive to understand the pressures. His parents, sensing his need for physical activity, encouraged him to play tennis. He likes this sport. He is an attractive boy who is interested in his appearance. He gets along well with his peers and has excellent social skills. Johnny is a person with real problems. He is gifted. That should not be a problem; but it is because no one at his school recognized his particular needs, much less was equipped to deal with them.

Many educators and other professionals believe that the gifted student of today will be a major contributor whose work will greatly affect our society. It is believed that although interest in the subject of gifted education has grown, our government and society, especially in Texas, must take even more interest in the potential of this small population. Even less attention has been given to the

creatively gifted and artistically gifted in the State of Texas.

Because gifted individuals encompass such a wide range of traits and behaviors, there is no single definition for giftedness. There is not a complete consensus as to the definition of or the characteristics of the gifted individual. However, many authorities believe that a special understanding of the gifted student is needed and that in addition to this, those students must be dealt with in ways differing from other students (Clark, 1979; Lowenfeld, 1957; Renzulli, 1977; Gallagher, 1975; Newland, 1976; Khatena, 1982; TEA, n.d.). In order to deal with the needs of these students, instructors must be aware of those needs and deal with them in ways which differ from those used in regular classroom settings. It is agreed by many educators that special and specific training is necessary to provide those teachers with knowledge and training of strategies, so that those students can benefit (Gowan, 1971; Sanderlin, 1979). Some states have special requirements for their teachers of gifted and talented students (Clark, 1979). But only one out of every six teachers of the gifted has had any formal training for teaching the gifted (Lyon, 1981). Although classes for the gifted do exist, there has not been a national mandatory requirement for provision of gifted classes in the nation's schools (Clark, 1979). Therefore, states provide their own regulations. Seventeen states have

laws mandating appropriate education for all gifted children and another thirty-three have provided guidelines for gifted programs (Lyon, 1981). In the State of Texas, gifted education is not mandatory. However, there are regulations for those school districts which apply for government assistance for their gifted programs. Comprehensive guidelines for planning and implementing exemplary programs are provided for those schools who request them, but there is no provision for artistically gifted students. Schools without state funding have set up their own programs, with their own teacher requirements, their own means of identification, and their own curriculum (TEA, n.d.).

Need for the Study

The Texas Education Agency (n.d.) recommends that school districts provide special programs for the gifted. Since this is not a mandate, there are no regulations for determining qualifications for teachers of the gifted and no regulations for curriculum or strategies, except in the case that a school district applies for state funds. Furthermore, there are no regulations for specific visual arts gifted programs at all. It is of interest to know if art teachers recognize the specific needs of the gifted student and if there is any consensus among them as to the specific needs of the artistically gifted. It is possible that many students have been neglected because they have not been

recognized as gifted. It is also possible that even though identified, the type of instruction they receive is not the type that will meet their needs.

In the Marland Report of 1969, it was revealed that 57% of school administrators were unaware of any special needs of the gifted and talented population. A survey in the late 70's showed that out of a representative group of principals, 57.5% stated that they had no gifted students in their schools (Vernon, Adamson, & Vernon, 1977). Salome (1974) reported a scarcity of information about individualized instruction for students gifted in the arts. With systems geared to the average child, a high percentage of children drop out of school. "Wasting the potential of a gifted mind is reckless for a society in desperate need of creativity and inventiveness" (Lyon, 1981, p. 20GS). "It is imperative that the teacher should be sensitive to the abilities and interests of gifted children, and should be competent to decide on the best method of helping them to develop those abilities" (Shields, 1973, p. 92). Not only will the lack of proper guidance have an effect on progress of the child, but it could also cause the student to withdraw from art activities entirely (Salome, 1974). Our nation's greatest national resources are our future inventors, teachers, and artists, and their potential must be nurtured (Bruch, 1984). Lowenfeld (1957) feels that one of the most difficult problems in the field of education is providing for the

artistically gifted because of the extreme individuality of the children. What evidence do we have that this is happening? Are they being reached? Is their potential being developed?

In the 1983 Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, it was reported that over one-half of gifted students failed to match tested ability with comparable achievement in school (Bruch, 1984). Without specific state regulations regarding the characteristics of the gifted in the visual arts or specific regulations for the identification of these students, how do we know that their needs are being met? If experts define gifted as those individuals who show potential, then all programs should be designed to identify and instruct all gifted children. However, if only children who are identified by high I.Q., high achievement scores, good grades, and good behavior, are admitted into gifted programs, what happens to the student who demonstrates only "potential" without demonstrating any of the other more standard traits? How is this potential discovered?

Statement of the Problem

Research into the field of gifted education reveals many and varied definitions of gifted, talented and creative individuals. There is even less agreement as to the definitions for those who are considered gifted, talented, or

creative in the field of art. What definitions do Texas art teachers use? Is there a common thread in what they believe? Are all potentially gifted students being identified? Understanding the nature of giftedness is at the heart of all planning efforts for the education of these students (Passow, 1981). Even the ability to define giftedness is listed as one of the first requirements of effective teaching of gifted students in M. Lindsey's book, Training Teachers of the Gifted and Talented (Lindsey, 1980). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to survey the views of Texas art teachers to find out the following:

1. What characteristics do the teachers attribute to gifted students?
2. By what means are the gifted in art being identified?
3. What are the goals of their programs for the artistically gifted?

Methodology

As the study was meant to examine the opinions of art teachers in Texas public schools, the survey method was chosen. In order to develop a questionnaire, research was done to examine existing authoritative opinions on characteristics of giftedness, identification methods being used or suggested for use, and goals suggested for use in programs for the artistically gifted. Lists of characteristics, identification methods, and goals were compiled from these sources and were arranged into a questionnaire form.

This questionnaire was then sent to five experts in the field for suggestions and opinions. Changes and additions were then made before the survey was sent.

As the surveys were returned, the data from each was then entered into a computer file for storage. When one hundred twenty-five answered surveys were returned, the data was calculated by totaling the number and percentages of answers to each item concerning characteristics. These were then charted to display the results. The weighted mean average of each response item was calculated and then sorted in order of highest to lowest. This was then presented in chart form. The number of identification methods chosen by each participant was then totaled and charted. The number of goals chosen by each participant was totaled and charted. Charts were then made to arrange items in order of most-chosen to least-chosen. Finally, some cross referencing was done in individual sections and between sections in order to compare some information for aid in analysis.

Scope and Limitations

The survey was meant to determine the opinions of Texas art teachers on the subject of gifted education in the visual arts. A list was acquired from the TEA of all Texas School districts who had some kind of program for which they had identified gifted students. Individual districts were then chosen randomly from this list. Letters were then sent

to art consultants or supervisors of districts from various parts of Texas, asking for names and addresses of art teachers presently employed in those districts. From those lists, specific names were chosen at random and a survey was sent to each. Five hundred surveys were sent in January of 1986. By March, only ninety-eight had responded with answered questionnaires. In order to obtain a more representative number, one hundred additional questionnaires were sent in February. Twenty-three more answered questionnaires were received by April. Results were tabulated at this time.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruch, C. (1984). Schooling for the gifted: Where do we go from here? Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(1), 2-16.

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gallagher, J. (1975). Teaching the gifted child (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gowan, J., & Bruch, C. (1971). The academically talented student and guidance. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Khatena, J. (1982). Educational psychology of the gifted. New York: Wiley.

Lindsey, M. (1980). Training teachers of the gifted and talented. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lowenfeld, V. (1957). Creative and mental growth (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Lyon, H. (1981). Our most neglected natural resource. Today's Education, February, 19GS-21GS.

Newland, T. (1976). The gifted in socioeducational perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Passow, A. (1981). The nature of giftedness and talent. Gifted Child Quarterly, 25(1), 5-10.

Renzulli, J. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Salome, R. (1974). Identifying and instructing the gifted in art. Art Education, 27(3), 16-19.

Sanderlin, O. (1979). Gifted children. New York: Barnes.

Shields, B. (1973). The gifted child. New York: Humanities Press.

Texas Education Agency. (n.d.). The Texas state plan and guidelines for the education of the gifted and talented. Austin, TX: Author.

Vernon, P., Adamson, G., & Vernon, D. (1977). The psychology and education of gifted children. Boulder, CO: Viewpoint Press.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Giftedness has been defined in many ways and broken down into specific areas of giftedness. Most comprehensive research is based on general academic giftedness, so it is necessary to understand the problems created by trying to define even this major category.

Definitions of Giftedness

The U.S. Office of Education definition:

> Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who, by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs in order to realize their contribution to self and society. Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination:
>
> 1. General intellectual ability,
> 2. Specific academic aptitude,
> 3. Creative or productive thinking,
> 4. Leadership ability,
> 5. Visual or performing arts,
> 6. Psychomotor ability (USOE, 1972).

A major authority on giftedness, Joe Renzulli (1978), objects to this definition because it includes no reference to motivation. He feels that the components of giftedness are: greater than average ability, creativity, and motivation (or task commitment), and that these should be present

simultaneously and manifested in some kind of project or performance.

Barbara Clark, author of Growing Up Gifted, defines the gifted as "people who have developed high levels of intellectual ability or who show promise of such development. A person who has a high level of development of the sensing function would be designated as talented" (Clark, 1979, p. 5). Mendelowitz defines the talented child as one

> who has received, for one reason or another, sufficient satisfaction from a certain kind of activity to participate in it more frequently and with more intensity than most children in the same age group, and so has developed his capacities beyond the average of his group (Mendelowitz, 1963, p. 21).

The Texas Education Agency uses the terms gifted and talented synonymously and defines them much like Clark:

> Gifted and talented students are those who excel consistently or who show the potential to excel in any one or combination of the following areas: general intellectual ability, specific subject matter aptitude, creative and productive thinking ability, leadership ability, ability in the visual and performing arts, and psychomotor ability. These students require educational experiences beyond those normally provided by the regular school program (TEA, n.d., p. 7).

Defining artistic giftedness presents many of the same problems, encountering conflicts also among the terms gifted, talented, and creative. It was only in 1972 that the Marland Report acknowledged the population of artistically gifted children (USOE, 1972). The Council for

Exceptional Children now includes a definition of students gifted in artistic ability and one for creative ability:

> The student gifted in 'artistic ability' means an individual who shows skill in such visual arts as painting, sculpting, or creating with materials or who demonstrate talents or ability in such performing arts as dramatics, dancing, singing, movement, or music. A student gifted in 'creative ability' means an individual who possesses the ability to integrate seemingly unrelated information to formulate new solutions or the ability to manipulate accepted operations into the productions of unique outcomes (Grossi, 1980, p. 24).

The council explains that skill should be significantly greater than the age of a child usually allows, and that those children with artistic ability should demonstrate some sense of a basic command of media, either orally, emotionally, or tactilely. Creativity is further explained as referring to artistic ability, but more to mental process as used to produce both tangible and intangible end products involving the use of higher level thinking and problem-solving skills (Grossi, 1980).

The Texas Education Agency offers no definition or guidelines for the education of the artistically gifted individuals, however, it does offer a glossary of terms adapted from the Idaho State Department of Education. In this glossary, artistically gifted would come under the definition of visual and performing arts, which is: ". . . those students who have demonstrated or indicated outstanding ability or potential in areas such as art, music, drama, speech, and language" (Idaho State Department

of Education, n.d., p. 1). Clark and Zimmerman (1984) believe that creativity, as measured by tests, is only nominally related to ability in the arts, and that as yet, knowledge about art talent is fragmentary and incomplete. Lowenfeld and Brittain (1964) said that intelligence tests show no sign of artistic giftedness. A number of other art educators, cited by Clark and Zimmerman (1984), believe that a relationship does exist between intelligence and art ability. Authoritative definitions of gifted art ability are hard to find. Instead of defining it, some authorities assign specific characteristics to it. Visually artistic students have manual skill, energy, perceptual facility, aesthetic intelligence, creative imagination and aesthetic judgment (Meier, 1939). They have a tendency to experience things visually and to represent, suggest, and symbolize in visual terms (Munro, 1942). Lark-Horovitz, Lewis, and Luca (1967) did not define artistically gifted children, but did devote separate chapters to artistic giftedness and creativity. Cagne (1985) states that a major trend of opinion shows no distinction between gifted and talented, legislation passed in Delaware which separates the two being the major exception. Cagne sees the contrast as being between intelligence (giftedness) and other non-I.Q. derived abilities (talent), citing several authorities as being in general agreement. Cagne, along with Fraser (1980),

believes that the kind of program should dictate the definitions of those who participate.

Characteristics of Giftedness

If the problem of defining giftedness is difficult, the problem of assigning characteristics to those termed to be gifted is even more so. Research suggests a wide range of commonly used characteristics and terms. It would be advisable to keep in mind a range of terms cited by Coleman (1985, p. 14):

many interests	single interests
general ability	specific ability
balanced	unbalanced
well rounded	unidimensional
committed	uninvolved
demonstrated	potential
stability	instability

The very broadness of definitional terms creates shortcomings in identification and program goals. Because so many varieties are recognized, there is a need for separate procedures for identification. Coleman recommends that it would be best not to have an absolute definition of giftedness, as the definitions constantly change with the results of new research. Recent research showing that creativity is not synonymous with intelligence and that creativity may be nurtured, could have startling implications for the future.

Knowing these traits is a very important part of educating the gifted. It is a mistake to think of a gifted child as only one who has a high I.Q. "The term gifted

refers to individuals who are functioning at high levels of intellectual ability" (Clark, 1979, p. 34). What gifted educators are interested in is the capacity the student has for learning. As there are no measures for capacity, those who identify the gifted use other means. Although the more gifted an individual is, the more unique he is, there are some characteristics which recur. "Knowledge of all the characteristics may avail our attempts to optimize learning environments and understand the demands higher levels of intelligence make on individuals within our society" (Clark, 1979, p. 21). It must be noted that there are basic differences between the gifted child and the high achiever's ability to generalize, use abstract ideas, and synthesize diverse relationships. The gifted child exhibits these qualities in a manner far above the high achiever, and exhibits them at an earlier time. Although high achievers generally function better with knowledge and comprehension level learning and get good grades, gifted students have more range and diversity.

Clark (1979) has devised a chart which lists the differentiating characteristics of the gifted child and shows the possible concomitant problems and related needs. She recommends what she calls a "responsive environment" for gifted children. This is one which allows the students to interact, to help in the choosing of their own learning style and pace. In this kind of environment the teacher

acts more as a facilitator or resource person and is ready with additional experiences available ahead of their observed need (Renzulli, 1977). Clark believes the strength of interaction with the environment determines how much a person can develop. She is supported scientifically by others (Rosenzweig, 1966; Dobzhansky, 1964; Cattell, 1971).

Clark charts the differential cognitive characteristics so that qualitatively different planning can be done which will provide ways to encourage processes of understanding, analyzing, organizing, integrating, and evaluating. For instance, the advanced comprehension and unusual retentiveness of the gifted child necessitate a varied, new, and challenging curriculum. Without this, students become bored with the curriculum, impatient with slower learners, and display a dislike of routine and drill. They need to be exposed to varied subjects and be allowed to pursue individual ideas as far as it takes them, because they sometimes have difficulty in conforming to groups. They must be monitored though, because many times they overextend themselves (Getzells & Jackson, 1962). Their high level of language development, sometimes perceived as "showing off," must be directed to increasingly difficult vocabulary and concepts. Gifted students' accelerated and flexible thought processes lead to activity which is sometimes seen as disruptive. This necessitates their being exposed to varieties of ideas at many levels and at an individual pace, and their

being allowed to solve problems in diverse ways. Their capacity for seeing unusual relationships necessitates time for experimenting with new ideas and materials without being considered "off the subject." They should be exposed to alternatives, abstractions, consequences of choice, to pursue inquiries beyond allotted time span, and to set and evaluate priorities.

Clark also charts differential affective characteristics of the gifted. Teachers can help children learn to use their own cognitive powers in order to make sense of their world. The program successfully adapted to gifted individuals provides opportunities to bring emotional knowledge and assumptions to awareness (Gowan, 1971). The effective teacher can aid them in applying verbal ability and inquiry and research skills to serve affective development. Gifted children many times feel isolated, vulnerable to criticism, and have feelings of failure because of high goal-setting. A teacher who understands these needs can help students form more realistic goals, relate better to others, and clarify personal values and share them in a non-defensive manner.

The third realm of differential characteristics is that of the physical (sensation). Often, gifted students have a wide discrepancy between their physical and intellectual abilities. It is the teacher who, being familiar with these traits, can use his or her knowledge to help shorten the gap between mind and body.

The next group of characteristics deals with those which are in the intuitive realm. The least defined area, but the one which promises the most, intuition works with the other areas. The knowledgeable teacher can find ways to guide students in developing and using their intuitive energy and ability, by directing them to a historical approach and helping them learn to use their analytical and evaluative skills.

The last area is that of societal characteristics. Gifted students need guidance in finding a place for themselves in society and in developing the skills for effective social involvement (Clark, 1979).

For purposes of this paper, the following list of characteristics supplied by the Texas Education Agency (1978) will be used. Gifted individuals may possess from one to any number of the following traits.

1. Is intellectually curious, innovative, and playful with ideas.
2. Enjoys the challenge and involvement of intellectual and creative tasks.
3. Has a keen and sometimes unique sense of humor.
4. Is an independent thinker and seeks to act independently.
5. Develops at an early age an inner control and satisfaction which may lead to divergent and nonconformist behavior.

6. Formulates abstractions while very young and shows facility in moving from concrete to abstract levels of thinking and of communicating.

7. Prefers complex tasks and processes information in complex ways.

8. Reads at an early age and comprehends with advanced understanding.

9. Reads widely and reads extensively in areas of special interest.

10. Acquires basic skills rapidly and with a minimum of practice.

11. Comprehends advanced ideas, concepts, and implications.

12. Has an unusual ability to memorize.

13. Is impatient with detail and drill, which may result in gaps in basic skills for some.

14. Resists requirements of unnecessary detail in the completion of tasks.

15. Explores wide-ranging and special interests not usually associated with children of his age and relates well to peers and adults who have similar interests.

16. Expends much energy and time in pursuing special interests and may be involved in numerous projects and activities.

17. Employs high intellectual and creative skills in assessing his physical and social environment, in solving problems, and in creating products.

18. Generates many ideas and multiple solutions to problems.

19. Copes with environmental situations in resourceful and creative ways.

20. Expresses himself fluently, clearly, and forcefully with numbers, words, and creative products.

21. Demonstrates a richness of imagery in formal language and brainstorming.

22. Has capability for extraordinary leadership and tends to assume leadership.

23. Becomes excited about new ideas but may not carry them through.

24. May tend to be a loner at least part of the time.

25. May have a sense of his own uniqueness which leads to feelings of loneliness.

Little research has been done to establish definitive differential characteristics for those who are felt to be gifted in the visual arts. Much of what has been said, has been compiled into a list by Clark and Zimmerman (1984, pp. 53-69). This list, which shows the various opinions of authorities, is shown here in part.

Characteristics which distinguish artistically gifted students from others are:

1. Skillful composition

2. Complex composition

3. Elaboration and depiction of details

4. Excellence in many aspects of art including color, form, grouping, and movement

5. Specializes in one subject matter

6. Draws a wide variety of things

7. Adept at depiction of movement

8. Uses personal experiences and feelings as subject matter

9. True-to-appearance representation

10. Accurate depiction of depth by perspective

11. Effective use of media

12. May lack sufficient technical skills to represent mature talent

13. Products show obvious talent and artistic expression

14. Superior manual skill and good muscular control

15. Independence of ideas and ability to experience events from multiple points of view

16. Adherence to rules and regulations and routine study

17. Relative freedom from ordinary frustration

18. Highly individualized differences in psychological characteristics

19. Desire to work alone

20. High potential for leadership due to fluency of ideas offered

21. Good concentration and flexibility in adaptation of knowledge

22. Dynamic and intuitive quality of imagination

23. Unusual penchant for visual imagery and fantasy

24. Intense desire to make art by filling extra time with art activities

25. High desire for visual awareness experiences

26. High interest in drawing representationally or to emulate the style of adult artists

27. Self-initiative to make art work

28. Finds satisfaction in engagement in art activities with a high degree of sustained interest

29. Desire to improve own art work

30. Persistence, perseverance, enthusiasm, and self-motivation to do art work

31. Willingness to explore and use new media, tools, and technique
32. Ambitious for an art career

33. Acute power of visualization and fascination with visual things

34. Require a high degree of arousal and motivation

35. May manifest talents early but talent may not persist into maturity

36. May have motor skills specific to talent; may not have general motor superiority

37. Easy visual recall from an encyclopedic visual memory; may have a "photographic" mind

38. Extraordinary skills of visual perception and a highly developed visual sensibility

39. Above-average I.Q. is prerequisite to acquire advanced techniques and produce meritorious art

40. Above-average I.Q. is necessary condition but not sufficient to guarantee art talent or creativity

41. Higher I.Q. allows development of art talent but does not insure such development

42. Analytic, mechanical, symbolic and expressionistic drawings are dependent upon intelligence

43. Intelligence tests do not give indication of artistic talent

44. Artistically talented students display mature, high-quality behaviors for their age

45. Originality; use of own ideas and idiosyncratic depictions of content

46. Demonstrates flexibility with ideas when creating art products

47. Gives less personal, more objective, reasons for critical judgment of art work of others

48. Applies critical insights to own art work

Hurwitz (1983) discusses some of these same characteristics. His opinions as to those and other characteristics of artistic giftedness can be suggested by the following list:

1. Shows early skills which develop quickly
2. Surpass others in quality of work, love of work and time spent on art work
3. Have extended concentration, self initiative
4. May not want to experiment in new areas
5. Prefer to work alone
6. Are self-motivated
7. Express fantasies through their work
8. Have visual and conceptual fluency
9. Draws multiple rather than single episodes
10. Can utilize past information in new ways
11. Handle shading, proportion, perspective and form better than others
12. Display compositional control
13. Display complexity and elaboration in their work
14. Have excellent memory for detail
15. Display sensitivity to art media
16. Often doodle
17. Have sharper artistic perceptions
18. Assimilate art vocabulary easily

19. Are able to make connections between the meaning, the work, intention of the artists and the formal structure of the work

20. Accept art appreciation as part of their studies

21. Have potential for critical-discursive abilities

The scarcity of authorities and the variety of opinions and subjects dealt with merely illustrate the need for a more compact, congruous, and substantiated list of characteristics for use in identifying the artistically gifted. However, the very diversity of the characteristics may indicate the diversity of the group.

Identification of the Gifted

One of the greatest concerns in education is for the "development of students, not only those with demonstrated abilities, but also those with potential . . ." (Bruch, 1984, p. 13). If many authorities agree that identification of the gifted should stem from the dictates of the program, then ideally, the program would include methods which could reveal not only demonstrated abilities, but potential as well. What kind of identification methods are recommended? What kind of identification methods are being used in Texas schools? Obviously, an intelligence test would not be used for the identification of someone with painting talent for an accelerated class in acrylic painting studio. However, an intelligence test might be appropriate for identifying

someone who was being considered for admittance into a class about aesthetic appreciation with the area of study being that of paintings.

Clark and Zimmerman (1984) group current identification practices into three groups: standardized tests, informal instruments (such as teacher made or local made tests), and non-test methods (self-nomination, desire, past academic record). Although many recommended instruments exist for identification of intellectual giftedness, "there has been no consensus about recommended identification procedures or instruments for such programs" (Clark and Zimmerman, 1984, p. 63). They also cite many available tests, but say they all have inadequacies. Some of those cited are: the Horn Art Aptitude Inventory, Meier Art Tests, Graves Design Judgment Test, Guillford Creativity Tests, Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, Knauber Art Ability Test, Advanced Placement Program in Studio Art, Art Talent Behavior Record, Baker's Narrative Drawing Assessment, and Baker's Visual Memory Assessments. Clark and Zimmerman state that people outside the field of art recommend these tests, but that they are not being used. Clark and Zimmerman surveyed the selection procedures used in forty-nine programs for art/talented and reported that none of the above mentioned standardized tests were used. They also listed the nineteen procedures which were used, ranking from most used to least used: self-nomination, portfolio, interview, informal art

tests, classroom teacher nomination, art teacher nomination, creativity tests, structured nominations, academic record, parent nomination, achievement test scores, peer nomination, desire or interest of student, descriptive checklist, citizenship or health, art courses taken previously, I.Q. test scores, letters of nomination by others, and first come, first serve.

Clark and Zimmerman (1984, p. 85) also stress the need for research into the

> observable characteristics of the art products . . . and observable, art specific predispositional behaviors and process behaviors in art production, art criticism, and art history as a basis for establishing sound and appropriate criteria for identification.

Hurwitz (1983, p. 45) does not recommend the use of tests such as the Scholastic Achievement or I.Q. tests as a "major criteria in screening for an art program because the correlation between academic achievement and artistic ability is unclear." However, he does recommend some methods which might be helpful in identification. Those not already mentioned are: the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, the Williams Cognitive Affective Interaction Model, the Wilson Cognitive Instrument, the Kenmore Personal Characteristics Appraisal Instrument, and Hurwitz's own Art Centered Tasks.

The TEA states:

> . . . identity is based upon a local district definition of gifted/talented that is compatible with National and State definitions. Identity procedures evolve from the philosophy, goals, and

> the objectives of the local district's plan and clearly reflect the intent of the program (TEA, n.d., p. 20).

The TEA also lists criteria for identification of ability in the visual or performing arts: auditions, teacher input, parent input, review of student's products by experts, standardized tests of creative and divergent thinking, locally constructed tests of specific skills and abilities in the visual or performing arts, standardized tests of specific skills and abilities.

Goals for Gifted Programs

The last matter to be dealt with is that of program goals. A goal concerns itself with the overall effect a program is meant to have. A goal may include more specific subdivisions as objectives. Sometimes it is hard to delineate the two. The TEA (n.d., p. 8) states its overall goal as "to identify all gifted/talented students in grades K-12 and to provide educational experiences and/or services appropriate to their unique needs." Nothing is stated about particular goals for visual arts programs for the State of Texas. An example might be the goals of a state-wide program in West Virginia, cited by Hurwitz (1983, p. 94):

1. the exploration and refining of an art or craft form
2. the cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art or craft forms
3. the formation of a value system for art or craft criticism and future growth

4. the examination of creative problem-solving in an art or craft form

5. the enrichment and acceleration of experience in art or crafts

6. the exploration of markets and the marketing of art and craft work

7. the examination of careers and vocations in art or crafts

Clark and Zimmerman (1984) mention several goals they have found in their research. Among them are: enrichment with specific media, acceleration with specific media, the study of critical thinking skills (also visual thinking or problem-solving), self expression, individualized art experiences, the learning of elements and principles, unified or interdisciplinary understanding of the arts, career preparation, artists in the classroom, art as enrichment for academically gifted students, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. Although goals are so diverse, an emphasis was found in art production. Hurwitz (1983) and Clark and Zimmerman (1984) believe that skills should not be used as the entire basis for goals in programs. They advocate the use of higher level thinking skills which would be involved in the study of history, criticism, and aesthetics. Clark and Zimmerman (1984, p. 131) express the need for future programs to

> develop curricula that will be based upon individual needs and abilities of artistically talented students and that are consistent with a sound philosophy and well constructed goals appropriate to such students.

Gold (1982) lists his view of important goals for the program development for artistically gifted students: development of visual sensitivity and powers of observation, acquisition of a non-verbal system of cognition and communication, development of aesthetic attitudes and standards, opportunity for experimentation and innovation in various art media, establishment of self-identity through satisfying individual performances, development of self-criticism and evaluation, the study of art history, and to relate art to other disciplines.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruch, C. (1984). Schooling for the gifted: Where do we go from here? Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(1), 2-16.

Cagne, F. (1985). Giftedness and talent: Reexamining a reexamination of the definitions. Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(3), 103-112.

Cattell, R. (1971). The structure of intelligence in relation to the nature-nurture controversy. In R. Cancro (Ed.), Intelligence genetic and environmental influences. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Clark, G., & Zimmerman, E. (1984). Educating artistically talented students. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Coleman, L. (1985). Schooling the gifted. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Dobzhansky, T. (1964). Heredity and nature of man. New York: New American Library.

Fraser, M. (1980). Screening and identification of gifted students. In J. Jordan & J. Grossi (Eds.), An administrators handbook on designing programs for the gifted and talented (pp. 48-50). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Getzells, J., & Jackson, P. (1962). Creativity and Intelligence: Explorations with gifted children. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Gold, M. (1982). Education of the gifted/talented. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gowan, J., & Bruch, C. (1971). The academically talented student and guidance. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Grossi, J. (1980). Model state policy, legislation and state plan toward the education of gifted and talented students. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Hurwitz, A. (1983). The gifted and talented in art. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Idaho State Department of Education. (n.d.). Guidelines for gifted and talented program. (Educational programs for g/t students). (1978). Austin, TX: TEA.

Lark-Horovitz, B., Lewis, H., & Lucas, M. (1967). Understanding children's art for better teaching. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W. L. (1964). Creative and mental growth. New York: Macmillan.

Meier, N. (Ed.). (1939). Studies in the psychology of art. Vol. 3: Psychological Monographs. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1939.

Mendelowitz, D. (1963). Children are artists: An introduction to children's art for teachers and parents (2nd ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Munro, T., Lark-Horovitz, B., & Barnhardt, E. (1942). Studies at the Cleveland Museum of Art. Journal of Experimental Education, 11(2), 97-184.

Renzulli, J. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. Phi Delta Kappan, 261(1).

Rosenzwieg, M. (1966). Environmental complexity, cerebral change and behavior. American Psychologist, 21, 321-332.

Texas Education Agency. (n.d.). The Texas state plan and guidelines for the education of the gifted and talented. Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1978). Characteristics of the gifted individual. [Available from Pat Schmidt, Gifted/Talented Specialist, San Antonio Independent School District, 141 Lavaca St., San Antonio, TX 78210]. Unpublished list.

United States Office of Education. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented: Report to Congress. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to investigate the opinions of teachers regarding artistic giftedness in the visual arts, a survey was devised. This survey is a written questionnaire divided into three sections (Appendices A, B, and C).

Survey Development

The first section (Appendix A) was designed to poll the opinions of art teachers as to the characteristics of artistic giftedness. It deals with characteristics of behavior and work. The items for this section were compiled from the suggestions of authoritative sources (Clark, 1979; Clark & Zimmerman, 1984; Hurwitz, 1983; McGee-Cooper, 1985; Wilson, 1985; Hurwitz, 1985; Clark, 1985). They include experts in the fields of art education and giftedness. Forty-six characteristics are listed. Among them are general academic, creative problem-solving, art-related behaviors, and art-product related characteristics. Several seemingly contradictory or conflicting characteristics were listed in order to obtain an unbiased survey. Nineteen work or product related characteristics were listed. Those surveyed were asked to check one of four boxes provided. Box No. 4 indicates the characteristic is "always displayed" in a

student gifted in the visual arts, box No. 3 indicates "often displayed," box No. 2 indicates "seldom displayed," and box No. 1 indicates "never displayed."

The second section (Appendix B) is a list of thirty-four methods of identification used or suggested for use in the identification of artistically gifted students for participation in special art programs. Various authorities (Clark & Zimmerman, 1984; Hurwitz, 1983) cited in the Review of Literature served as sources for these items. Those surveyed were asked to check those formal and/or informal methods which they or their school used to identify the artistically gifted. A space was provided for additional methods which were not on the survey.

The third section (Appendix C) is a list of twenty broad goal statements which have been used or suggested for use by authorities already mentioned in the Review of Literature (Hurwitz, 1983; Clark & Zimmerman, 1984; Gold, 1982). Survey participants were asked to check the goals which they have for their artistically gifted students, as differentiated from those of the regular classroom students. A space was provided for other goals they might feel important which were not already stated.

A questionnaire was sent to five experts in the field of art education and giftedness. These experts were asked to read and evaluate the survey in terms of appropriateness of item or wording. Based upon their responses, changes

were made in phrasing of the items, and a few items were added to the questionnaire.

Data Collection

The sample group was chosen from a list of Texas school districts which have identified gifted students. This list was supplied by the TEA. Lists of teachers presently teaching art in those school districts were supplied by the individual district art supervisors or coordinators. Six hundred elementary and secondary art teachers were chosen randomly from these lists. The questionnaire was sent to each of them. One hundred sixty questionnairres were returned. Thirty of those questionnaires were returned blank. Five questionnaires were returned too late to be included in the statistical data. Three surveys were omitted from the survey because the last page was left blank. One hundred and twenty-five questionnaires were used to establish survey results. Those participating in the study were public school teachers. Forty-eight taught in elementary schools and eighty-five were secondary teachers. One art coordinator participated. A few indicated additional teaching positions in museums or colleges. Personal notes indicated a variety of student backgrounds and school locations and sizes.

Data Recording

The method of tabulating and recording survey results was to assign each questionnaire a number and enter those individual survey answers into a computer. Results were totaled by number and percentage of the choices made. To display the results, charts were made. Appendix D shows marginal tabulations for each item on the questionnaire dealing with characteristics. This chart displays the number and percentage of teachers who chose: (4) (always displayed), (3) (often displayed), (2) (seldom displayed), (1) (never displayed). Two additional columns appear on this chart which were not included in the survey: (5) (items answered in an unconventional manner) and (6) (items unanswered). A chart of the results of part two of the survey (Table III) displays items relating to identification methods and their related number and percentage of people choosing the items. A chart of the results of part three of the survey (Table IV) displays items relating to goals and their related number and percentage of participants who chose them.

Another chart was compiled to indicate the frequency distribution of the characteristics chosen. The method of tabulating this was to add the number of "always displayed" (4) answers to the number of "often displayed" (3) answers on each item. Those items were then organized into a list

beginning with the most chosen items to the least chosen items (Table I).

Another chart (Table II) shows the weighted mean average of each response to the items on characteristics. It lists the mean averages in order of highest to lowest.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Clark, G. (November, 1985). Personal communication.

Clark, G., & Zimmerman, E. (1984). Educating artistically talented students. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Gold, M. (1982). Education of the gifted/talented. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Hurwitz, A. (1983). The gifted and talented in art. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Hurwitz, A. (November 11, 1985). Personal communication.

McGee-Cooper, A. (December 10, 1985). Personal communication.

Wilson, B. (November 21, 1985). Personal communication.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Survey results are illustrated by a table and an analysis of each of the three sections of the questionnaire. Those sections represent the findings on characteristics of artistic giftedness, methods of identifying the artistically gifted, and goals for gifted programs as used or preferred by those teachers participating in the survey.

Characteristics of Artistic Giftedness

To illustrate the findings, a chart was made indicating the percentage of positive responses to the characteristics listed in the questionnaire (see Table I). This information shows the frequency distribution of the items and lists those items in order of most-chosen to least-chosen. Choices range in percentage from 98.4%, choosing "often" or "always displayed," to 46.4% choosing "often" or "always displayed." The weighted mean average of each item was then calculated and displayed in order of highest to lowest by means of a chart (Table II).

Since the lowest positive answer was 46.4% on the frequency distribution chart and 2.461 on the weighted mean distribution chart, it would seem to indicate that all questionnaire items could be highly possible as indicators

TABLE I

POSITIVE RESPONSE TABULATION
(125 Surveys)

Rank	Item No.*	Characteristic	Percentage of Response for Choices 3 and 4
1	1	Enjoys the challenge and involvement of intellectual and creative tasks	98.4
2	14W	Displays skills of visual perception and sensibility	98.4
3	28	Shows a strong interest in things visual	97.6
4	12W	Products show obvious talent and artistic expression	96.8
5	19	Is committed to tasks he/she is interested in, good concentration	96.0
6	6	Comprehends advanced ideas, concepts, implications	95.2
7	3W	Shows elaboration in work	94.4
8	32	Shows aesthetic intelligence and judgment	94.4
9	27	Has an intuitive quality of imagination	93.6
10	7W	Expresses own feelings in work	92.8
11	5	Acquires basic skills rapidly, with minimum practice	92.8
12	17	Is willing or able to experiment with new ideas	92.8
13	10W	Shows effective use of media	92.8
14	1W	Shows compositional control	92.0
15	33	Remembers and uses much detail	91.2
16	29	Has flexibility with ideas	91.2
17	9	Generates multiple solutions to problems	90.4
18	15W	Work is original	90.4
19	2W	Shows complexity in composition of work	90.4
20	10	Expends much energy and time in pursuing special interests and may be involved in numerous projects	90.4

TABLE I--Continued

Rank	Item No.*	Characteristic	Percentage of Response for Choices 3 and 4
21	35	Shows fluency of visual expression	89.6
22	18	Is self-motivated	89.6
23	20	Shows early evidence of interest of art	89.6
24	2	Has keen and sometimes unique sense of humor	89.6
25	13W	May manifest talent early	88.8
26	6W	Uses deliberate contrast and blending	88.0
27	4	Formulates abstractions and moves easily from concrete to abstract levels of thinking and communicating	88.0
28	25	Shows superior manual and technical skills	87.2
29	22	Utilizes past experiences in new ways	86.4
30	44	Has a prolific and unusual imagination	86.4
31	9W	Exhibits good use of perspective	84.8
32	17W	Shows vivid and accurate detail in work	84.8
33	19W	Work demonstrates ability to synthesize own inventions with ideas from diverse sources	84.8
34	21	Shows an interest in fantasy, mystery, unusual phenomena	84.0
35	11	Expresses himself/herself fluently, clearly and forcefully with words and creative products	83.2
36	46	Has the ability and desire to invent or re-invent	82.4
37	5W	Is adept in depiction of movement	81.6
38	40	Doodles frequently	80.8
39	30	Accepts art appreciation as part of studies	80.0
40	12	Demonstrates a richness of imagery in formal language and brainstorming	80.0
41	16	Is a loner part of the time	80.0
42	8W	Uses true to appearance representation	78.4

TABLE I--Continued

Rank	Item No.*	Characteristic	Percentage of Response for Choices 3 and 4
43	38	Relates to pictures more than words	77.6
44	15	Becomes excited about new ideas but does not always carry them through	76.8
45	3	Displays divergent and nonconformist behavior	76.8
46	31	Displays critical-discursive abilities	76.0
47	13	Has leadership abilities	75.2
48	37	Relates art to other fields	75.2
49	23	Has a high I.Q.	70.4
50	7	Has an unusual ability to memorize	68.0
51	8	Is impatient with detail and drill, which may result in gaps in basic skills for some	66.4
52	18W	Shows early ability to mimic styles of adult artists	65.5
53	14	Tends to assume leadership	64.8
54	45	Has future goals which relate to art fields	64.8
55	16W	Spontaneously produces large numbers	63.2
56	34	Recognizes major works in art history	60.8
57	4W	Specializes in one subject matter	58.4
58	24	Is a high academic achiever	57.6
59	41	Challenges authority	56.0
60	39	Often spread too thin and overcommitted	56.0
61	11W	May lack sufficient skills to represent mature talent	55.2
62	42	Is strong willed and aggressive	55.2
63	26	Adheres to rules, regulations, routine study	53.6
64	43	Reads and talks about art and visits museums	49.6
65	36	Recognizes styles and periods in art history	46.4

*"W" denotes characteristics of work.

TABLE II

WEIGHTED MEAN AVERAGE SCALE
(125 Surveys)

Rank	Item No.*	Item	Weighted Mean Average of Response
1	12W	Products show obvious talent and artistic expression	3.621
2	28	Shows a strong interest in things visual	3.589
3	19	Is committed to tasks he/she is interested in, good concentration	3.544
4	5	Acquires basic skills rapidly, with minimum practice	3.516
5	1	Enjoys the challenge and involvement of intellectual and creative tasks	3.504
6	20	Shows early evidence of interest in art	3.500
7	13W	May manifest talent early	3.427
8	14W	Displays skills of visual perception and sensibility	3.423
9	3W	Shows elaboration in work	3.419
10	17	Is willing or able to experiment with new ideas	3.415
11	6	Comprehends advanced ideas, concepts, implications	3.411
12	15W	Work is original	3.405
13	27	Has an intuitive quality of imagination	3.400
14	10W	Shows effective use of media	3.398
15	7W	Expresses own feelings in work	3.390
16	18	Is self-motivated	3.369
17	21	Shows an interest in fantasy, mystery, unusual phenomena	3.367
18	2W	Shows complexity in composition of work	3.361
19	33	Remembers and uses much detail	3.358
20	10	Expends much energy and time in pursuing special interests and may be involved in numerous projects	3.355
21	35	Shows fluency of visual expression	3.325

TABLE II--Continued

Rank	Item No.*	Item	Weighted Mean Average of Response
22	1W	Shows compositional control	3.320
23	29	Has flexibility with ideas	3.311
24	32	Shows aesthetic intelligence and judgment	3.287
25	17W	Shows vivid and accurate detail in work	3.276
26	25	Shows superior manual and technical skills	3.262
27	44	Has a prolific and unusual imagination	3.254
28	4	Formulates abstractions and moves easily from concrete to abstract levels of thinking and communicating	3.246
29	9W	Exhibits good use of perspective	3.242
30	46	Has the ability and desire to invent or re-invent	3.241
31	6W	Uses deliberate contrast and blending	3.238
32	9	Generates multiple solutions to problems	3.211
33	38	Relates to pictures more than words	3.179
34	40	Doodles frequently	3.172
35	22	Utilizes past experiences in new ways	3.160
36	2	Has keen and sometimes unique sense of humor	3.153
37	19W	Work demonstrates ability to synthesize own inventions with ideas from diverse sources	3.118
38	12	Demonstrates a richness of imagery in formal language and brainstorming	3.201
39	11	Expresses himself/herself fluently, clearly and forcefully with words and creative products	3.053
40	8W	Uses true to appearance representation	3.953
41	5W	Is adept in depiction of movement	3.051
42	30	Accepts art appreciation as part of studies	3.041
43	13	Has leadership abilities	2.983
44	31	Displays critical-discursive abilities	2.982
45	23	Has a high I.Q.	2.981

TABLE II--Continued

Rank	Item No.*	Item	Weighted Mean Average of Response
46	37	Relates art to other fields	2.957
47	16	Is a loner part of the time	2.943
48	15	Becomes excited about new ideas but does not always carry them through	2.943
49	3	Displays divergent and nonconformist behavior	2.933
50	16W	Spontaneously produces large numbers of works	2.913
51	18W	Shows early ability to mimic styles of adult artists	2.902
52	7	Has an unusual ability to memorize	2.876
53	8	Is impatient with detail and drill, which may result in gaps in basic skill for some	2.860
54	45	Has future goals which relate to art fields	2.816
55	14	Tends to assume leadership	2.785
56	24	Is a high academic achiever	2.761
57	42	Is strong willed and aggressive	2.728
58	34	Recognizes major works in art history	2.722
59	4W	Specializes in one subject matter	2.700
60	41	Challenges authority	2.690
61	39	Often spread too thin and overcommitted	2.687
62	11W	May lack sufficient skills to represent mature talent	2.632
63	26	Adheres to rules, regulations, routine study	2.629
64	43	Reads and talks about art and visits museums	2.543
65	36	Recognizes styles and periods in art history	2.461

*"W" denotes characteristics of work.

of artistic giftedness. It is certainly probable that if over 50% of those being surveyed indicated a positive response to a questionnaire item, then that item bears attention as a possible identifier for those gifted in the visual arts. A factor indicating the probability of this, is that all survey items chosen for the questionnaire were indicated for possible use by at least two experts in the field. Had items been chosen which were not in any way associated with giftedness, then percentages would have been lower in those cases. Although questionnaire items were rated highly or skewed to the higher scores, this does not mean that all artistically gifted students will exhibit all characteristics. It simply indicates that all characteristic items could indicate some possible identifiers. Wilson (1985) cautions that a gifted child may not have all of the characteristics, but may capitalize on some in order to compensate for the lack of others. Some disagreement among experts, as well as among those surveyed should be noted even in those items ranked in the top twelve. For example, Hurwitz disagrees with item #17 (willing or able to experiment with new ideas or media). He states (1983, p. 21): "Because gifted students have invested a great deal of themselves in developing mastery in a certain idiom, they are unwilling or unable to experiment in new areas." Item #32 (has aesthetic intelligence and judgment) presents another question with which Hurwitz (1985) disagrees. He

believes this to be more related to teacher initiative. Responses from many of those surveyed show some agreement with this.

Receiving some of the lowest ratings were items which deal with characteristics which are often considered negative. Table I displays survey results which indicate that 77% believe the artistically gifted exhibit divergent and non-conformist behavior (Item #3). Table II indicates this item to rate 2.933 on the weighted mean scale. Some experts agree. Among those is Frank Williams, whose Cognitive Affective Interaction Model lists non-conformist behavior as an identifier for creativity (Hurwitz, 1983). Clark and Zimmerman (1984) report that teachers tend to overrate docile and conforming students, and underrate the original and independent ones. This could account for the 18% who said that the artistically gifted seldom or never displayed non-conformist behavior. On the other hand, that 18% answered negatively could indicate that not all artistically gifted should be identified by this characteristic. To further confirm this possibility, survey results indicate that 54% believe that artistically gifted students adhere to rules, regulations, and routine study, but 39% do not. 6.4% indicated that they "sometimes do and other times do not." This item ranked third to last on the weighted mean average scale. This characteristic was one which shows the least agreement among experts as well as those surveyed. Luca and

Allen (1974) agree. B. Clark (1979), McGee-Cooper (1985), and Clark (1985) disagree. Those who associate giftedness with high achievement would be most likely to choose a positive answer to this item. B. Clark (1979) believes that gifted students are often mistakenly associated with high achievers, but that the gifted often dislike routine and drill. She says that this is because they can process new information so rapidly, that routine becomes boring. McGee-Cooper states that "marching to own drummer" is one of the characteristics she sees most in creative people (1985). Because of this, gifted students are often seen as disruptive and disrespectful. Item #41 states that artistically gifted students challenge authority. 56% agrees, 37% disagree, and 7% said sometimes. This item appears sixth from the last on the weighted mean average scale, ranking 2.69 (see Table II). Some experts believe that the gifted will challenge authority because they are always questioning, persistent, evaluating, and demanding. The gifted also have a high level of need for success and recognition (B. Clark, 1979; McGee-Cooper, 1985; Clark, 1985). Clark (1985) feels that characteristics such as "strong willed and aggressive or "challenges authority" are not negative, but that they describe many artistically gifted students. It was at his suggestion that these two traits were added to the questionnaire. 55% of those surveyed agree that the artistically gifted individual is strong willed and aggressive, 36%

disagree with this, and 8% believe that they sometimes are and sometimes are not.

Item #8 states that artistically gifted people often become impatient with detail and drill, which may result in lack of basic skill for some. Of those surveyed, 66% agreed and 30% disagreed. Certainly this may correspond to the previous items. If students assimilate and process knowledge rapidly, they may become bored with routine and drill and therefore miss out on some basic skills or knowledge. B. Clark (1979) indicates that the gifted have an ability to generate original solutions and ideas and that this may lead to difficulty with rigid conformity. Indeed, McGee-Cooper (1985) lists this (#8) as an identifier for artistically gifted. Though B. Clark (1979) did not deal specifically with the artistically gifted, survey results indicate an agreement. One hundred sixteen of the teachers surveyed said that the artistic gifted acquire basic skills rapidly with a minimum of practice (#5), and seventy-six of those believe that they become impatient with details and drill.

Another characteristic which is related to the above is #15. This survey item states that the artistically gifted become excited about new ideas, but do not always carry them through. 77% of those surveyed responded positively and 21% responded negatively. McGee-Cooper (1985) and B. Clark (1979) list this as an identifier for artistically gifted and gifted, respectively. B. Clark says that over-expenditure

of energy towards many projects and ideas is a characteristic of giftedness. An early differential pattern for thought processing such as thinking in alternatives and abstract terms could lead to an omission or even rejection of detail. Even though the majority of those who were surveyed agree, it is interesting to note that of the ninety-six who agreed, ninety-two said that the artistically gifted had good task commitment when they were interested in the subject.

Another related item is #39 (often spread too thin and overcommitted). It was one of the items most highly disputed among those surveyed. 56% agreed, 36% disagreed, and 4% said sometimes. McGee-Cooper (1985), B. Clark (1979), and Getzells and Jackson (1962) agree. Cross referencing of the data indicate that many of the forty-five who indicated that the artistically gifted are never overcommitted also believed that the artistically gifted spent much time and energy pursuing special interests and projects (#10).

Another group of items which might be important to deal with specifically, is that group concerned with being a leader and being a loner. Item #16 states that the artistically student is a loner part of the time. 80% of those surveyed agree and 18% disagree. Although Luca and Allen (1984), Hurwitz (1983), B. Clark (1979), and TEA (n.d.) agree with this item, other authorities believe it either has no bearing on artistic giftedness, or is not true. Of

the one hundred people who indicated that artistically gifted students were often/always loners, seventy-five also said they had leadership ability, and of those, sixty-six said they assume leadership. Of the one hundred twenty-five surveyed, ninety-four believe the artistically gifted to have leadership abilities, and of those ninety-four, fifteen believe that they seldom or never assume leadership. Sixty-five of those surveyed feel that the artistically gifted tend to assume leadership, but assuming leadership is ranked number fifty-five on the weighted mean scale, with a weighted mean average of 2.785. Cross referencing indicated the fact that of the one hundred people who checked often/always on being a loner, sixty-six also checked them as assuming leadership. Fritz (1930) and Luca and Allen (1974) state that the artistically gifted have a high potential for leadership. Wilson (1985) states that "leadership has no necessary connection to artistic giftedness."

Experts in educational fields dealing with intelligence, creativity, and artistic ability, do not agree as to the relationship between intelligence and artistic giftedness or academic achievement and artistic giftedness. 15% of those surveyed said that artistically gifted students always have a high I.Q., 55% believe that they often have a high I.Q., 6% said sometimes, 14% said seldom, and 2% said never. 9% of those who answered the survey did not answer this question. Many of those surveyed added special

comments to this item. Among those comments were: "It differs," "It is a mistake to label a student either way," "Not applicable," "My art kids fall into categories of extremely high and extremely low I.Q.," and "Creativity messes up I.Q. scores." Lowenfeld and Brittain (1964) have claimed that results of intelligence tests cannot be used to indicate art talent. Although many experts claim that high intelligence is necessary in order to produce excellent art work (Clark & Zimmerman, 1984), and 70% of those who took the survey indicate that their artistically gifted students display a high I.Q., there is no conclusive evidence that a high I.Q. is a prerequisite to art ability. The variety of other answers and expert opinions might indicate that labeling the artistically gifted students as to high or low I.Q. would be inconclusive as a deciding factor in indicating art ability. Of the eighty-eight people who checked often or always on high I.Q., fourteen used I.Q. tests as a method of identification for their program. This might indicate that high I.Q. was thought to be a primary concern in the type of program which they offered.

On the question of high achievement (item #24), 12% said that the artistically gifted student always is a high academic achiever, 45.6% said he/she is often a high academic achiever, 7.2% said "sometimes," 26.4% said seldom, 3.2% said never, and 5.6% did not answer the question. Out of the seventy-two who said artistically gifted were always

or often high achievers, eighteen used the SAT as a method of identifying the artistically gifted. Thirty-three people checked previous academic record as a method of identification. Twenty-five of those who checked always or often on high achievement, also checked previous academic record as a method of identification. It appears that more than half of those surveyed believe the artistically gifted to be high achievers, and for some, high achievement was important for their program. On the other hand, several specific comments were made about this questionnaire item. Many were concerned about the lack of a fifth column which might indicate that students varied in this area, sometimes falling in the group of high achievers and sometimes falling in a group of low achievers. It is possible that those who normally associate giftedness with achievement could more easily fit their opinions into existing boxes. Those who understand the complexities of the artistically gifted were unable to fit their opinions into the boxes provided, and therefore responded with comments and other methods unavailable on the survey. These divergent answers represented about 12%, including those who did not answer the question because they felt it was irrelevant, not applicable, or other unknown reasons. Survey results on this questionnaire item echo the various opinions of authorities. Clark and Zimmerman (1984) equate intelligence with artistic giftedness. B. Clark (1979) and A. Hurwitz (1983) do not. Hurwitz (1983, p. 45)

recommends not using SAT, I.Q., or other similar tests as a major criteria in screening for art programs because "the correlation between academic and artistic ability is unclear."

Educational authorities disagree as to the importance of the characteristics of motivation and task commitment and their connection with artistic giftedness. The research of Clark and Zimmerman indicates that the following experts believe that the artistic gifted have "persistence, perseverence, enthusiasm, and self-motivation to do art work: Fritz, Munro, Conant and Randall, Inglehart, Luca and Allen, Doob, and Peterson" (1984, p. 57). Clark and Zimmerman also report that the following experts believe the artistically gifted "find satisfaction in engagement in art activities with a high degree of sustained interest: Boas, Kough and De Hann, Munro, Lark-Horowitz, Luca, and Peterson" (1984, p. 58). Renzulli (1977, 1978) believes that motivation or task commitment should be one of the major components of giftedness. In fact, this is one of the characteristics which he believes differentiates the truly gifted from those who are only above average. Wilson and Wilson (1976), on the other hand, believe artistically gifted individuals require a high degree of arousal and motivation. B. Clark (1979, p. 118) lists one gifted identifier as: "completes only part of an assignment or project and then takes off in a new direction." The very next identifier she lists is

"sticks to a subject long after a class has gone on to different subjects." These characteristics seem mutually exclusive, yet, ninety-six of those surveyed believe the artistic gifted often or always get excited about new ideas, but do not always carry them through. However, ninety-two of those ninety-six also checked often or always on task commitment. A probable explanation to this lies in the fact that the statement reads "tasks which they are interested in." Generally, gifted children, whether academic or artistic, may have good task commitment when they are interested in the subject, but may require outside motivation when the subject seems of little value to them. The informed teacher is the key in guiding the student to seeing the value in either finishing the project or arranging for some equally valuable alternatives. In addition, B. Clark (1979, p. 24) suggests that the gifted need "a longer incubation time for ideas," "to be allowed to pursue new ideas without forced closure or products demanded," and to "be allowed to pursue individual ideas as far as interest takes them." Results of the survey show that 90% of those taking the survey believe that the artistically gifted are often or always self-motivated and that 96.4% believe them to be committed to subjects in which they are interest.

Other comments which were added to the questionnaire by those participating in the survey indicated that several of the items were more due to teacher initiative than to

predispositional behavior. Among those mentioned were: compositional control, depiction of movement, deliberate contrast and blending, use of perspective, and recognition of major works, periods and styles in art history. It was also mentioned by several participants that reading and talking about art and visiting museums are based more on socio-economic background and exposure than predispositional behavior.

Means of Identification

Table III displays the list of methods of identifying the artistically gifted. It indicates the number and percentage of times each method was chosen by those professionals answering the questionnaire. Thirteen of those answering the survey used no methods of identification for their programs. The average amount of methods chosen was 6.5. Four chose one method only, two chose two methods, and the range goes up to seventeen methods chosen by two of those participating in the survey. The amount of methods chosen by the most people was eight. Fifty-six of those surveyed chose no standardized tests as methods of identification. Twenty-seven of those were elementary teachers, twenty-nine were secondary teachers. Of forty elementary teachers and eighty-five secondary teachers participating in the study, there was no recognizable pattern to the combination of formal and informal tests chosen.

TABLE III

IDENTIFICATION METHODS
(125 Surveys)

Rank	Item No.	Frequency of Choices Number	Percentage	Identification Methods*
1	31	94	75.2%	Observation
2	34	78	62.4%	Art Teacher Nomination
3	19	68	54.4%	Portfolio
4	28	67	53.6%	Indicators of Design/ Interest
5	17	66	52.8%	Teacher Made
6	29	64	51.2%	Previous Art Record
7	27	37	29.6%	Interviews
8	22	36	28.8%	Product Checklist
9	30	33	26.4%	Previous Academic Record
10	21	30	24.0%	Behavior Checklist
11	26	29	23.2%	Peer Nomination
12	32	29	23.2%	Self-Nomination
13	23	28	22.4%	Self-Interest Inventory
14	33	29	23.2%	Parent Nomination
15	2	22	17.6%	S.A.T.
16	1	16	12.8%	I.Q.
17	9	15	12.0%	Advanced Placement Studio Art
18	10	15	12.0%	Art Talent Behavior Record
19	20	15	12.0%	Structured Nomination
20	18	13	10.4%	Local Nomination
21	24	11	8.8%	Biographical Information
22	7	6	4.8%	Torrance
23	5	6	4.8%	Graves
24	13	5	4.0%	Metropolitan Achievement
25	3	3	2.4%	Horn
26	4	2	1.6%	Meier
27	11	1	0.8%	Baker's Narrative
28	12	1	0.8%	Baker's Visual
29	14	1	0.8%	Williams Cognitive
30	15	0	0.0%	Wilson Cognitive
31	8	0	0.0%	Knauber Art Ability
32	6	0	0.0%	Guillford

*Others Mentioned: Iowa, Tabs, Boat, Classroom Teacher Recommendation, Other Teacher Recommendation, Counselor Recommendation, Draw A Man.

Only sixteen chose I.Q. tests and twenty-two chose achievement tests. Hurwitz (1983) recommends that these kinds of tests not be used as the only means of judging artistic giftedness. However, he cites the New Rochelle program in New York, which requires high performance in both the art and academic domain. The Warminster Pennsylvania program, also cited by Hurwitz, requires an I.Q. of one hundred thirty or more. Suburban school systems with higher income levels tend to place more value on non-art activities than do lower income, urban communities (Clark & Zimmerman, 1984). Clark and Zimmerman (1984, p. 70) state: "For the visual and performing arts, a number of standardized art tests have been recommended through their utility for identification of artistically talented students has been questioned by numerous critics."

The subject of creativity tests is also one which experts question. Hurwitz (1983) mentions and describes Torrance Creativity tests, but says that some critics believe it to be outdated. Knauber, Graves, Meier, and Horn are tests which many experts question as to their contribution to identification of artistically gifted students (Clark and Zimmerman, 1984). The Texas Education Agency lists creativity tests as possible measurement when used in conjunction with other tests (TEA, n.d.).

The fact that informal non-test measures were used by the majority suggests that no one test or set of tests has

been widely accepted by educators. It may also reflect the fact that this survey population was from the public schools. In only one case was it stated that specific procedures had been set up for identification of the artistically gifted. The remainder deal with artistically gifted individuals as identified by whatever means the teacher has available. Teacher knowledge of the subject of giftedness, availability of testing methods and extra time, and inclination of the teacher would be major factors influencing the choice of identification methods. Many indicated that their main means of identification is intuition. Several expressed interest in the identification methods listed on the questionnaire. The recommendation that the means of identification be based on the type of program has no validity in the public school class where teachers are not able to choose their students. Those teachers may merely want to identify students who they feel may benefit by whatever special attention they are able to give.

Goals of Programs for the Artistically Gifted

Table IV represents the goals chosen by the sample. The list shows those goals most frequently chosen to those least frequently chosen and the number and percentage of those choosing each item. Five of those surveyed stated that they had no differential goals. Those five were elementary teachers. Many of those surveys which were returned

TABLE IV

GOALS OF PROGRAMS
(125 Surveys)

Rank	Goal No.	Frequency of Choices Number	Percentage	Goals of Programs*
1	2	99	79.2%	Explore Particular Art/ Craft
2	9	82	65.6%	Self-Expression
3	4	80	64.0%	Creative Problem-Solving
4	10	76	60.8%	Individualization
5	11	76	60.8%	Elements/Principles
6	17	67	53.6%	Develop Visual Sensitivity/Observation
7	6	63	50.4%	Enrichment
8	16	62	49.6%	Aesthetics
9	19	59	47.2%	Establish Self-Identity
10	15	56	44.8%	Art History
11	3	54	43.2%	Criticism-Values
12	1	49	39.2%	Explore Particular Art/ Craft
13	8	45	36.0%	Careers
14	20	39	31.2%	In-Depth Study
15	7	39	31.2%	Acceleration
16	14	39	31.2%	Artists Visit Class
17	12	36	28.8%	Interdisciplinary Study
18	18	31	24.8%	Acquire Non-Verbal System of Cognition/ Communication
19	5	24	19.2%	Marketing
20	13	23	18.4%	Art for Academic Gifted

*Others Mentioned: Portfolio Development, Field Trips, Mentorship, Encouragement.

blank had notes attached which stated that they had no gifted program in the arts. Not one of the returned surveyed indicated a special or separate program for the artistically gifted. The average number of goals chosen was 8.8. There was no identifiable pattern of combinations of goals chosen. The goal chosen most was "the cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art and craft forms." It was chosen by ninety-five of the one hundred twenty-five participants.

The list of goals chosen indicates what Texas public school art teachers believe are appropriate goals for differential study for gifted individuals in those art classes. There is no evidence that these goals are either being attempted or met.

The Texas Education Agency has no recommendations for goals for programs for the artistically gifted. However, the TEA does recommend principles for differential study for the gifted in general. Among those are: multiple disciplines in area of study, independent or self-directed study skills, independent learning of a self-selected topic within the area of study, higher level thinking skills developed, encouragement of development of products that use new techniques, materials, and forms, encouragement of self-understanding and appreciating likenesses and differences between oneself and others (TEA, n.d., p. 53).

Although the average classroom art teacher may have no knowledge of these recommendations, survey results indicate some accordance with these principles. That about 61% chose "individualization as a goal" (which would correlate with "independent, self-directed study") is an indication of the importance teachers place on this as a goal for the artistically gifted. Another clear indication would be that of "creative problem-solving." This could be correlated with "higher level thinking skills." 64% chose this as a goal. Other areas associated with higher level thinking skills would be the study of aesthetics and the study of criticism and values in art. These goals fall lower in ranking by those surveyed and they were chosen by 50 and 43% respectively. The principle of "self-understanding" could be linked with the goal "establish self-identity." 47% chose this as a goal. Also ranking low as a choice, "interdisciplinary study" was chosen by 29% as a goal. This could be correlated with "multiple disciplines" and may indicate that some recognize it as important in the teaching of the artistically gifted student.

Many notes were written by the teachers to explain that they did not have the knowledge, time, or facilities to implement special programs for the artistically gifted. That such a large percentage of teachers chose not to participate in the survey may also indicate the lack of programs or differential goals for the artistically gifted.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Clark, G. (November, 1985). Personal communication.

Clark, G., & Zimmerman, E. (1984). Educating artistically talented students. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Fritz, H. (1930). A search for and conservation of the gifted. Bulletin of High Points, 12(8), 19-25.

Getzells, J., & Jackson, P. (1962). Creativity and Intelligence: Explorations with gifted children. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Hurwitz, A. (1983). The gifted and talented in art. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Hurwitz, A. (November 11, 1985). Personal communication.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W. L. (1964). Creative and mental growth. New York: Macmillan.

Luca, M., & Allen, B. (1974). Teaching gifted children in grades one through three. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 082433).

McGee-Cooper, A. (December 10, 1985). Personal communication.

Renzulli, J. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. Phi Delta Kappan, 261(1).

Texas Education Agency. (n.d.). The Texas state plan and guidelines for the education of the gifted and talented. Austin, TX: Author.

Wilson, B. (November 21, 1985). Personal communication.

Wilson, B., & Wilson, M. (1976). Visual narrative and the artistically gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 20(4), 432-447.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Many educators, parents, and teachers who deal with students they believe to be artistically gifted, feel the education of these students to be inadequate. Many experts feel that not only do the artistically gifted fail to be identified, but that those few who may be identified do not receive the kind of education which provides curriculum and strategies geared to their particular needs. If this is so, what is the reason? Problems such as these may stem from this lack of understanding of the individual behavioral characteristics, and thus the individual needs of the artistically gifted individual. If this is so, then what are the characteristics of the artistically gifted individual? Motivation for this study originated with this question. Personal experiences attest to the fact that these problems do exist. Research into the subject shows that there is no official accepted definition for the artistically gifted individual. If art teachers have no official definition in order to help them identify artistically gifted students, how can they identify them in order to properly educate them? A wealth of gifts is not being tapped because the potential of these students is not being developed.

Research into the subject found few definitions for artistic giftedness; none were accepted officially by the State of Texas. Some authorities listed descriptive characteristics of behavior and work, but many of these authorities held opposing views. None of these characteristics have been incorporated into official policy for the education of the artistically gifted in Texas. Research also indicated several authorities who advised that the definition or description of the artistically gifted students be based on the philosophies and goals of the particular program. Therefore, the problem developed: How do public school art teachers identify the artistically gifted, and what goals do they have for their programs? In what ways do the opinions of teachers agree or disagree with the experts? Is there a consensus of opinion as to the characteristics of artistic giftedness? Are the same methods being used to identify them? Are the same goals being used to educate them? Is there evidence of any connection between goals and characteristics?

In order to determine the answers to these questions, it was decided that a survey would be sent to Texas public school art teachers. This survey was developed by investigating the opinions of various authorities as to traits, identification methods, and goals and combining these into lists. These lists were then arranged in questionnaire form in order for those surveyed to indicate their opinions.

Six hundred questionnaires were sent to randomly chosen art teachers in Texas public schools. One hundred twenty-five questionnaires were included as participants in the survey. The survey was meant to determine what characteristics art teachers attribute to the gifted in the visual arts, what means they use to identify them, and what goals are being set for the artistically gifted students in public schools.

The first section of the survey contained sixty-five items concerning characteristics of giftedness. The teachers surveyed were asked to rate each item on a scale of one to four: one, meaning "never displayed;" two, meaning seldom displayed;" three, meaning "often displayed;" and four, meaning "always displayed."

In calculating the mean average of each item, it was found that all items were rated at the top end of the scale. The highest rating was 3.621 and the lowest rating was 2.461. The median of the scale would be 2.5. The fact that the results were skewed indicates that all items dealing with characteristics could serve as possible identifiers of artistically gifted students. The higher the average, the more possible it could be to use it as an identifier. The lower the average, the less the chance of it being used to identify a large group of artistically gifted.

In the second part of the survey, thirty-two different methods for identification of the artistically gifted

individual were listed. Survey participants chose the ones which they used in their programs. The study determined that the majority of identification procedures used falls into the category of non-test methods, such as observation and teacher nomination. Standardized tests were used by some, but only in one case as the only criteria. Elementary teachers rarely used standardized testing methods. Creativity tests were seldom used. As recommended by experts, teachers are using a combination of types of testing methods. The average number of methods chosen per teacher was 6.6.

To determine the goals set for the artistically gifted in Texas public schools, a list of twenty specific goals was made. Survey participants checked the goals they prefer from the list. It was found that "the cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art and craft forms" was the most popular. "Self-expression" and "Creative problem-solving" followed as second. Many teachers had no differential goals for their artistically gifted. There was no evident connection between goals chosen and characteristics chosen.

Problems and Limitations of Survey

Survey results can give a strong indication of what most art teachers feel are the characteristics of artistic giftedness, what methods are preferred for their use in

identification, and what goals are preferred for their education in the visual arts. However, some factors indicate that there are some limitations to the representativeness of the survey. It was found that there was some basic difference between the responses of elementary and secondary teachers. For instance, secondary teachers had no knowledge of characteristics which might be displayed early in life, and elementary teachers had no knowledge of characteristics dealing with future goals. A survey which dealt with only the elementary level or the secondary level might have been more definitive. Another factor deals with the number of professionals responding to the survey. When the number of surveys which were sent out is compared to the number returned completed, it may suggest that those who participated were already interested in the subject. If this is true, then those participants may be more knowledgeable about the subject, therefore making the results biased. Another problem is that of the limited number of participants. A greater number of surveys sent to the population would have yielded a greater number of participants, thus rendering the study more valid. Personal contact with the sample would possibly have helped, though logistics of this make it difficult for this kind of a study.

Another factor in the reliability of the study deals with wording. When listing possible choices to indicate the frequency of characteristics displayed, more definitive

results may have been obtained had there been an additional column which read: "has the potential for the characteristic." There is a great deal of controversy between displayed ability and potential ability. Including this may have given the study more depth.

Another problem deals with the identification procedures mentioned. A question which might have been asked, would be: "Who identifies the artistically gifted in your school?" It might have been helpful to know who has charge of the identification and for what purpose these students are being identified.

The final problem deals with the section on goals. Since those participating chose so many goals, it would be beneficial to the study to know if these are goals which are used for the regular class or only for the artistically gifted. Another factor which might effect the study would be to find if these goals are actually being attempted, or if they were only checked because the teacher thought they appeared to be exemplary goals.

Implications and Observations

Responses to questionnaire items concerning characteristics were varied. Rather than narrowing the field, survey results show artistically gifted to be an even more diverse and varied group. Opinions indicated by the survey results imply a wide variety of differing and sometimes

opposing views. This can be attributed to many factors. Among those could be: the varied circumstances and training of the teacher, the diverse source of students and settings, and the diverse nature of the artistically gifted students themselves. At first glance, answers to some of the questions may show an inconsistency; some answers show that a characteristic is always displayed, and some show that the characteristic is never displayed. Yet many experts believe that the very nature of the group of artistically gifted is demonstrated by its diversity. The disagreement among those surveyed indicates the probability of this.

Although survey participants were in disagreement as to many of the characteristics of artistic giftedness, the percentage of high ratings on most characteristics most likely indicates general predispositional characteristics of behavior and art work. These highly rated characteristics could be used as identifiers for many artistically gifted students. Opposing characteristics may be present in different individuals, and seemingly opposing traits may be present in the same individual at different times and relating to different subjects. The study clearly shows that, if one will bear in mind the individualities of students, it could be possible to use the most popular characteristics as identifiers in designating those gifted in the visual arts. It is also possible that those characteristics rated the lowest might help identify a small group

of artistically gifted individuals. For example: those characteristics which were rated lowest could be those that draw the least attention or are the hardest to deal with or identify, and therefore are overlooked by some as identifiers. Even the characteristic which was rated lowest (#36, "Recognizes styles and periods in art history") was indicated as being always or often displayed by almost half of those surveyed. Many teachers and experts noted that this was a characteristic which could be based on, or at least enhanced by, such factors as teacher initiative or socio-economic background of the student. Certainly a first grader would not be able to identify styles and periods of art history unless he had an unusual background. And, though he may have the potential for this, it may not be developed or identified until he is older. Implications, therefore, are that the artistically gifted student may indeed have the potential for development in some areas, but circumstances have not allowed for exposure. Also, some traits, though primarily related to teacher initiative or exposure may be more strongly inherent in an artistically gifted individual.

Survey items which deal with Art History, Aesthetics, Criticism, and Appreciation, not only gained special interest and comments from the participants, but included the greatest range of answers on the scales. There were many responses which indicated that the teachers realize the

importance of these subjects, but for various reasons were not able to include them in their programs. This was especially true of elementary art programs, where teachers spend once or twice a month with their students or have as many as five hundred students. The wide variety of responses may also be attributed to the fact that these subjects are dealt with less than product-related projects in public schools. This may be due to inadequate teacher training, lack of time, facilities, or other reasons. Another factor in the teaching of Aesthetics, Appreciation, and Criticism, is that in this time of accountability in schools, teachers may have a reluctance to teach them, as they are less easy to grade. Still another factor lies in the understanding of the art class in public schools. Many student do not want to have an academic slant in art classes. They prefer hands-on experiences. Some gifted individuals (artistic or otherwise) may fall into this category. Because even the artistically gifted student must meet the pressures of a system that is based on grades, added academic-type work in an art class receives some resentment. In a time when art enrollment is falling, teachers reluctantly must feel a need to cater to the desires of the students in order to draw them to the program. Although a few experts believe these characteristics (#36, 43), which deal with Art History, to be inherent

in an artistically gifted student, others believe them to be learned traits and rely heavily on teacher motivation.

Although some experts deal only with art-related behavior to identify the gifted, other general characteristics of giftedness and creativity were included on the questionnaire. Some of the general characteristics dealt with leadership, linguistic fluency, being a loner, and ability to memorize. Some characteristics identified with creativity or creative problem-solving can be associated with multiple solutions, intellectual and creative tasks, forming abstractions, fluency, imagery in brainstorming, and synthesizing. Many experts believe these characteristics, which deal with creativity, overlap with those which identify the gifted in the visual arts. Survey results indicate that the texas art teachers give some credence to those beliefs, as those characteristics are rated from 80% to 98% in frequency distribution and from 2.8 to 3.3 in the mean average scale. In both scales, less than half of the top twelve characteristics dealt with product-related behaviors. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers place greater importance on general behavioral characteristics than on technical qualities of the work.

Several negative characteristics were listed. Responses ranging from 53 to 80% in the often/always group indicate that many teachers recognize characteristics normally considered undesirable as being possessed by some

artistically gifted students. Those less familiar with gifted students would probably not associate these characteristics with the high achiever or the well-behaved student, and thus not with the gifted. Those who responded with low ratings would be the ones who least understand the complexities of giftedness. Those who responded with an answer deviating from those offered on the questionnaire would be the ones who most understand the diversity of the group of artistic individuals. Many experts do not view some of these characteristics as negative, but as traits which allow the student to question, discover, and invent. Strong willed, aggressive, divergent, and non-conformist, are descriptors which may be viewed in this way. The fact that many teachers recognize these behaviors, may indicate a positive shift in attitudes formerly associating good behavior with high achievement and thus with giftedness. Survey results also indicate that some artistically gifted students may have trouble with detail and drill, adhering to rules and regulations, and accepting authority. Those who associate giftedness with high achievement and conformist behavior may have the most disagreement with this. Survey results also indicate the possibility that, due to an interest in many areas, the artistically gifted individual may have enthusiasm for new projects, thus overextending himself or herself and not always being able to carry through with those projects. Survey results indicate that

there is the possibility that student interest in the subject matter will have some effect on task commitment.

Survey results indicate that, though the artistically gifted are often loners, even those loners may have the potential for leadership and sometimes actually assume leadership. Although leadership abilities may not have an important connection to artistic giftedness, it may be important for those identifying them to be aware that the artistically gifted individual may have any one or more of the following traits: he/she may be a loner, he/she may have leadership abilities, and it is likely that he/she may, at times, assume leadership. It may be important that the identifier know that all of these possibilities exist, in order to prevent exclusion of particular types from entrance into a program.

Other specific descriptors might have questionable validity as identifiers. These are product-related characteristics such as composition, movement, contrast and blending, and perspective, and art history related characteristics such as recognition of major works, periods, and styles. Many feel these to be either based on experience or teacher initiative. Therefore, it might be recommended that these characteristics be limited to use as identifiers for older, more experienced students, or not be used at all.

Because Texas art teachers feel strongly about certain characteristics, they could be used as identifiers for the

artistically gifted. The top thirteen characteristics chosen could be used in this way. However, conclusions based on the total survey results, indicate a list which is broader in scope, and would therefore identify a more diverse group of individuals gifted in the visual arts:

1. Most will display talent and interest in art; some will display this at an early age.
2. Most will display a strong interest in things visual.
3. Most will display a visual perception and sensibility.
4. Most will have the ability to experiment with news concepts, media, and ideas; some may display a reluctance to do so.
5. Many will display an interest in fantasy, mystery, and unusual phenomena.
6. Many will have task commitment when they are interested in a subject; some will need motivation on some tasks and direction in task completion.
7. Many will display a prolific, unusual, and intuitive imagination.
8. Many will display a keen and unique sense of humor.
9. Many will display the ability to move from the concrete to the abstract.
10. Many will display an ability to assimilate diverse concepts and to synthesize with own inventions.
11. Some will have a high I.Q. and a few will have a low I.Q.
12. Some will be high academic achievers and some will be low academic achievers.
13. Many will display an impatience with detail and drill which will lead to gaps in basic skills for some.

14. Many will have an ability for leadership; some will be loners.

15. Some will be well-behaved; some will exhibit nonconformist behavior.

16. Many will have the ability to use aesthetic judgment; some will need to be taught how to use this ability.

17. Many will acquire basic skills rapidly.

18. Many will have the ability to recognize periods, styles, and works in art history when exposed to this.

19. Many will do original work.

20. Many will do work which exhibits complex composition, much detail and elaboration, good use of movement, perspective, and media; some will need to be exposed to this.

21. Many will enjoy the challenge of intellectual and creative tasks.

22. Many will express their own feelings in work.

23. Many will generate multiple solutions to problems.

24. Many will spend much time in pursuing special interests and projects; some may overextend themselves.

In summary, major conclusions drawn from this part of the study are as follows:

1. The wide range of responses suggests an even wider range of characteristics which may be used to describe the diverse group of artistically gifted.

2. The fact that all characteristics were rated highly would support the theory that all characteristics could be used as identifiers. The higher rated items could be used to identify a large number of artistically gifted; the lower rated items, a smaller number.

3. Survey results indicate that teachers place more importance on general behavioral characteristics than art making skills.

4. Survey results indicate a shift in attitudes which heretofore associated good behavior and conformity with giftedness.

5. Survey results indicate that though leadership may not be an important component of artistic giftedness, it may be beneficial for those who identify to know that the artistically gifted can be either leaders or loners.

6. Survey results indicate that teachers recognize that artistically gifted students have undeveloped potential, and though a particular characteristic has not been developed, the possibility exists that it could.

Responses to the questionnaire items dealing with identification methods were straightforward. The ratings speak for themselves. That non-test measures represent the most frequently used methods may relate to the fact that survey participants were not involved in formal programs for the education of the artistically gifted. The fact that standardized tests were rarely used on the elementary level may tend to support this. It may also indicate that teachers, like many experts, do not trust the reliability of standardized tests of intelligence or creativity to detect artistic giftedness. A third possibility is that teachers do not know of these tests or how to obtain them. This is evidenced by the fact that several teachers asked where to find the tests listed, and several stated that they had never heard of them. That there is not enough agreement on

proper identification procedures may explain why teachers rely on intuition in order to identify the visually gifted.

Only sixteen chose the I.Q. test as a means of identification. There was some correlation between those who gave high ratings to intelligence as a characteristic of giftedness and those who chose I.Q. as a test method. This would imply that those who believe I.Q. to be important as a characteristic of artistic giftedness would use the I.Q. test as a method of identification for those programs. A similar relationship exists between those who chose creativity tests and those who rated highly those characteristics dealing with creativity or creative problem-solving. Only twenty participants chose creativity tests as a means of identification. While this could indicate that only a few believe creativity to be a part of artistic giftedness, other parts of the survey indicate otherwise. Characteristics, goals chosen, and specific comments made reveal that the participants in this survey do equate creativity with artistic giftedness. A specific point should serve as a reminder her. All of the participants in the survey were teachers (and one coordinator) of students in public schools. For the most part, identification was left entirely to the discretion of the teacher. The choice of what kind of program they developed could not be decided without first identifying the type of students they have. Many authorities on artistic gifted programs recommend that

the type of student to be attracted to the program be determined first, and that the means of identification be based on that type. This is impossible for the regular art class teacher. Choices and comments made on survey items indicate the need for official information regarding recommendations for identification of those gifted in the visual arts.

In summary, major conclusions drawn from this part of the study are as follows:

1. That non-test measures represent the most frequently used methods of identification may reflect the idea that teachers have little confidence in the validity of existing tests for use in identifying the artistically gifted and therefore rely heavily on their own intuition.

2. Although teachers equate creativity with artistic giftedness, few feel formal tests are a valid means of identification.

3. That few teachers used I.Q. tests as a means of identification would indicate that teachers feel I.Q. is of little value when identifying the artistically gifted.

4. Teachers indicated that they feel a need for more information on existing testing methods and a need for new testing methods.

The third part of the questionnaire (goals) may give some indication of the goals that art teachers think are important for artistically gifted students. Certainly if a list of the top ten choices was used, it would give teachers an example of important goals from which to choose. However, there is no evidence that these goals are being set or met. An average of 8.8 goals per teacher was chosen. The fact that so many goals were chosen by each teacher, may

serve to illustrate the fact that they feel these are important, but it is doubtful that all of them could be met, considering the complaints of class load and lack of time.

The goal rated the highest was "cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art and craft forms." This could suggest one of several things. It was the broadest subject of any of the goals and therefore could be the easiest to identify. It could also be the most closely linked to regular classroom programs. The fact that "cultivation" and "appreciation" were linked could give the statement a broader scope from which to choose. In other words, if the teacher was interested in having the students cultivate techniques in some media, but not study the appreciation of those particular media, he/she would be compelled to choose the goal, even though it included a goal which was not being set (that of appreciation). Linking art and crafts might have created the same problem. On the other hand, the fact that only 40% chose "explore a particular art or craft form" might indicate that the emphasis could be on the "appreciation" part of the goal statement. This is also indicated by the high rating of thinking skills over manual skills in the characteristic study. 67% of those surveyed chose "Creative Problem-Solving" and 67% chose "Self-Expression" as a goal. That this was the second highest rating could suggest that the teachers realize the need for goals related to higher level thinking skills.

Though 45% chose Criticism-Values and 46% chose Art History, many experts see the need for more of this in the schools. The survey results indicate that teachers also feel the need for this, but survey results do not offer proof that these goals are actually being set, much less met. Though emphasis seems to be shifting from product to thought, more research in this area is necessary in order to provide evidence that this is true.

When school districts do not set differential goals for the education of the artistically gifted, art teachers must choose goals to suit their particular circumstances. The advice that students be chosen to fit the goals and philosophies of the program is not valid in the case of the public school which has no established program. Leaving this up to the art teacher presents problems relating to lack of time, facilities, and knowledge. Until these needs are noted and attended to, there will be a lack of differential education for the artistically gifted.

In summary, major conclusions drawn from this part of the study are:

1. Results of the survey give an indication of what goals teachers think are important in educating the artistically gifted.

2. The highest rated goal chosen was "cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art and craft forms." This would seem to indicate that teachers choose goals which are broad and most easily linked to regular classroom curriculum.

3. Goals chosen indicate a shift from an emphasis on product to an emphasis on higher level thinking skills.

Recommendations for Future Study

This study was designed to determine what characteristics Texas art teachers attribute to the artistically gifted, what identification methods are being used, and what goals are being set for artistically gifted students in Texas public schools. Results of this study give some indication as to the opinions of the characteristics of artistic giftedness. The study does not offer proof that those characteristics can all be attributed to artistically gifted students, nor was it intended to. However, it does offer some insight into the various characteristics and behaviors of artistically gifted individuals and serves to emphasize the diversity of the group. Additional research would help in further defining the artistically gifted individual and making the distinctions between elementary and secondary artistically gifted clearer. A survey or personal interviews held with a large number of only elementary or secondary art teachers might serve to further refine and develop characteristics which would more clearly delineate differences between elementary and secondary gifted students. Such a list could assist public school art teachers in identification of the artistically gifted students and enhance the differentiation of the programs for

the students. Establishing a definition and a list of behavioral traits could also aid in deciding what methods to use in the identification of the artistically gifted. Ideally, a definition could be established, and this and a list of possible traits could be supplied to art teachers in public schools. Another study which might prove valuable, would be to investigate the educational background of art teachers in relation to gifted education. A study could then be done to determine if this has any influence on the kinds of characteristics which they use to describe the artistically gifted student. Additional research comparing the responses of teachers and using variables which were not determined by this survey could include comparisons of responses with socio-economic background, sex, age, and rural or urban setting.

Survey results show what a fairly representative sample uses as identification methods, but the study indicates the lack of any conclusive information which could direct the classroom teacher in choosing a method or combination of methods to identify artistically gifted students. Although some experts have certain methods which they would recommend, there is no conclusively valid method for detecting artistically gifted individuals. Future research might include a study of identification methods used in established programs for the artistically gifted in schools other than public. Though research may never prove conclusively

that any one or combination of these methods is foolproof, more attention to the subject by educators would assist teachers in establishing guidelines. Certainly, a list of methods, how to use them, and where to obtain them would be beneficial to art teachers. Further research in this area could include a study which involved administering tests and combinations of tests to a group of students and a follow-up study to trace the progress of those students identified as artistically gifted. Two different test combinations could be used, and those two groups of students could be compared in relation to progress in future art classes, college art courses, and related careers. Certainly, it is of vital importance that a way be found to properly identify the visually gifted.

The third part of the study was meant to determine what goals art teachers set for their artistically gifted students. Table IV clearly indicates what the respondents in the sample group believe to be important goals in art education. Further research, such as personal interviews, may be able to determine what goals are actually being set and met. It could also determine what and how many goals would be feasible for the instruction of the artistically gifted in the regular art class. This research could include further investigation into goals of existing programs for the artistically gifted. A comparison study could be made to see how the characteristics used to

identify the artistically gifted relate to the goals of those programs.

Most available information on the subject gives recommendations on how to set up separate programs for the artistically gifted outside the regular art class. Certainly the results of this study attest to the fact that this kind of information has little bearing on the plight of classroom art teachers, who are blessed with ten (out of one hundred to five hundred) students who they feel to be artistically gifted. The information that is most needed now, is that which assists the regular art teacher in providing for this small group of special students in the most inexpensive and expedient way. Interviews with teachers interested in finding ways to identify and instruct would provide helpful insights into specific needs and provide personal input which may yield interpretations differing from those obtained through the mail. Recommendations for future study could include these interviews and further research into establishing valid and appropriate goals which relate to the specific needs of artistically gifted students in the regular public school art class.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: CHARACTERISTICS

Rate characteristics of the artistically gifted individuals by checking those characteristics you believe describe them best. 4=always displayed, 3=often displayed, 2=seldom displayed, 1=never displayed.

		4	3	2	1
1.	Enjoys the challenge and involvement of intellectual and creative tasks				
2.	Has keen and sometimes unique sense of humor				
3.	Displays divergent and nonconformist behavior				
4.	Formulates abstractions and moves easily from concrete to abstract levels of thinking and communicating				
5.	Acquires basic skills rapidly and with a minimum of practice				
6.	Comprehends advanced ideas, concepts, and implications				
7.	Has an unusual ability to memorize				
8.	Is impatient with detail and drill, which may result in gaps of basic skills for some				
9.	Generates multiple solutions to problems				
10.	Expends much energy and time in pursuing special interests and may be involved in numerous projects				
11.	Expresses himself/herself fluently, clearly, and forcefully with words and creative products				
12.	Demonstrates a richness of imagery in formal language and brainstorming				
13.	Has leadership abilities				
14.	Tends to assume leadership				
15.	Becomes excited about new ideas but does not always carry them through				
16.	Is a loner part of the time				
17.	Is willing or able to experiment with new ideas				
18.	Is self-motivated				
19.	Is committed to tasks he/she is interested in, good concentration				
20.	Shows early evidence of interest in art				

	4	3	2	1
21. Shows an interest in fantasy, mystery, unusual phenomena				
22. Utilizes past experiences in new ways				
23. Has a high I.Q.				
24. Is a high academic achiever				
25. Shows superior manual and technical skills				
26. Adheres to rules, regulations, routine study				
27. Has an intuitive quality of imagination				
28. Shows a strong interest in things visual				
29. Has flexibility with ideas				
30. Accepts art appreciation as part of studies				
31. Displays critical-discursive abilities				
32. Shows aesthetic intelligence and judgment				
33. Remembers and uses much detail				
34. Recognizes major works in art history				
35. Shows fluency of visual expression				
36. Recognizes styles and periods in art history				
37. Relates art to other fields				
38. Relates to pictures more than words				
39. Often spread too thin and overcommitted				
40. Doodles frequently				
41. Challenges authority				
42. Is strong willed and aggressive				
43. Reads and talks about art and visits museums				
44. Has a prolific and unusual imagination				
45. Has future goals which relate to art fields				
46. Has the ability and desire to invent or re-invent				
Characteristics of Work:				
1. Shows compositional control				
2. Shows complexity in composition of work				
3. Shows elaboration in work				
4. Specializes in one subject matter				
5. Is adept in depiction of movement				
6. Uses deliberate contrast and blending				
7. Expresses own feelings in work				
8. Uses true to appearance representation				
9. Exhibits good use of perspective				
10. Shows effective use of media				
11. May lack sufficient skills to represent mature talent				
12. Products show obvious talent and artistic expression				
13. May manifest talent early				
14. Displays skills of visual perception and sensibility				

	4	3	2	1
15. Work is original				
16. Spontaneously produces large numbers of works				
17. Shows vivid and accurate detail in work				
18. Shows early ability to mimic styles of adult artists				
19. Work demonstrates ability to synthesize own inventions with ideas from diverse sources				

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: IDENTIFICATION METHODS

Check the methods that are used to identify your students as gifted in the visual arts.

Standardized Tests:

I.Q. Test
Scholastic Achievement Test
Horn Art Aptitude Inventory
Meier Art Tests, 1 or 2
Graves Design Judgment Test
Guillford Creativity Tests
Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking
Knauber Art Ability Test
Advanced Placement Program in Studio Art
Art Talent Behavior Record
Baker's Narrative Drawing Assessment
Baker's Visual Memory Assessment
Metropolitan Achievement Tests
Williams Cognitive Affective Interaction Model
Wilson Cognitive Instrument
Other (list)

Informal Instruments:

Teacher made tests
Local made tests
Portfolio review
Structured nominations
Behavior checklist
Self-interest inventory
Biographical inventory
Other (list)

Non-Test Measures:

Peer nominations
Interviews
Indicators of desire or interest
Previous art record

Previous academic record
Observation
Self-nomination
Parent nomination
Art teacher nomination
Other (list)

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: GOALS

Check the goals which best identify the goals of your program for educating the gifted in your art classes.

		✓
1.	The exploration and refining of a particular art or craft form	
2.	The cultivation and appreciation of a variety of art or craft forms	
3.	The formation of a value system for art or craft criticism	
4.	The examination of creative problem-solving in an art or craft form	
5.	The exploration of markets and the marketing of an art or craft form	
6.	The enrichment in an art or craft medium	
7.	The acceleration in an art or craft medium	
8.	The examination of careers and vocations in art or crafts	
9.	Self-expression	
10.	Individualized art experiences	
11.	The learning of elements and principles	
12.	Unified or interdisciplinary understanding of the arts	
13.	Art as enrichment for academically gifted students	
14.	Artists visiting in the class	
15.	The examination of art history	
16.	The development of aesthetic attitudes	
17.	The development of visual sensitivity and powers of observation	
18.	Acquisition of a non-verbal system of cognition and communication	
19.	The establishment of self-identity through satisfying individual performances	
20.	Extra time for in-depth study	
21.	Other (list)	

APPENDIX D

MARGINAL TABULATION
(125 Surveys)

General Characteristics

Question Number	Response 4		Response 3		Response 5		Response 2		Response 1		Response 6	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	65	52.0%	58	46.4%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	32	25.6%	80	64.0%	1	0.8%	11	8.8%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
3	18	14.4%	78	62.4%	2	1.6%	20	16.0%	3	2.4%	4	3.2%
4	42	33.6%	68	54.4%	0	0.0%	12	9.6%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%
5	69	55.2%	47	37.6%	1	0.8%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%
6	56	44.8%	63	50.4%	0	0.0%	5	4.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
7	19	15.2%	66	52.8%	2	1.6%	23	18.4%	5	4.0%	10	8.0%
8	28	22.4%	55	44.0%	1	0.8%	31	24.8%	7	5.6%	3	2.4%
9	37	29.6%	76	60.8%	1	0.8%	9	7.2%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%
10	58	46.4%	55	44.0%	0	0.0%	8	6.4%	3	2.4%	1	0.8%
11	27	21.6%	77	61.6%	4	3.2%	13	10.4%	2	1.6%	2	1.6%
12	31	24.8%	69	55.2%	3	2.4%	17	13.6%	1	0.8%	4	3.2%
13	26	20.8%	68	54.4%	4	3.2%	22	17.6%	3	2.4%	2	1.6%
14	18	14.4%	63	50.4%	2	1.6%	36	28.8%	4	3.2%	2	1.6%
15	25	20.0%	71	56.8%	2	1.6%	20	16.0%	6	3.8%	1	0.8%
16	20	16.0%	80	64.0%	1	0.8%	19	15.2%	4	3.2%	1	0.8%
17	59	47.2%	57	45.6%	1	0.8%	6	4.8%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%
18	55	44.0%	57	45.6%	3	2.4%	10	8.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
19	73	58.4%	47	37.6%	0	0.0%	5	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
20	65	52.0%	47	37.6%	2	1.6%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	5	4.0%
21	60	48.0%	45	36.0%	3	2.4%	14	11.2%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
22	32	25.6%	76	36.0%	2	1.6%	9	7.2%	2	1.6%	4	3.2%
23	19	15.2%	69	60.8%	7	5.6%	17	13.6%	2	1.6%	11	8.8%
24	15	12.0%	57	55.2%	9	7.2%	33	26.4%	4	3.2%	7	5.6%
25	47	37.6%	62	45.6%	1	0.8%	11	8.8%	2	1.6%	2	1.6%
26	13	10.4%	54	49.6%	8	6.4%	42	33.6%	7	5.6%	1	0.8%
27	58	46.4%	60	43.2%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
28	76	60.8%	46	48.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%
29	47	37.6%	67	53.6%	2	1.6%	7	5.6%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%
30	27	21.6%	73	58.4%	2	1.6%	20	16.0%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
31	18	14.4%	77	61.6%	2	1.6%	16	12.8%	2	1.6%	10	8.0%
32	39	31.2%	79	63.2%	1	0.8%	4	3.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%
33	54	43.2%	60	48.0%	2	1.6%	8	6.4%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%
34	12	9.6%	64	51.2%	5	4.0%	34	27.2%	5	4.0%	5	4.0%
35	48	38.4%	64	51.2%	0	0.0	7	5.6%	1	0.8%	5	4.0%
36	5	4.0%	53	42.4%	4	3.2%	47	37.6%	10	8.0%	6	4.8%
37	20	16.0%	74	59.2%	2	1.6%	17	13.6%	4	3.2%	8	6.4%
38	46	36.8%	51	40.8%	2	1.6%	15	12.0%	5	4.0%	6	4.8%
39	21	16.8%	49	39.2%	5	4.0%	33	26.4%	12	9.6%	5	4.0%
40	46	36.8%	55	44.0%	0	0.0%	17	13.6%	4	3.2%	3	2.4%
41	21	16.8%	49	39.2%	7	5.6%	35	28.0%	11	8.8%	2	1.6%
42	20	16.0%	49	39.2%	8	6.4%	39	31.2%	6	4.8%	3	2.4%
43	10	8.0%	52	41.6%	2	1.6%	45	36.0%	9	7.2%	7	5.6%
44	46	36.8%	62	49.6%	1	0.8%	13	10.4%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
45	18	14.4%	63	50.4%	4	3.2%	27	21.6%	6	4.8%	7	5.6%
46	37	29.6%	66	52.8%	2	1.6%	8	6.4%	1	0.8%	11	8.8%

Work Characteristics

Question Number	Response 4		Response 3		Response 5		Response 2		Response 1		Response 6	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	46	36.8%	69	55.2%	0	0.0%	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%
2	53	42.4%	60	48.0%	0	0.0%	9	7.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%
3	58	46.4%	60	48.0%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
4	17	13.6%	56	44.8%	2	1.6%	41	32.8%	6	4.8%	3	2.4%
5	24	19.2%	78	62.4%	2	1.6%	14	11.2%	2	1.6%	5	4.0%
6	42	33.6%	68	54.4%	0	0.0%	11	8.8%	1	0.8%	3	2.4%
7	54	43.2%	63	50.4%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%
8	24	19.2%	74	59.2%	10	8.0%	12	9.6%	3	2.4%	2	1.6%
9	44	35.2%	62	49.6%	3	2.4%	13	10.4%	1	0.8%	2	1.6%
10	56	44.8%	60	48.0%	1	0.8%	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
11	14	11.2%	55	44.0%	1	0.8%	39	31.2%	9	7.2%	7	5.6%
12	80	64.0%	41	32.8%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
13	56	44.8%	55	44.0%	2	1.6%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	6	4.8%
14	52	41.6%	71	56.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%
15	57	45.6%	56	44.8%	3	2.4%	8	6.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
16	29	23.2%	50	40.0%	5	4.0%	33	26.4%	3	2.4%	5	4.0%
17	42	33.6%	67	53.6%	3	2.4%	10	8.0%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%
18	23	18.4%	59	47.2%	5	4.0%	26	20.8%	4	3.2%	8	6.4%
19	30	24.0%	76	60.8%	2	1.6%	10	8.0%	3	2.4%	4	3.2%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Cattell, R. (1971). The structure of intelligence in relation to the nature-nurture controversy. In R. Cancro (Ed.), Intelligence genetic and environmental influences. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Clark, B. (1979). Growing up gifted. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Clark, G., & Zimmerman, E. (1984). Educating artistically talented students. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Coleman, L. (1985). Schooling the gifted. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Dobzhansky, T. (1964). Heredity and nature of man. New York: New American Library.

Gallagher, J. (1975). Teaching the gifted child (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Getzells, J., & Jackson, P. (1962). Creativity and Intelligence: Explorations with gifted children. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Gold, M. (1982). Education of the gifted/talented. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gowan, J., & Bruch, C. (1971). The academically talented student and guidance. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Hurwitz, A. (1983). The gifted and talented in art. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Khatena, J. (1982). Educational psychology of the gifted. New York: Wiley.

Lark-Horovitz, B., Lewis, H., & Lucas, M. (1967). Understanding children's art for better teaching. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Lindsey, M. (1980). Training teachers of the gifted and talented. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lowenfeld, V. (1957). Creative and mental growth (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W. L. (1964). Creative and mental growth. New York: Macmillan.

Mendelowitz, D. (1963). Children are artists: An introduction to children's art for teachers and parents (2nd ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Newland, T. (1976). The gifted in socioeducational perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Renzulli, J. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Sanderlin, O. (1979). Gifted children. New York: Barnes.

Shields, B. (1973). The gifted child. New York: Humanities Press.

Vernon, P., Adamson, G., & Vernon, D. (1977). The psychology and education of gifted children. Boulder, CO: Viewpoint Press.

Articles

Bruch, C. (1984). Schooling for the gifted: Where do we go from here? Gifted Child Quarterly, 28(1), 2-16.

Cagne, F. (1985). Giftedness and talent: Reexamining a reexamination of the definitions. Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(3), 103-112.

Fritz, H. (1930). A search for and conservation of the gifted. Bulletin of High Points, 12(8), 19-25.

Lyon, H. (1981). Our most neglected natural resource. Today's Education, February, 19GS-21GS.

Meier, N. (Ed.). (1939). Studies in the psychology of art. Vol. 3: Psychological Monographs. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 1939.

Munro, T., Lark-Horovitz, B., & Barnhardt, E. (1942). Studies at the Cleveland Museum of Art. Journal of Experimental Education, 11(2), 97-184.

Passow, A. (1981). The nature of giftedness and talent. Gifted Child Quarterly, 25(1), 5-10.

Renzulli, J. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. Phi Delta Kappan, 261(1).

Rosenzwieg, M. (1966). Environmental complexity, cerebral change and behavior. American Psychologist, 21, 321-332.

Salome, R. (1974). Identifying and instructing the gifted in art. Art Education, 27(3), 16-19.

Wilson, B., & Wilson, M. (1976). Visual narrative and the artistically gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 20(4), 432-447.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Fraser, M. (1980). Screening and identification of gifted students. In J. Jordan & J. Grossi (Eds.), An administrators handbook on designing programs for the gifted and talented (pp. 48-50). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Grossi, J. (1980). Model state policy, legislation and state plan toward the education of gifted and talented students. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Public Documents

Idaho State Department of Education. (n.d.). Guidelines for gifted and talented program. (Educational programs for g/t students). (1978). Austin, TX: TEA.

Luca, M., & Allen, B. (1974). Teaching gifted children in grades one through three. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 082433).

Texas Education Agency. (n.d.). The Texas state plan and guidelines for the education of the gifted and talented. Austin, TX: Author.

United States Office of Education. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented: Report to Congress. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Unpublished Materials

Clark, G. (November, 1985). Personal communication.

Hurwitz, A. (November 11, 1985). Personal communication.

McGee-Cooper, A. (December 10, 1985). Personal communication.

Texas Education Agency. (1978). Characteristics of the gifted individual. [Available from Pat Schmidt, Gifted/Talented Specialist, San Antonio Independent School District, 141 Lavaca St., San Antonio, TX 78210]. Unpublished list.

Wilson, B. (November 21, 1985). Personal communication.