Intellectual giftedness

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Intellectual giftedness is an intellectual ability significantly higher than average. It is a characteristic of children, variously defined, that motivates differences in school programming. It is thought to persist as a trait into adult life, with various consequences studied in longitudinal studies of giftedness over the last century. There is no generally agreed definition of giftedness for either children or adults, but most school placement decisions and most longitudinal studies over the course of individual lives have been based on IQ in the top 2 percent of the population, that is above IQ 130.

The various definitions of intellectual giftedness include either general high ability or specific abilities. For example, by some definitions an intellectually gifted person may have a striking talent for mathematics without equally strong language skills. In particular, the relationship between artistic ability or musical ability and the high academic ability usually associated with high IQ scores is still being explored, with some authors referring to all of those forms of high ability as "giftedness," while other authors distinguish "giftedness" from "talent." There is still much controversy and much research on the topic of how adult performance unfolds from trait differences in childhood, and what educational and other supports best help the development of adult giftedness.

Contents

Identification

Overview

The identification of giftedness first emerged after development of IQ tests for school placement.[1][2][3] It has since become an important issue for schools, as the instruction of gifted students often presents special challenges. During the twentieth century, gifted children were often classified via IQ tests; other identification procedures have been proposed but are only used in a minority of cases in most public schools in the English-speaking world.[4][5][6] Developing useful identification procedures for students who could benefit from a more challenging school curriculum is an ongoing problem in school administration.[7][8]

Because of the key role that gifted education programs in schools play in the identification of gifted individuals, both children and adults, it is worthwhile to examine how schools define the term "gifted".

Definitions

For many years, psychometricians and psychologists, following in the footsteps of Lewis Terman in 1916, equated giftedness with high IQ. This "legacy" survives to the present day, in that giftedness and high IQ continue to be equated in some conceptions of giftedness. Since that early time, however, other researchers (e.g., Raymond Cattell, J. P. Guilford, and Louis Leon Thurstone) have argued that intellect cannot be expressed in such a unitary manner, and have suggested more multifaceted approaches to intelligence.

Research conducted in the 1980s and 1990s has provided data which support notions of multiple components to intelligence. This is particularly evident in the reexamination of "giftedness" by Sternberg and Davidson in their collection of articles *Conceptions of Giftedness*. The many different conceptions of giftedness presented, although distinct, are interrelated in several ways. Most of the investigators define giftedness in terms of multiple qualities, not all of which are intellectual. IQ scores are often viewed as inadequate measures of giftedness.[9] Motivation, high self-concept, and creativity are key qualities in many of these broadened conceptions of giftedness.

Joseph Renzulli's (1978) "three ring" definition of giftedness is one frequently mentioned conceptualization of giftedness. Renzulli's definition, which defines gifted behaviors rather than gifted individuals, is composed of three components as follows: Gifted behavior consists of behaviors that reflect an interaction among three basic clusters of human traits—above average ability, high levels of task commitment, and high levels of creativity.[10] Individuals capable of developing gifted behavior are those possessing or capable of developing this composite set of traits and applying them to any potentially valuable area of human performance. Persons who manifest or are capable of developing an interaction among the three clusters require a wide variety of educational opportunities and services that are not ordinarily provided through regular instructional programs.

In *Identifying Gifted Children: A Practical Guide*, Susan K. Johnsen explains that gifted children all exhibit the potential for high performance in the areas included in the United States' federal definition of gifted and talented students:[11]

There is a federal government statutory definition of gifted and talented students in the United States.

> The term "gifted and talented" when used in respect to students, children, or youth means students, children, or youth who give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, artistic, or leadership capacity, or in specific academic fields, and who require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop such capabilities." (P.L. 103–382, Title XIV, p. 388)

This definition has been adopted partially or completely by the majority of the individual states in the United States (which have the main responsibility for education policy as compared to the federal government). Most states have a definition similar to that used in the State of Texas:

> "gifted and talented student" means a child or youth who performs at or shows the potential for performing at a remarkably high level of accomplishment when compared to others of the same age, experience, or environment, and who
>
> - exhibits high performance capability in an intellectual, creative, or artistic area;
> - possesses an unusual capacity for leadership; or
> - excels in a specific academic field." (74th legislature of the State of Texas, Chapter 29, Subchapter D, Section 29.121)

The major characteristics of these definitions are (a) the diversity of areas in which performance may be exhibited (e.g., intellectual, creativity, artistic, leadership, academically), (b) the comparison with other groups (e.g., those in general education classrooms or of the same age, experience, or environment), and (c) the use of terms that imply a need for development of the gift (e.g., capability and potential).

Identification methods

Many schools use a variety of assessments of students' capability and potential when identifying gifted children.[11] These may include portfolios of student work, classroom observations, achievement tests, and IQ test scores. Most educational professionals accept that no single criterion can be used in isolation to accurately identify a gifted child.

IQ scores can vary for the same person, so a person does not always belong to the same IQ score range each time the person is tested. (IQ score table data and pupil pseudonyms adapted from description of KABC-II norming study cited in Kaufman 2009.[12])

Pupil			
Asher	90	95	111
Brianna	125	110	105
Colin	100	93	101
Danica	116	127	118
Elpha	93	105	93
Fritz	106	105	105
Georgi	95	100	90
Hector	112	113	103
Imelda	104	96	97
Jose	101	99	86
Keoku	81	78	75
Leo	116	124	102

One of the criteria used in identification may be an IQ test score. Until the late 1960s, when “giftedness” was defined by an IQ score, a school district simply set an arbitrary score (usually in the 130 range) and a student either did or did not “make the cut”. It is no longer accepted today in academic circles; however, it's still used by many school districts because it is simple and not entirely without merit. Although a high IQ score is not the sole indicator of giftedness, usually if a student has a very high IQ, that is a significant indicator of high academic potential.[13] Because of this consideration, if a student scores highly on an IQ test, but performs at an average or below average level academically, school officials may think that this issue warrants further investigation as an example of underachievement.[14] However, scholars of educational testing point out that a test-taker's scores on any two tests may vary, so a lower score on an achievement test than on an IQ test neither necessarily indicates that the test-taker is underachieving nor necessarily that the school curriculum is underchallenging.[15]

IQ classification varies from one publisher to another. IQ tests do not have validity for determining test-takers' rank order at higher IQ levels,[16] and are perhaps only effective at determining whether a student is gifted rather than distinguishing among levels of giftedness. The Wechsler tests have a standard score ceiling of 160. Today, the Wechsler child and adult IQ tests are by far the most commonly used IQ tests in hospitals,

schools, and private psychological practice.[17][18] Older versions of the Stanford-Binet test, now obsolete, and the Cattell IQ test purport to yield IQ scores of 180 or higher, but those scores are not comparable to scores on currently normed tests. The Stanford-Binet Third Revision (Form L-M) yields consistently higher numerical scores for the same test-taker than scores obtained on current tests. This has prompted some authors on identification of gifted children to promote the Stanford-Binet form L-M, which has long been obsolete,[19] as the only test with a sufficient ceiling to identify the exceptionally and profoundly gifted, despite the Stanford-Binet L-M never having been normed on a representative national sample.[20] Because the instrument is outdated, current results derived from the Stanford-Binet L-M generate inflated and inaccurate scores.[21] The IQ assessment of younger children remains debated.

While many people believe giftedness is a strictly quantitative difference, measurable by IQ tests, some authors on the "experience of being" have described giftedness as a fundamentally different way of perceiving the world, which in turn affects every experience had by the gifted individual. This view is doubted by some scholars who have closely studied gifted children longitudinally.[22]

Developmental theory

Gifted children may develop asynchronously: their minds are often ahead of their physical growth, and specific cognitive and emotional functions are often developed differently (or to differing extents) at different stages of development. One frequently cited example of asynchronicity in early cognitive development is Albert Einstein, who did not speak until the age of four, but whose later fluency and accomplishments belied this initial delay. Psychologist and cognitive scientist Steven Pinker theorized that, rather than viewing Einstein's (and other famously gifted late-talking individuals) adult accomplishments as existing distinct from, or in spite of, his early language deficits, and rather than viewing Einstein's lingual delay itself as a "disorder", it may be that Einstein's genius and his delay in speaking were developmentally intrinsic to one another.[23] This is actually a total myth. Albert Einstein spoke in complete sentences at age 2.

It has been said that gifted children may advance more quickly through stages established by post-Freudian developmentalists such as Jean Piaget.[24] Gifted individuals also experience the world differently, resulting in certain social and emotional issues.

Francoy Gagne's (2000) *Differentiated Model of Giftedness and Talent* (DMGT) is a developmental theory that distinguishes giftedness from talent, offering explanation on how outstanding natural abilities (gifts) develop into specific expert skills (talents).[25] According to DMGT theory, "one cannot become talented without first being gifted, or almost so".[26] There are six components that can interact in countless and unique ways that foster the process of moving from having natural abilities (giftedness) to systematically developed skills.

These components consist of the *gift* (G) itself, *chance* (C), *environmental catalyst* (EC), *intrapersonal catalyst* (IC), *learning/practice* (LP) and the outcome of *talent* (T).[26] It is important to know that (C), (IC), and (EC) can facilitate but can also hinder the learning and training of becoming talented. The learning/practice is the moderator. It is through the interactions, both environmental and intrapersonal that influence the process of learning and practice along with/without chance that natural abilities are transformed into talents.

Multiple intelligences theory

Multiple intelligences has been associated with giftedness or overachievement of some developmental areas (Colangelo, 2003).[27] Multiple intelligences has been described as an attitude towards learning, instead of techniques or strategies (Cason, 2001).[28]

There are said to be eight Intelligences, or different areas in which people assimilate or learn about the world around them: interpersonal, intrapersonal, bodily-kinesthetic, linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, naturalistic, and spatial-visual. If the Theory of Multiple Intelligences is applied to educational curriculum, by providing lesson plans, themes, and programs in a way that all students are encouraged to develop their stronger area, and at the same time educators provide opportunities to enhance the learning process in the less strong areas, academic success may be attainable for all children in a school system.

Howard Gardner proposed in *Frames of Mind* (Gardner 1983/1994) that intellectual giftedness may be present in areas other than the typical intellectual realm. The concept of multiple intelligences (MI) makes the field aware of additional potential strengths and proposes a variety of curricular methods.

Gardner suggests MI in the following areas: Linguistic, logico-mathematical, musical, spatial, kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, naturalistic and existential.

Identification of gifted students with MI is a challenge since there is no simple test to give to determine giftedness of MI. Assessing by observation is potentially most accurate, but potentially highly subjective. MI theory can be applied to not only gifted students, but it can be a lens through which all students can be assessed. This more global perspective may lead to more child-centered instruction and meet the needs of a greater number of children (Colangelo, 2003).[27]

This perspective has been criticized on the grounds that it is *ad hoc*: that Gardner is not expanding the definition of the word "intelligence", but rather denies the existence of intelligence as traditionally understood, and instead uses the word "intelligence" where other people have traditionally used words like "ability" and "aptitude".

Characteristics

Generally, gifted individuals learn more quickly, deeply, and broadly than their peers. Gifted children may learn to read early and operate at the same level as normal children who are significantly older. The gifted tend to demonstrate high reasoning ability, creativity, curiosity, a large vocabulary, and an excellent memory. They can often master concepts with few repetitions. They may also be perfectionistic, and may frequently question authority. Some have trouble relating to or communicating with their peers because of disparities in vocabulary size (especially in the early years), personality, interests, and motivation. As children, they may prefer the company of older children or adults.[29]

Giftedness is frequently not evenly distributed throughout all intellectual spheres; an individual may excel in solving logic problems yet be a poor speller; another gifted individual may be able to read and write at a far above-average level yet have trouble with mathematics.

It is possible there are different types of giftedness with their own unique features, just as there are different types of developmental delay.

Giftedness may become noticeable in individuals at different points of development. While early development (i.e. speaking or reading at a very young age) usually comes with giftedness, it is not a determinant of giftedness.

Savantism

Savants are individuals who perform exceptionally in a single field of learning. More often savant and savantism describes people with a single field of learning well beyond what is considered normal, even among the gifted community. *Autistic savantism* refers to the exceptional abilities occasionally exhibited by people with autism or other pervasive developmental disorders. The term was introduced in a 1978 article in *Psychology Today* describing this condition.

Gifted minority students in the United States

While White students represent the majority of students enrolled in gifted programs, Black and Hispanic students constitute a percentage less than their enrollment in school.[30] For example, statistics from 1993 indicate that in the U.S., Black students represented 16.2% of public school students, but only constituted 8.4% of students enrolled in gifted education programs. Similarly, while Hispanic students represented 9% of public school students, these students only represented 4.7% of those identified as gifted.[31] However, Asian students make up only 3.6% of the student body, yet constitute 14% in the gifted programs.

In their 2004 study, "Addressing the Achievement Gap Between Minority and Nonminority Children by Increasing Access to Gifted Programs" Olszewski-Kubilius et al. write that minority students are "less likely to be nominated by teachers as potential candidates for gifted programs and, if nominated, are less likely to be selected for the program, particularly when such traditional measures as I.Q. and achievement tests are used for identification."[32]

This underrepresentation of such students in gifted programs is attributed to a multiplicity of factors including cultural bias of testing procedures, population differences in IQ, selective referrals and educator bias, and a reliance on deficit-based paradigms.[33] To address the inequities in assessment procedures, researchers suggest the use of multiple tests and alternative methods of testing, such as performance-based assessment measures, oral-expressiveness measures as well as non-verbal ability assessments (such as Naglieri Nonverbal Abilities Tests (NNAT) or Raven's Matrix Analogies Tests.[34]

According to 2013-2014 data collected by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education, White students have more opportunities and exposure to attending school that offers gifted and talented education programs (GATE) than racial and ethnic minority students, specifically Black and Latino students. Data collected by the Office of Civil Rights department of the Department of Education also reveal that racial/ethnic minority students are underrepresented in gifted and talented education programs. Forty-nine percent of all students enrolled in schools that offer GATE programs are White. Whereas 42% of all students enrolled in schools that offer GATE programs are Latino and Black. Thus revealing that white people have more opportunities to being a part of a school that offers GATE programs. The issue is within these GATE programs 29% of the students are Latino and Black and 57% are White (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).[35] These statistics makes one desire information that explains why there is such a small representation of racial minority intellectual gifted students in American schools.

Weinstein's (2002) suggests that some teachers recommend racial minority students – with the exception to Asian students – to special education and remedial classes more often than gifted and talented classes due to teacher expectancy biases placed on racial minority students. Teachers expectations of their students' academic performance influences how students perceive themselves. If a teacher expects more success

academically from specific students, those students are prone to displaying behavior and work ethic that will set them apart from others in a positive light. Whereas if a teacher only expects bare minimum from his or her students, those students will merely do what is expected of them (Weinstein, 2002).[36]

Racial minority students who are perceived as being disadvantaged from their peers in regards to socioeconomic status tend to have less supportive relations with their teachers (Fitzpatrick, 2015).[37] Due to this lack of support, teachers do not expect these disadvantaged students to go above and beyond, therefore they are often overlooked when it's time for gifted and talented education program nominations. Research suggests that teacher expectancy bias can also be diminish by matching the racial demographics of students to that of teachers. Gershenson and colleagues (2016) found that non-Black teachers held low expectations of their black students specifically in relation to black male students and math. Whereas, Black teachers held high expectations to black male students in regards to math. This finding suggests that racial diversity in our educators is positive step toward diminishing teacher expectancy bias.[38]

Weinstein and colleagues (1991)[39] aimed to change the low expectations attached to racial minority students of an urban high school that placed many Black and Latino students in remedial programs rather than college preparatory or honor classes. The study aimed to prepare these racial minority students for college level academic work while attending high school. With positive teacher attitudes toward students and greater teacher self-efficacy, the students who were once on track to being recommended for remedial classes where performing at advanced academic levels after 2 years of intervention. They were also more heavily involved in leadership roles at their high school. This study supports the claim that teacher expectancy contributes to how a student sees him or herself in regards to achievements (Weinstein et al., 1991).[39]

In addition to the findings and conclusions within the Weinstein et al. study; It is also important to consider reevaluating teacher expectancy biases in order to increase the number of racial minority students being recommended to gifted and talented education programs. This can be achieved by monitoring the rate in which minority students are being recommended to remedial classes in comparison to GATE programs. It is also important to ensure that the process for entrance into both types of education programs are not steered by subconscious biases. This can be achieved by eliminating the biases surrounding teacher expectancy for racial minority students based on prejudices. Once we are able to eliminate the biases surrounding teacher expectancy, we should see an increase in the number of racial minority students being referred to GATE programs.

Gifted students of color experience success when multicultural content is incorporated in the curriculum and furthermore when the curriculum itself is designed to be culturally and linguistically compatible.[30] A culturally diverse curriculum and instruction encourages gifted minority students to experience a sense of belonging and validation as scholars.[40] Furthermore, the educator's role in this process is significant as Lee et al. argue that "[t]eacher awareness and understanding of students' racial and cultural differences and their ability to incorporate multicultural perspectives into curricular content and instructional techniques may counter gifted minority students' discomfort in being one of the few minority students in gifted programs."[40]

Twice-exceptional

The term twice-exceptional was coined by James J. Gallagher to denote students who are both gifted and have disabilities.[41][42] People have known about twice-exceptional students for thirty years; however, identification and program strategies remain ambiguous.[43] These students need remediation for their

learning deficits and enhancement for their strengths to achieve.[43] Twice-exceptional students are considered to be at risk because they are hidden within the general population of their educational environment, and usually viewed as either underachievers or average learners.[43][44]

Early identification and intervention is critical; however, giftedness in the twice-exceptional population is often identified later than in the average population as it is masked by the disability. The disabilities may include auditory processing weaknesses, sensory motor integration issues, visual perceptual difficulties, spatial disorientation, dyslexia, and attention deficits. Recognition of learning difficulties among the gifted is made extremely difficult by virtue of their ability to compensate. Among the signs that the student may be twice-exceptional are apparent inconsistencies between abilities and results, deficits in short-term memory and attention, and negative behaviors such as being sarcastic, negative, or aggressive.[45]

Social and emotional issues

Isolation

Isolation is one of the main challenges faced by gifted individuals, especially those with no social network of gifted peers. In order to gain popularity, gifted children will often try to hide their abilities to win social approval. Strategies include underachievement (discussed below) and the use of less sophisticated vocabulary when among same-age peers than when among family members or other trusted individuals.[46]

The isolation experienced by gifted individuals may not be caused by giftedness itself, but by society's response to giftedness. Plucker and Levy have noted that, "in this culture, there appears to be a great pressure for people to be 'normal' with a considerable stigma associated with giftedness or talent."[47] To counteract this problem, gifted education professionals recommend creating a peer group based on common interests and abilities. The earlier this occurs, the more effective it is likely to be in preventing isolation.[48][49]

Research suggests that gifted adolescents might have deficiencies in social valuation, mentalization,[50] and social adaptive learning.[51]

Perfectionism

Perfectionism is another issue for gifted individuals. It is encouraged by the fact that gifted individuals tend to be easily successful in much of what they do.

Healthy perfectionism refers to having high standards, a desire to achieve, conscientiousness, or high levels of responsibility. It is likely to be a virtue rather than a problem, even if gifted children may have difficulty with healthy perfectionism because they set standards that would be appropriate to their mental age (the level at which they think), but they cannot always meet them because they are bound to a younger body, or the social environment is restrictive. In such cases, outsiders may call some behavior perfectionism, while for the gifted this may be their standard.

"Perfectionism becomes desirable when it stimulates the healthy pursuit of excellence."[52]

Unhealthy perfectionism stems from equating one's worth as a human being to one's achievements, and the simultaneous belief that any work less than perfect is unacceptable and will lead to criticism. Because perfection in the majority of human activities is neither desirable, nor possible, this cognitive distortion creates self-doubt, performance anxiety and ultimately procrastination.

The unhealthy perfectionism can be triggered or further exaggerated by parents, siblings, classmates with good or ill intentions. Parents are usually proud and will praise extensively the gifted child, on the other hand siblings, comrades and school bullies will generally become jealous of the intellectual ease of the gifted child and tease him or her about any minor imperfection in his work, strength, clothes, appearance, or behavior. Either approach—positive reinforcement from parents, or negative reactions from siblings and comrades for minor flaws—will push these kids into considering their worth to their peers as equal to their abilities and consider any imperfection as a serious defect in themselves. The unhealthy perfectionism can be further exaggerated when the child counter-attacks those who mocked him with their own weapons, i.e. their lower abilities, thus creating disdain in himself for low or even average performance.

There are many theories that try to explain the correlation between perfectionism and giftedness. Perfectionism becomes a problem as it frustrates and inhibits achievements.

D. E. Hamachek identified six specific, overlapping types of behavior associated with perfectionism. They include:

- Depression
- A nagging "I should" feeling
- Shame and guilt feelings
- Face-saving behavior
- Shyness and procrastination
- Self-deprecation.[53]

Underachievement

There is often a stark gap between the abilities of the gifted individual and his or her actual accomplishments. Many gifted students will perform extremely well on standardized or reasoning tests, only to fail a class exam. This disparity can result from various factors, such as loss of interest in classes that are too easy or negative social consequences of being perceived as smart.[54] Underachievement can also result from emotional or psychological factors, including depression, anxiety, perfectionism, or self-sabotage.[55]

An often-overlooked contributor to underachievement is undiagnosed learning differences. A gifted individual is less likely to be diagnosed with a learning disorder than a non-gifted classmate, as the gifted child can more readily compensate for his or her paucities. This masking effect is dealt with by understanding that a difference of one standard deviation between scores constitutes a learning disability even if all of the scores are above average.

In addition, many gifted students may underachieve because they have grown to believe that because of their intelligence, things should always come easily to them, and thus may lag behind their non-gifted peers in the work ethic required to learn things that do not come immediately to them.

Some gifted children may not be aware that they are gifted, and not just average. One apparently effective way to attempt to reverse underachievement in gifted children includes educating teachers to provide enrichment projects based on students' strengths and interests without attracting negative attention from peers.

Depression

It has been thought in the past that there is a correlation between giftedness and depression or suicide. This is not an established research finding. As Reis and Renzulli mention,

> With the exception of creatively gifted adolescents who are talented in writing or the visual arts, studies do not confirm that gifted individuals manifest significantly higher or lower rates or severity of depression than those for the general population...Gifted children's advanced cognitive abilities, social isolation, sensitivity, and uneven development may cause them to face some challenging social and emotional issues, but their problem-solving abilities, advanced social skills, moral reasoning, out-of-school interests, and satisfaction in achievement may help them to be more resilient.[54]

Also, no research points to suicide rates being higher in gifted adolescents than other adolescents.[56]

See also

- Aptitude
- Child prodigy
- Davidson Institute for Talent Development
- Genius
- Gifted education
- Heritability of IQ
- IQ classification
- Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth
- Multipotentiality
- *A Nation Deceived: How Schools Hold Back America's Brightest Students*
- *Marland report*

References

1. Mackintosh, N. J. (2011). *IQ and Human Intelligence* (second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 14. ISBN 978-0-19-958559-5. Retrieved 15 June 2014. "The Binet scales, as they were known, formed the basis of modern IQ tests, just as mental age formed the basis for IQ scores. ... Although Galton was the first to try to measure individual differences in intelligence, it was Binet who appeared to have succeeded."
2. Urbina, Susana (2011). "Chapter 2: Tests of Intelligence". In Sternberg, Robert J.; Kaufman, Scott Barry. *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 20–38, 24–25. ISBN 9780521739115. Lay summary (9 February 2012). "The closest Binet came to defining intelligence was in an article he co-authored with Simon (1904) in which they equate intelligence with judgment or common sense, adding that 'to judge well, to comprehend well, to reason well' (p. 197) are the essential activities' of intelligence. Unlike Galton, Binet believed that intelligence consists of a complex set of abilities—such as attention, memory, and reasoning—that are fluid and shaped by environmental and cultural influences."
3. Pintner, Rudolph (1923). *Intelligence Testing: Methods and Results*. New York: Henry Holt. p. 196. Retrieved 14 July 2013. "We do not mean to leave the impression that before the general use of mental tests no attention had ever been paid to children of remarkable ability. We find many references in literature to especially bright children, and the biographies of many great men bear record of their superior performances in childhood. Nevertheless, such references are scattered and leave the impression of something peculiar and very uncommon. Superior intelligence has certainly not been recognized as a vital educational problem. It is becoming to be so regarded today, because of the scientific study of such children by means of intelligence tests."
4. Davis, Gary A.; Rimm, Sylvia B.; Siegle, Del (April 2010). *Education of the Gifted and Talented*. Pearson Education, Limited. p. 56. ISBN 978-0-13-505607-3. Lay summary (8 October 2013). "In her article "The Case Against Formal Identification," Davidson (1986) expressed strong frustration with formal testing, rating, and nomination procedures, including the use of point systems and cutoffs. Davidson noted that a student with a tested IQ of 110 may show greater giftedness in the sense of originality and thought-provoking ideas and answers than a student with a tested IQ of 140—who will be selected for the program. Even creativity tests do not measure every aspect of a child's creativeness, noted Davidson; and peer, parent, and teacher nominations can be biased in favor of popular, English-speaking, middle-class students."

speaking, middle-class students.
5. Callahan, Carolyn M.; Hertberg-Davis, Holly L. (21 August 2012). "Chapter 32: Heterogeneity among the Gifted". In Callahan, Carolyn M.; Hertberg-Davis, Holly L. *Fundamentals of Gifted Education: Considering Multiple Perspectives*. Routledge. p. 330. ISBN 978-1-136-94643-1. "While there are differences among subgroups of students identified as gifted, there are also differences among students in the general population whose talents are never addressed because we fail even to recognize that talent. Considerable attention has been directed at the under-representation of these students in programs for the gifted. Among the groups most often recognized as deserving of special attention for identification, talent development, and subsequent adjustments in curriculum are African American, Latino/Latina, and twice-exceptional learners."
6. McIntosh, David E.; Dixon, Felicia A.; Pierson, Eric E. (2012). "Chapter 25: Use of Intelligence Tests in the Identification of Giftedness". In Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L. *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. pp. 623–42, 636. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (29 March 2014). "The use of a single cognitive test composite score as the primary criterion for determining giftedness is highly common within schools. In the past, the WISC-R (Wechsler, 1974) and the fourth edition of the Stanford-Binet (SB-IV; Thorndike, Hagen, & Sattler, 1986) were the most commonly used cognitive measures in the schools (Coleman & Cross, 2005)."
7. Kalbfleisch, M. Layne (21 August 2012). "Chapter 35: Twice-Exceptional Students". In Callahan, Carolyn M.; Hertberg-Davis, Holly L. *Fundamentals of Gifted Education: Considering Multiple Perspectives*. Routledge. p. 360. ISBN 978-1-136-94643-1. "Because defining twice exceptionality has defied psychometric and empirical characterization up to this point, and because it can include co-morbidity with a number of disorders (specific learning disability, dyslexia, attention deficit disorders, and autism, to name the few highlighted in this chapter), the gifted education field at large has only been able to respond to the consequences of it, when the goal should be proactive identification and support to enable the success that should come from educational experience and learning, not in spite of it. This is critical because the social and emotional aspects of twice exceptionality are fundamentally important to the twice-exceptional individual's ability to achieve a well-adjusted life (Assouline, Nicpon, & Huber, 2006; Foley Nicpon, Doobay, & Assouline, 2010; Gardynik & McDonald, 2005; King, 2005; New, 2003)."
8. McIntosh, David E.; Dixon, Felicia A.; Pierson, Eric E. (2012). "Chapter 25: Use of Intelligence Tests in the Identification of Giftedness". In Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L. *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. pp. 623–42, 636. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (29 March 2014). "Although many would consider screening to be the crucial point in the identification process, predictive validity must be established between the screening procedure and the intellectual measure(s) used to ensure the accuracy and utility of the identification process."
9. Sternberg, Robert J.; Davidson, Janet E., eds. (2005). *Conceptions of Giftedness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-54730-7. Lay summary (18 July 2010). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by James Borland, Linda E. Brody, Julian Stanley, Carolyn M. Callahan, Erin M. Miller, Tracy L. Cross, Laurence J. Coleman, John F. Feldhusen, Joan Freeman, Francoys Gagne, Edmund Gordon, Beatrice L. Bridglall, Kurt A. Heller, Christoph Perleth, Tock Keng Lim, Ida Jeltova, Elena L. Grigorenko, Franz J. Monks, Michael W. Katzko, Jonathan A. Plucker, Sasha A. Barab, Sally M. Reis, Joseph S. Renzulli, Nancy M. Robinson, Mark A. Runco, Dean Keith Simonton, Robert J. Sternberg, Rena F. Subotnik, Linda Jarvin, Joyce Van Tassel-Baska, Catya von Karolyi, Ellen Winner, Herbert J. Walberg, Susan J. Paik, Albert Ziegler, and Richard E. Mayer.
10. Renzulli,, J. (November 1978). "What Makes Giftedness? Reexamining a Definition". *Phi Delta Kappan*. **60** (3): 180–84, 261. Retrieved 29 November 2014.
11. Johnsen, Susan K. (May 2011). *Identifying Gifted Students: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press. ISBN 978-1-59363-701-9. Retrieved 29 November 2014.
12. Kaufman, Alan S. (2009). *IQ Testing 101*. New York: Springer Publishing. pp. 151–153. ISBN 978-0-8261-0629-2.
13. Gottfredson, Linda S. (2009). "Chapter 1: Logical Fallacies Used to Dismiss the Evidence on Intelligence Testing". In Phelps, Richard F. *Correcting Fallacies about Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington (DC): American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-1-4338-0392-5. Lay summary (9 July 2013).
14. Government of New Brunswick, Canada, Department of Education. Educational Services Division (2007). "Gifted And Talented Students: A Resource Guide for Teachers" (PDF). p. 39 (citing Davis and Rimm, 2004). Retrieved 29 November 2014.
15. Kranzler, John H.; Floyd, Randy G. (1 August 2013). *Assessing Intelligence in Children and Adolescents: A Practical Guide*. Guilford Press. ISBN 978-1-4625-1121-1. Retrieved 9 June 2014.
16. Perleth, Christoph; Schatz, Tanja; Mönks, Franz J. (2000). "Early Identification of High Ability". In Heller, Kurt A.; Mönks, Franz J.; Sternberg, Robert J.; et al. *International Handbook of Giftedness and Talent* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Pergamon. p. 301. ISBN 978-0-08-043796-5. "norm tables that provide you with such extreme values are constructed on the basis of random extrapolation and smoothing but not on the basis of empirical data of representative samples."
17. Georgas et al. 2003, p. xxv "The Wechsler tests are perhaps the most widely used intelligence tests in the world"

18. Meyer & Weaver 2005, p. 219 Campbell 2006, p. 66 Strauss, Sherman & Spreen 2006, p. 283 Foote 2007, p. 468 Kaufman & Lichtenberger 2006, p. 7 Hunt 2011, p. 12
19. Freides, D. (1972). "Review of Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, Third Revision". In Oscar Buros. *Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park (NJ): Gryphon Press. pp. 772–773. "The Binet scales have been around for a long time and their faults are well known. . . . Requiescat in pace"
20. Waddell, Deborah D. (1980). "The Stanford-Binet: An Evaluation of the Technical Data Available since the 1972 Restandardization". *Journal of School Psychology*. **18** (3): 203–209. doi:10.1016/0022-4405(80)90060-6. Retrieved 29 June 2010.
21. Perleth, Christoph; Schatz, Tanja; Mönks, Franz J. (2000). "Early Identification of High Ability". In Heller, Kurt A.; Mönks, Franz J.; Sternberg, Robert J.; et al. *International Handbook of Giftedness and Talent* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Pergamon. p. 302. ISBN 978-0-08-043796-5. "a gifted sample gathered using IQ > 132 using the old SB L-M in 1985 does not contain the top 2% of the population but the best 10%."
22. Feldman, David (1984). "A Follow-up of Subjects Scoring above 180 IQ in Terman's Genetic Studies of Genius". *Exceptional Children*. **50** (6): 518–523. Retrieved 8 July 2010. "Put into the context of the psychometric movement as a whole, it is clear that the positive extreme of the IQ distribution is not as different from other IQ levels as might have been expected."
23. Steven Pinker. "His Brain Measured Up".
24. M. Gross. "Small poppies: Highly gifted children in the early years".
25. Colangelo, N., & Davis, G. (2003).*Handbook of Gifted Education*. Boston: Pearson education, Inc.
26. http://www.curriculumsupport.education.nsw.gov.au/policies/gats/assets/pdf/poldmgt2000rtcl.pdf
27. Colangelo, N. (2003). *Handbook of Gifted Education*. (third ed.). Allyn & Bacon. ISBN 978-0205340637.
28. Renzulli,, J. (May 2001). "Evaluation of a Preschool Nutrition Education Program Based on the Theory of multiple Intelligences". *Journal of Nutrition Education*. **33** (3): 161–166. PMID 11953232.
29. "Characteristics of Gifted/Creative Children". Retrieved 2007-07-03.
30. Taylor, Lorraine S. and Catharine R. Whittaker. Bridging Multiple Worlds: Case Studies of Diverse Educational Communities. Allyn and Bacon, 2003.
31. Ford,, Donna; Grantham,, Tarek (June 2003). "Providing Access for Culturally Diverse Gifted Students: From Deficit to Dynamic Thinking.". *Theory Into Practice*. **42** (3): 217–225. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4203_8.
32. Olszewski-Kubilius,, Paula; Seon-Young, Lee (Jan 2004). "Addressing The Achievement Gap Between Minority And Nonminority Children By Increasing Access To Gifted Programs". *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*. **28** (2): 127–158. doi:10.1177/016235320402800202.
33. Mary M. Frasier; Jaime H. Garcia. "A Review of Assessment Issues in Gifted Education and Their Implications for Identifying Gifted Minority Students" (PDF).
34. Lee, Seon-Young, Olszewski-Kubilius, Peternel. "Follow-Up with students after 6 years of participation in project EXCITE." The Gifted Child Quarterly. Cincinnati: 2009. 53.2. p 137
35. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (2016). Key Data Highlights on Equity and Opportunity Gaps in our Nation's Public Schools. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/2013-14-first-look.pdf
36. Weinstein, R. S. (2002). Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
37. Fitzpatrick, C., Côté-Lussier, C., Pagani, L. S., & Blair, C. (2015). I Don't Think You Like Me Very Much Child Minority Status and Disadvantage Predict Relationship Quality With Teachers. Youth & Society, doi: 10.1177/0044118X13508962.
38. Gershenson, S., Holt, S. B., & Papageorge, N. W. (2016). Who believes in me? The effect of student–teacher demographic match on teacher expectations. Economics of Education Review, 52, 209-224.
39. Weinstein, R.S., Soulé, C. R., Collins, F., Cone, J., Mehlhorn, M., & Simontacchi, K. (1991). Expectations and high school change: Teacher researcher collaboration to prevent school failure. American Journal of Community Psychology, 19, 333–363.
40. Seon-Young, Lee; Olszewski-Kubilius,, Paula (April 2009). "Follow-Up with students after 6 years of participation in project EXCITE.". *The Gifted Child Quarterly*. **53** (2): 137–156.
41. Coleman, Mary Ruth; Harradine, Christine; King, Emily Williams (September 2005). "Meeting the needs of students who are twice exceptional.". *Teaching Exceptional Children*. **38** (1): 5–6.
42. King, Emily Williams (September 2005). "Addressing the social and emotional needs of twice-exceptional students.". *Teaching Exceptional Children*. **38** (1): 16–20.
43. Krochak, L. A.; Ryan, T. G. (2007). "The challenge of identifying gifted/learning disabled students" (PDF). *International Journal of Special Education*. **22** (3): 44–53.
44. Nielson, M. E. (2002). "Gifted students with learning disabilities: Recommendations for identification and programming". *Exceptionality*. **10** (2): 93–111.
45. Shenfield, T. (2014). "Twice Exceptional: When Your Child is Both Gifted and Learning Disabled" (http://www.psy-e

d.com/wpblog/gifted-and-learning-disabled/) *Advanced Psychology*
46. Swiatek, M. A. (1995). "An Empirical Investigation Of The Social Coping Strategies Used By Gifted Adolescents". *Gifted Child Quarterly*. **39**: 154–160. doi:10.1177/001698629503900305.
47. Plucker, J. A.; Levy, J. J. (2001). "The Downside of Being Talented". *American Psychologist*. **56**: 75–76. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.56.1.75.
48. Robinson, N. M. (2002). "Introduction. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N. M. Robinson, & S. M. Moon (Eds.) "The Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Children"". Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press, Inc. External link in `|title=` (help);
49. Lardner, C. (2005). "School Counselors Light-Up the Intra- and Inter-Personal Worlds of Our Gifted".
50. Yun, Kyongsik (2011). "Mathematically Gifted Adolescents Have Deficiencies in Social Valuation and Mentalization". *PLoS ONE*. **7** (4): 335–345. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018224. PMC 3070719. PMID 21483742.
51. Chung, Dongil (2011). "Different Gain/Loss Sensitivity and Social Adaptation Ability in Gifted Adolescents during a Public Goods Game". *PLoS ONE*. **6** (2): e17044. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0017044. PMC 3040203. PMID 21359224.
52. Parker, W. D.; Mills, C. J. (1996). "The Incidence of Perfectionism in Gifted Students". *Gifted Child Quarterly*. **40**: 194–199. doi:10.1177/001698629604000404.
53. Schuler, P. (2002). Perfectionism in Gifted Children and Adolescents. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N. M. Robinson, & S. M. Moon (Eds.). *The Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Children* (http://www.amazon.com/Social-Emotional-Development-Gifted-Children/dp/1882664779) (pp. 71-79). Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press, Inc.
54. Reis, S. M. & Renzulli, J. S. (2004). "Current Research on the Social and Emotional Development of Gifted and Talented Students: Good News and Future Possibilities." (http://www.researchgate.net/publication/229501585_Current_research_on_the_social_and_emotional_development_of_gifted_and_talented_students_Good_news_and_future_possibilities) *Psychology in the Schools, 41,* published online in Wiley InterScience.
55. Reis, S. M. & McCoach, D. B. (2002). Underachievement in Gifted Students. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N. M. Robinson, & S. M. Moon (Eds.). *The Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Children* (http://www.amazon.com/Social-Emotional-Development-Gifted-Children/dp/1882664779) (pp. 81-91). Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press, Inc.
56. Neihart, M. (2002). Risk and Resilience in Gifted Children: A Conceptual Framework. In M. Neihart, S. Reis, N. M. Robinson, & S. M. Moon (Eds.) *The Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Children*. (http://www.amazon.com/Social-Emotional-Development-Gifted-Children/dp/1882664779) (pp. 113-124). Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press, Inc.

Bibliography

- Aiken, Lewis (1979). *Psychological Testing and Assessment* (Third ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. ISBN 0-205-06613-5.
- Ambrose, Don; Sternberg, Robert J.; Sriraman, Bharath, eds. (2003). *Confronting Dogmatism in Gifted Education*. New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-89446-3. Lay summary (20 May 2013). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by James Borland, LeoNora M. Cohen, David Yun Dai, Jean Peterson, James J. Gallagher, Donna Y. Ford, Don Ambrose, Bharath Sriraman, Jennifer Riedl Cross, Tracy L. Cross, Diane Montgomery, Taisir Subhi Yamin, Don Ambrose, Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Kathleen M. Pierce, Laurie R. Kash, Laurence J. Coleman, Margie Spino, and Charles Rop.
- Anastasi, Anne; Urbina, Susana (1997). *Psychological Testing* (Seventh ed.). Upper Saddle River (NJ): Prentice Hall. ISBN 978-0-02-303085-7. Lay summary (28 July 2010).
- Benbow, Camilla Persson; Lubinski, David, eds. (1996). *Intellectual Talent: Psychometric and Social Issues*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. ISBN 978-0-8018-5302-9. Lay summary (27 March 2011). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr., David T. Lykken, Auke Tellegen, Matthew McGue, Abraham J. Tannenbaum, James J. Gallagher, A. Harry Passow, Herbert J. Klausmeier, Lloyd G. Humphreys, David Lubinski, John F. Feldhusen, Lynn W. Glass, Nancy M. Robinson, Lee J. Cronbach, Ellis B. Page, Timothy Z. Keith, James S. Coleman, Arnold E. Ross, Julian C. Stanley, Joyce Van Tassel-Baska, Linda E. Brody, Carol C. Blackburn, Camilla Persson Benbow, Babette Suchy, Richard E. Snow, Michelle Ennis, Leroy Wolins, Lola L. Minor, Betsy Jane Becker, N. L. Gage, and Arthur R. Jensen.
- Borland, James H. (1 January 2003). *Rethinking Gifted Education*. Teachers College Press. ISBN 978-0-8077-4304-1. Lay summary (8 October 2014).
- Burks, Barbara S.; Jensen, Dortha W.; Terman, Lewis M. (1930). *The Promise of Youth: Follow-up Studies of a Thousand Gifted Children*. Genetic Studies of Genius Volume 3. Stanford (CA): Stanford

University Press.
- Campbell, Jonathan M. (2006). "Chapter 3: Mental Retardation/Intellectual Disability". In Campbell, Jonathan M.; Kamphaus, Randy W. *Psychodiagnostic Assessment of Children: Dimensional and Categorical Approaches*. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-21219-5. Lay summary (21 May 2013).
- Cianciolo, Anna T.; Sternberg, Robert J. (2004). *Intelligence: A Brief History*. Blackwell Brief Histories of Psychology. Malden (MA): Blackwell. ISBN 978-1-4051-0824-9. Lay summary (14 August 2010).
- Colangelo, Nicholas; Davis, Gary A., eds. (2003). *Handbook of Gifted Education*. Julian C. Stanley (Guest Foreword). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. ISBN 978-0-205-34063-7. Lay summary (7 November 2013). This handbook includes chapters by Nicholas Colangelo, Gary A. Davis, James J. Gallagher, Linda S. Gottfredson, Abraham J. Tannenbaum, Françoys Gagné, Joseph S. Renzulli, Robert J. Sternberg, Catya von Károlyi, Valerie Ramos-Ford, Howard Gardner, Robert Plomin, Thomas S. Price, Susan G. Assouline, E. Susanne Richert, Shirley W. Schiever, C. June Maker, Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Sally M. Reis, Ann Lupkowski-Shoplik, Camilla Persson Benbow, Linda E. Brody, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, John F. Feldhusen, Penny Britton Kolloff, Lauren A. Sosniak, Donna Rae Clasen, Robert E. Clasen, James A. Kulik, Ann Robinson, James H. Borland, Arthur L. Costa, Ellen Winner, Gail Martino, Herbert J. Walberg, Deborah B. Williams, Susie Zeiser, Dean Keith Simonton, Sidney M. Moon, Michael M. Piechowski, Terry McNabb, Sylvia B. Rimm, Ken Seely, Martha J. Morelock, David H. Feldman, Nancy Ewald Jackson, Robert A. Schultz, James R. Delisle, Barbara A. Kerr, Megan Foley Nicpon, Donna Y. Ford, David Lubinski, Linda Kreger Silverman, Miraca U. M. Gross, Laurie J. Croft, Clar M. Baldus, Jennifer K. New, Michael C. Pyryt, Frances A. Karnes, Ronald G. Marquardt, and Patricia O'Connell Ross.
- Cox, Catherine M. (1926). *The Early Mental Traits of 300 Geniuses*. Genetic Studies of Genius Volume 2. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press. Lay summary (2 June 2013).
- Cropley, David H.; Cropley, Arthur J.; Kaufman, James C.; Runco, Mark A., eds. (2010). *The Dark Side of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-13960-1. Lay summary (26 May 2013). This review of current research includes chapters by Arthur J. Cropley, Mark A. Runco, Keith James, Aisha Taylor, Maria N. Zaitseva, David Hecht, James M. Jasper, Jack A. Goncalo, Lynne C. Vincent, Pino G. Audia, Kevin Hilton, Lorraine Gamman, Maziar Raein, Jennie Kaufman Singer, Russell Eisenman, Dean Keith Simonton, Luis Daniel Gascón, James C. Kaufman, James R. Averill, Elma P. Nunley, Liane Gabora, Nancy Holmes, Arthur J. Cropley, Robert J. Sternberg, Amihud Hari, and David H. Cropley.
- Dai, David Yun (12 July 2014). *The nature and nurture of giftedness: a new framework for understanding gifted education*. Teachers College Press. ISBN 978-0-8077-5087-2. OCLC 762963086. Retrieved 20 July 2013.
- Davis, Gary A.; Rimm, Sylvia B.; Siegle, Del (April 2010). *Education of the Gifted and Talented*. Pearson Education, Limited. ISBN 978-0-13-505607-3. Lay summary (8 October 2013).
- Dumont, Ron; Willis, John O.; Elliot, Colin D. (2009). *Essentials of DAS-II® Assessment*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. p. 126. ISBN 978-0-470-22520-2.
- Dumont, Ron; Willis, John O. (2013). "Range of DAS Subtest Scaled Scores". *Dumont Willis*. Archived from the original on 7 April 2014.
- Eysenck, Hans (1995). *Genius: The Natural History of Creativity*. Problems in the Behavioural Sciences No. 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-48508-1. Lay summary (31 May 2013).
- Eysenck, Hans (1998). *Intelligence: A New Look*. New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction Publishers. ISBN 978-0-7658-0707-6.
- Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L., eds. (2012). *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (28 April 2013).
- Flanagan, Dawn P.; Kaufman, Alan S. (2009). *Essentials of WISC-IV Assessment*. Essentials of Psychological Assessment (2nd ed.). Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-470-18915-3. Lay summary (19 May 2013).
- Flynn, James R. (2012). *Are We Getting Smarter? Rising IQ in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-1-107-60917-4. Lay summary (16 May 2013).
- Foote, William E. (2007). "Chapter 17: Evaluations of Individuals for Disability in Insurance and Social Security Contexts". In Jackson, Rebecca. *Learning Forensic Assessment*. International Perspectives on Forensic Mental Health. New York: Routledge. pp. 449–480. ISBN 978-0-8058-5923-2.
- Freeman, Joan (2010). *Gifted Lives: What Happens when Gifted Children Grow Up*. London: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-47009-4. Lay summary (16 May 2013).
- Freides, David (1972). "Review of Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, Third Revision". In Oscar Buros. *Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park (NJ): Gryphon Press. pp. 772–773.
- Friedman, Reva C.; Rogers, Karen B., eds. (2002). *Talent in Context: Historical and Social Perspectives on Giftedness*. Washington (DC): American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-1-55798-944-4. Lay summary (26 May 2013). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by Carolyn M. Callahan, John F. Feldhusen, Reva C. Friedman, Françoys Gagné, Howard E. Gruber, F. Allan Hanson, Evelyn Levsky Hiatt, Joseph A. Horvath, Joan A. Jurich, Sidney M. Moon, Karen B. Rogers, Dean Keith Simonton, Robert J. Sternberg, Harold W. Stevenson, and Carol Tomlinson-Keasey.
- Gallagher, Sherri L.; Sullivan, Amanda L. (2011). "Chapter 30: Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition". In Davis, Andrew. *Handbook of Pediatric Neuropsychology*. New York: Springer Publishing. pp. 343–352. ISBN 978-0-8261-0629-2. Lay summary (14 July 2013).
- Georgas, James; Weiss, Lawrence; van de Vijver, Fons; Saklofske, Donald (2003). "Preface". In Georgas, James; Weiss, Lawrence; van de Vijver, Fons; Saklofske, Donald. *Culture and Children's Intelligence: Cross-Cultural Analysis of the WISC-III*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press. pp. xvx–xxxii. ISBN 978-0-12-280055-9. Lay summary (26 May 2013).
- Gleick, James (2011). *Genius: The Life and Science of Richard Feynman* (ebook ed.). Open Road Media. ISBN 978-1-4532-1043-7.
- Gottfredson, Linda S. (2009). "Chapter 1: Logical Fallacies Used to Dismiss the Evidence on Intelligence Testing". In Phelps, Richard F. *Correcting Fallacies about Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington (DC): American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-1-4338-0392-5. Lay summary (9 July 2013).
- Gregory, Robert J. (1995). "Classification of Intelligence". In Sternberg, Robert J. *Encyclopedia of human intelligence*. **1**. Macmillan. pp. 260–266. ISBN 978-0-02-897407-1. OCLC 29594474.
- Groth-Marnat, Gary (2009). *Handbook of Psychological Assessment* (Fifth ed.). Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-470-08358-1. Lay summary (11 September 2010).
- Heller, Kurt A.; Mönks, Franz J.; Sternberg, Robert J.; Subotnik, Rena F., eds. (2000). *International Handbook of Giftedness and Talent* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Pergamon. ISBN 978-0-08-043796-5. Lay summary (8 July 2010). The *International Handbook* includes chapters by A. Ziegler, K.A. Heller, A.J. Tannenbaum, R.J. Sternberg, F. Gagné, M. Csikszentmihalyi, R. Wolfe, E. Winner, G. Martino, D.K. Simonton, N.J. Schofield, E. Mason, L.A. Thompson, R. Plomin, W. Schneider, M. Gross, W. Lens, P. Rand, L. Coleman, T.L. Cross, I. Schoon, M. Morelock, D.H. Feldman, R.F. Subotnik, K.D. Arnold, M. Pasupathi, U. Staudinger, J.F. Feldhusen, F.A. Jarwan, L. Kanevsky, C. Perleth, G. Trost, L-N.M. Cohen, J. VanTassel Baska, J.S. Renzulli, S.M. Reis, H. Gruber, H. Mandl, P. Olszewski-Kubilius, S.P. Whalen, W. Wieczerkowski, M. Pyryt, R. Manstetten, O.D. Andreani, A. Pagnin, A. Cropley, K.K. Urban, S. Moon, H. Rosselli, J. Campbell, C.M. Callahan, L. Hernández de Hahn, A. Baldwin, J. Freeman, J.H. Borland, L. Wright, N. Colangelo, S. Assouline, W. Peters, F.A. Kaufmann, F.X. Castellanos, D. Lubinski, B. Kerr, C. Yewchuk, J. Lupart, R.A. Rudnitski, J. Gallagher, J.A. Leroux, R. Persson, E. Grigorenko, T. Subhi, N. Maoz, Shi Jiannong, Zha Zixiu, Wu-Tien Wu, E. Braggett, R.I. Moltzen, C. Taylor, S. Kokot, and E.M.L. Soriano de Alencar.
- Holahan, Carole K.; Sears, Robert R.; Cronbach, Lee J. (1995). *The Gifted Group in Later Maturity* (first ed.). Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-0804724074. Lay summary (14 August 2010).
- Frances Degen, Horowitz; O'Brien, Marion, eds. (1985). *The Gifted and talented: developmental perspectives*. American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-0-912704-94-4. LCCN 85007559. OCLC 11972824.
- Horowitz, Frances Degen; Subotnik, Rena F.; Matthews, Dona J., eds. (2009). *The Development of*

Giftedness and Talent Across the Life Span. Washington (DC): American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-1-4338-0414-4. Lay summary (27 July 2010). This handbook for practitioners includes chapters by Frances Degen Horowitz, John Colombo, D. Jill Shaddy, Otilia M. Blaga, Christa J. Anderson, Kathleen N. Kannass, Allen W. Gottfried, Adele Eskeles Gottfried, Diana Wright Guerin, Lynn S. Liben, Ellen Winner, Dona J. Matthews, Sandra Graham, Frank C. Worrell, Rena F. Subotnik, James E. Birren, and Daniel P. Keating.

- Hunt, Earl (2011). *Human Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-70781-7. Lay summary (28 April 2013).
- Jensen, Arthur R. (1998). *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability*. Human Evolution, Behavior, and Intelligence. Westport (CT): Praeger. ISBN 978-0-275-96103-9. ISSN 1063-2158. Lay summary (18 July 2010).
- Jensen, Arthur R. (2011). "The Theory of Intelligence and Its Measurement". *Intelligence*. International Society for Intelligence Research. **39** (4): 171–177. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2011.03.004. ISSN 0160-2896. Retrieved 27 August 2013.
- Johnsen, Susan K. (May 2011). *Identifying Gifted Students: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). Waco, Texas: Prufrock Press. ISBN 978-1-59363-701-9. Retrieved 29 November 2014.
- Kamphaus, Randy W. (2005). *Clinical Assessment of Child and Adolescent Intelligence* (Second ed.). New York: Springer. ISBN 978-0-387-26299-4. Lay summary (21 May 2013).
- Kamphaus, Randy; Winsor, Ann Pierce; Rowe, Ellen W.; Kim, Songwon (2012). "Chapter 2: A History of Intelligence Test Interpretation". In Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L. *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. pp. 56–70. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (28 April 2013).
- Kaufman, Alan S. (2009). *IQ Testing 101*. New York: Springer Publishing. pp. 151–153. ISBN 978-0-8261-0629-2.
- Kaufman, Alan S.; Lichtenberger, Elizabeth O.; Fletcher-Janzen, Elaine; Kaufman, Nadeen L. (2005). *Essentials of KABC-II Assessment*. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-66733-9. Lay summary (28 May 2013).
- Kaufman, Alan S.; Lichtenberger, Elizabeth O. (2006). *Assessing Adolescent and Adult Intelligence* (3rd ed.). Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-73553-3. Lay summary (22 August 2010).
- Kaufman, Scott Barry (1 June 2013). *Ungifted: Intelligence Redefined*. Basic Books. ISBN 978-0-465-02554-1. Retrieved 1 October 2013. Lay summary (1 October 2013).
- Leslie, Mitchell (July–August 2000). "The Vexing Legacy of Lewis Terman". *Stanford Magazine*. Retrieved 5 June 2013.
- Levine, Albert J.; Marks, Louis (1928). *Testing Intelligence and Achievement*. Macmillan. OCLC 1437258. Retrieved 23 April 2014. Lay summary (23 April 2014).
- Lohman, David F.; Foley Nicpon, Megan (2012). "Chapter 12: Ability Testing & Talent Identification" (PDF). In Hunsaker, Scott. *Identification: The Theory and Practice of Identifying Students for Gifted and Talented Education Services*. Waco (TX): Prufrock. pp. 287–386. ISBN 978-1-931280-17-4. Lay summary (14 July 2013).
- Mackintosh, N. J. (2011). *IQ and Human Intelligence* (second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-958559-5. LCCN 2010941708. Retrieved 15 June 2014.
- Matarazzo, Joseph D. (1972). *Wechsler's Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence* (fifth and enlarged ed.). Baltimore (MD): Williams & Witkins. Lay summary (PDF) (4 June 2013).
- McIntosh, David E.; Dixon, Felicia A.; Pierson, Eric E. (2012). "Chapter 25: Use of Intelligence Tests in the Identification of Giftedness". In Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L. *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. pp. 623–642. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (28 April 2013).
- Meyer, Robert G.; Weaver, Christopher M. (2005). *Law and Mental Health: A Case-Based Approach*. New York: Guilford Press. ISBN 978-1-59385-221-4. Lay summary (21 May 2013).
- Naglieri, Jack A. (1999). *Essentials of CAS Assessment*. Essentials of Psychological Assessment. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-29015-5. Lay summary (26 May 2013).
- Park, Gregory; Lubinski, David; Benbow, Camilla P. (2 November 2010). "Recognizing Spatial Intelligence". *Scientific American*. Retrieved 5 June 2013.
- Phillipson, Shane N.; McCann, Maria, eds. (2007). *Conceptions of Giftedness: Sociocultural*

Perspectives. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum. ISBN 978-0-8058-5751-1. Lay summary (18 July 2010). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by J. Chan, A. Ziegler, H. Stoeger, U. Anuruthwong, H. Begay, C.J. Maker, B. Wong-Fernandez, Ma. A. Bustos-Orosa, K. Gibson, W. Vialle, E. Mpofu, C. Ngara, E. Gudyanga, S. Phillipson, U. Sak, J. Šefer, N. Matsumura, S.B. Kaufman, R.J. Sternberg, M. McCann, J. Campbell, and D. Eyre.

- Pickover, Clifford A. (1998). *Strange Brains and Genius: The Secret Lives of Eccentric Scientists and Madmen*. Plenum Publishing Corporation. ISBN 978-0-688-16894-0. Lay summary (15 July 2013).
- Pintner, Rudolph (1931). *Intelligence Testing: Methods and Results*. New York: Henry Holt. Retrieved 14 July 2013.
- Plucker, Jonathan A.; Callahan, Carolyn M., eds. (2008). *Critical Issues and Practices in Gifted Education: What the Research Says*. Waco (TX): Prufrock Press. ISBN 978-1-59363-295-3. Lay summary (16 May 2013). This practitioner's handbook includes chapters by Jonathan A. Plucker, Carolyn M. Callahan, Stuart N. Omdal, M. Layne Kalbfleisch, Meredith Banasiak, Holly Hertberg-Davis, Tonya R. Moon, Pau-San Hoh, Felicia A. Dixon, Anne N. Rinn, Erin Morris Miller, Jean Sunde Peterson, Ronald A. Beghetto, Bruce M. Shore, Brenda M. Linn, Carol Ann Tomlinson, Nancy M. Robinson, Marcia Gentry, Saiying Hu, Adrian T. Thomas, Matthew C. Makel, Margie K. Kitano, Miraca U. M. Gross, Robert Kunzman, James H. Borland, Hilary Chart, Elena L. Grigorenko, Robert J. Sternberg, Joseph S. Renzulli, Rachel E. Systma Reed, Stephen T. Schroth, Trudy L. Clemons, Linda Jarvin, M. Katherine Gavin, Jill L. Adelson, Bharath Sriraman, Olof Bjorg Steinthorsdottir, Robin Kyburg Dickson, Joyce M. Alexander, Angela K. Schnick, Joanne Haroutounian, Sharlene D. Newman, Robin M. Schader, Sidney M. Moon, James J. Gallagher, David Henry Feldman, E. Jean Gubbins, Cheryll M. Adams, Rebecca L. Pierce, Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Bronwyn MacFarlane, Michael C. Pyryt, Jessica A. Hockett, Kelly E. Rapp, Tracy L. Cross, Michael S. Matthews, Sally M. Reis, Ann Robinson, Alane Jordan Starko, David Yun Dai, M. Layne Kalbfleisch, Carolyn M. Iguchi, D. Betsy McCoach, Del Siegle, Bess B. Worley II, and Bronwyn MacFarlane.
- Reynolds, Cecil; Kamphaus, Randy (2003). "Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales™ (RIAS™)" (PowerPoint). *Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales™ (RIAS™)*. PAR(Psychological Assessment Resources). Retrieved 11 July 2013.
- Reynolds, Cecil R.; Horton, Arthur M. (2012). "Chapter 3: Basic Psychometrics and Test Selection for an Independent Pediatric Forensic Neuropsychology Evaluation". In Sherman, Elizabeth M.; Brooks, Brian L. *Pediatric Forensic Neuropsychology* (Third ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 41–65. ISBN 978-0-19-973456-6. Lay summary (14 July 2013).
- Robinson, Andrew (2011). *Genius: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-959440-5. Lay summary (22 May 2013).
- Rogers, Karen B. (2002). *Re-Forming Gifted Education: Matching the Program to the Child*. Scottsdale (AZ): Great Potential Press. ISBN 978-0-910707-46-6.
- Saklofske, Donald; Weiss, Lawrence; Beal, A. Lynne; Coalson, Diane (2003). "Chapter 1: The Wechsler Scales for Assessing Children's Intelligence: Past to Present". In Georgas, James; Weiss, Lawrence; van de Vijver, Fons; Saklofske, Donald. *Culture and Children's Intelligence: Cross-Cultural Analysis of the WISC-III*. San Diego (CA): Academic Press. pp. 3–21. ISBN 978-0-12-280055-9. Lay summary (26 May 2013).
- Sattler, Jerome M. (1988). *Assessment of Children* (Third ed.). San Diego (CA): Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher. ISBN 0-9618209-0-X.
- Sattler, Jerome M. (2001). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Applications* (Fourth ed.). San Diego (CA): Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher. ISBN 978-0-9618209-7-8.
- Sattler, Jerome M. (2008). *Assessment of Children: Cognitive Foundations*. La Mesa (CA): Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher. ISBN 978-0-9702671-4-6. Lay summary (28 July 2010).
- Shurkin, Joel (1992). *Terman's Kids: The Groundbreaking Study of How the Gifted Grow Up*. Boston (MA): Little, Brown. ISBN 978-0-316-78890-8. Lay summary (28 June 2010).
- Shurkin, Joel (2006). *Broken Genius: The Rise and Fall of William Shockley, Creator of the Electronic Age*. London: Macmillan. ISBN 978-1-4039-8815-7. Lay summary (2 June 2013).
- Simonton, Dean Keith (1999). *Origins of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-512879-6. Lay summary (14 August 2010).
- Sternberg, Robert J., ed. (2000). *Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ISBN 978-0-521-59648-0. Lay summary (22 July 2013). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by Robert J. Sternberg, Nathan Brody, Janet E. Davidson, C. L. Downing, Elena L. Grigorenko, Zhe Chen, Robert S. Siegler, Cynthia A. Berg, Douglas K. Detterman, Lynne Gabriel, Joanne Ruthsatz, Carolyn Callahan, John Loehlin, Thomas Zentall, Harry Jerison, Philip Vernon, John Wickett, P. Gordon Bazana, Robert Stelmack, Ian Deary, David Lohman, Roger Schank, Brendon Towle, John Kihlstrom, Nancy Cantor, Richard K. Wagner, John Mayer, Peter Salovey, David Caruso, Susan Embretson, Karen McCollam, Alan Kaufman, Mark Daniel, Tina Grotzer, David Perkins, Richard Mayer, Craig Ramey, Robert Serpell, Moshe Zeidner, Gerald Matthews, and Linda O'Hara.

- Sternberg, Robert J. (2004). *International Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-00402-2. Lay summary (29 June 2010). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by Robert J. Sternberg, Ian Deary, Pauline Smith, Berit Carlstedt, Jan-Eric Gustafsson, Jarrlo Hautamaki, Rocio Fernandez-Ballesteros, Roberto Colom, Jacques Lautrey, Anik de Ribaupierre, Shu-Chen Li, Ute Kunzmann, Elena Grigorenko, Moshe Zeidner, Gerald Matthews, Richard D. Roberts, Sami Gulgoz, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, Bibhu D. Baral, J. P. Das, Tatsuya Sato, Hiroshi Namiki, Juko Ando, Giyoo Hatano, Jiannong Shi, Lazar Stankov, Ricardo Rosas, Andreas Demetriou, and Timothy C. Papadopoulos.
- Sternberg, Robert J.; Davidson, Janet E., eds. (2005). *Conceptions of Giftedness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-54730-7. Lay summary (18 July 2010). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by James Borland, Linda E. Brody, Julian Stanley, Carolyn M. Callahan, Erin M. Miller, Tracy L. Cross, Laurence J. Coleman, John F. Feldhusen, Joan Freeman, Francoys Gagne, Edmund Gordon, Beatrice L. Bridglall, Kurt A. Heller, Christoph Perleth, Tock Keng Lim, Ida Jeltova, Elena L. Grigorenko, Franz J. Monks, Michael W. Katzko, Jonathan A. Plucker, Sasha A. Barab, Sally M. Reis, Joseph S. Renzulli, Nancy M. Robinson, Mark A. Runco, Dean Keith Simonton, Robert J. Sternberg, Rena F. Subotnik, Linda Jarvin, Joyce Van Tassel-Baska, Catya von Karolyi, Ellen Winner, Herbert J. Walberg, Susan J. Paik, Albert Ziegler, and Richard E. Mayer.
- Sternberg, Robert J.; Jarvin, Linda; Grigorenko, Elena L. (2010). *Explorations in Giftedness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-74009-8. Lay summary (20 May 2013).
- Sternberg, Robert J.; Grigorenko, Elena L., eds. (2003). *The Psychology of Abilities, Competencies, and Expertise* (PDF). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-00776-4. Retrieved 15 May 2014. Lay summary (29 June 2010). This review of contemporary research includes chapters by Robert J. Sternberg, Margaret E. Beier, Philip Ackerman, Paul B. Baltes, Ralf T. Krampe, Tamoe Kanaya, Susan M. Barnett, Stephen Ceci, Anders Ericsson, Michael W. Connell, Kimberly Sheridan, Howard Gardner, Elena L. Grigorenko, Michael J. A. Howe, J. W. Davidson, Dean K. Simonton, and Richard E. Mayer.
- Sternberg, Robert J.; Kaufman, Scott Barry, eds. (2011). *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 9780521739115. Lay summary (22 July 2013). The *Cambridge Handbook* includes chapters by N. J. Mackintosh, Susana Urbina, John O. Willis, Ron Dumont, Alan S. Kaufman, Janet E. Davidson, Iris A. Kemp, Samuel D. Mandelman, Elena L. Grigorenko, Raymond S. Nickerson, Joseph F. Fagan, L. Todd Rose, Kurt Fischer, Christopher Hertzog, Robert M. Hodapp, Megan M. Griffin, Meghan M. Burke, Marisa H. Fisher, David Henry Feldman, Martha J. Morelock, Sally M. Reis, Joseph S. Renzulli, Diane F. Halpern, Anna S. Beninger, Carli A. Straight, Lisa A. Suzuki, Ellen L. Short, Christina S. Lee, Christine E. Daley, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, Thomas R. Zentall, Liane Gabora, Anne Russon, Richard J. Haier, Ted Nettelbeck, Andrew R. A. Conway, Sarah Getz, Brooke Macnamara, Pascale M. J. Engel de Abreu, David F. Lohman, Joni M. Lakin, Keith E. Stanovich, Richard F. West, Maggie E. Toplak, Scott Barry Kaufman, Ashok K. Goel, Jim Davies, Katie Davis, Joanna Christodoulou, Scott Seider, Howard Gardner, Robert J. Sternberg, John D. Mayer, Peter Salovey, David Caruso, Lillia Cherkasskiy, Richard K. Wagner, John F. Kihlstrom, Nancy Cantor, Soon Ang, Linn Van Dyne, Mei Ling Tan, Glenn Geher, Weihua Niu, Jillian Brass, James R. Flynn, Susan M. Barnett, Heiner Rindermann, Wendy M. Williams, Stephen J. Ceci, Ian J. Deary, G. David Batty, Colin DeYoung, Richard E. Mayer, Priyanka B. Carr, Carol S. Dweck, James C. Kaufman, Jonathan A. Plucker, Ursula M. Staudinger, Judith Glück, Phillip L. Ackerman, and Earl Hunt.
- Spearman, C. (April 1904). " "General Intelligence," Objectively Determined and Measured". *American Journal of Psychology*. **15** (2): 201–292. doi:10.2307/1412107.

JSTOR http://www.jstor.org/stable/1412107. Archived from the original (PDF) on 15 March 2013. Retrieved 31 May 2013.
- Spearman, Charles (1927). *The Abilities of Man: Their Nature and Measurement*. New York (NY): Macmillan.
- Strauss, Esther; Sherman, Elizabeth M.; Spreen, Otfried (2006). *A Compendium of Neuropsychological Tests: Administration, Norms, and Commentary* (Third ed.). Cambridge: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-515957-8. Lay summary (21 May 2013).
- Subotnik, Rena Faye; Arnold, Karen D., eds. (1994). *Beyond Terman: Contemporary Longitudinal Studies of Giftedness and Talent*. Norwood (NJ): Ablex. doi:10.1336/1567500110. ISBN 978-1-56750-011-0. Lay summary (29 June 2010).
- Tannenbaum, Abraham J. (1983). *Gifted children: psychological and educational perspectives*. Macmillan Publishing Company. ISBN 978-0-02-418880-9. LCCN 82004710.
- Terman, Lewis M. (1916). *The Measurement of Intelligence: An Explanation of and a Complete Guide to the Use of the Stanford Revision and Extension of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale*. Riverside Textbooks in Education. Ellwood P. Cubberley (Editor's Introduction). Boston: Houghton Mifflin. OCLC 186102. Retrieved 26 June 2010.
- Terman, Lewis M. (1925). *Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children*. Genetic Studies of Genius Volume 1. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press. LCCN 25008797. Retrieved 2 June 2013.
- Terman, Lewis Madison; Merrill, Maude A. (1937). *Measuring intelligence: A guide to the administration of the new revised Stanford-Binet tests of intelligence*. Riverside textbooks in education. Boston (MA): Houghton Mifflin.
- Terman, Lewis M.; Oden, Melita (1947). *The Gifted Child Grows Up: Twenty-five Years' Follow-up of a Superior Group*. Genetic Studies of Genius Volume 4. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press. LCCN 25008797. Lay summary (19 November 2014).
- Terman, Lewis M.; Oden, Melita (1959). *The Gifted Group at Mid-Life: Thirty-Five Years' Follow-Up of the Superior Child*. Genetic Studies of Genius Volume V. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press. Retrieved 2 June 2013.
- Terman, Lewis Madison; Merrill, Maude A. (1973). *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale: Manual for the Third Revision Form L-M with Revised IQ Tables by Samuel R. Pinneau*. Samuel R. Pinneau (Revised IQ Tables, 1960), R. L. Thorndike (1972 Norms Tables) (1972 Norms ed.). Boston (MA): Houghton Mifflin.
- Thompson, Bruce; Subotnik, Rena F., eds. (2010). *Methodologies for Conducting Research on Giftedness*. Robert J. Sternberg (Foreword). Washington (DC): American Psychological Association. ISBN 978-1-4338-0714-5. This practitioner's handbook includes chapters by Robin K. Henson, Bruce Thompson, Geoff Cumming, Fiona Fidler, Kevin M. Kieffer, Robert J. Reese, and Tammi Vacha-Haase, Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, Kathleen M. T. Collins, Nancy L. Leech, and Qun G. Jiao, Rex B. Kline, J. Kyle Roberts, Kim Nimon, and Lindsey Martin, Jason E. King and Brian G. Dates, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Tracy L. Cross and Jennifer R. Cross, and D. Betsy McCoach.
- United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Programs for the Improvement of Practice (1993). *National excellence: a case for developing America's talent* (PDF). United States Government Printing Office. Archived (PDF) from the original on 5 June 2013. Retrieved 6 June 2014. Lay summary – *ERIC Collection: National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent* (6 June 2014).
- Urbina, Susana (2011). "Chapter 2: Tests of Intelligence". In Sternberg, Robert J.; Kaufman, Scott Barry. *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 20–38. ISBN 978-0-521-73911-5. Lay summary (9 February 2012).
- Uzieblo, Katarzyna; Winter, Jan; Vanderfaeillie, Johan; Rossi, Gina; Magez, Walter (2012). "Intelligent Diagnosing of Intellectual Disabilities in Offenders: Food for Thought" (PDF). *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. **30** (1): 28–48. doi:10.1002/bsl.1990. PMID 22241548. Retrieved 15 July 2013.
- Wasserman, John D. (2012). "Chapter 1: A History of Intelligence Assessment". In Flanagan, Dawn P.; Harrison, Patti L. *Contemporary Intellectual Assessment: Theories, tests, and issues* (Third ed.). New York (NY): Guilford Press. pp. 3–55. ISBN 978-1-60918-995-2. Lay summary (28 April 2013).
- Wechsler, David (1939). *The Measurement of Adult Intelligence*. Baltimore (MD): Williams &

Witkins. LCCN 39014016. Lay summary – *American Psychological Association* (29 September 2014).
- Wechsler, David (1939). *The Measurement of Adult Intelligence* (first ed.). Baltimore (MD): Williams & Witkins. LCCN 39014016. Lay summary – *American Psychological Association* (29 September 2014).
- Weiss, Lawrence G.; Saklofske, Donald H.; Prifitera, Aurelio; Holdnack, James A., eds. (2006). *WISC-IV Advanced Clinical Interpretation*. Practical Resources for the Mental Health Professional. Burlington (MA): Academic Press. ISBN 978-0-12-088763-7. Lay summary (15 August 2010). This practitioner's handbook includes chapters by L.G. Weiss, J.G. Harris, A. Prifitera, T. Courville, E. Rolfhus, D.H. Saklofske, J.A. Holdnack, D. Coalson, S.E. Raiford, D.M. Schwartz, P. Entwistle, V. L. Schwean, and T. Oakland.
- Wolman, Benjamin B., ed. (1985). *Handbook of Intelligence*. consulting editors: Douglas K. Detterman, Alan S. Kaufman, Joseph D. Matarazzo. New York (NY): Wiley. ISBN 978-0-471-89738-5. This handbook includes chapters by Paul B. Baltes, Ann E. Boehm, Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr., Nathan Brody, Valerie J. Cook, Roger A. Dixon, Gerald E. Gruen, J. P. Guilford, David O. Herman, John L. Horn, Lloyd G. Humphreys, George W. Hynd, Randy W. Kamphaus, Robert M. Kaplan, Alan S. Kaufman, Nadeen L. Kaufman, Deirdre A. Kramer, Roger T. Lennon, Michael Lewis, Joseph D. Matarazzo, Damian McShane, Mary N. Meeker, Kazuo Nihira, Thomas Oakland, Ronald Parmelee, Cecil R. Reynolds, Nancy L. Segal, Robert J. Sternberg, Margaret Wolan Sullivan, Steven G. Vandenberg, George P. Vogler, W. Grant Willis, Benjamin B. Wolman, James W. Soo-Sam, and Irla Lee Zimmerman.
- Woodrow, Herbert Hollingworth (1919). *Brightness and Dullness in Children*. J. B. Lippincott Company. Archived from the original on 30 September 2012. Retrieved 14 November 2013. Lay summary (14 November 2013).

External links