

Donna Y. Ford  
Tarek C. Grantham

---

# Providing Access for Culturally Diverse Gifted Students: From Deficit to Dynamic Thinking<sup>1</sup>

*Few school districts in the United States have successfully recruited and retained culturally diverse students in programs for gifted students. Black, Hispanic, and Native American students are underrepresented in gifted education programs nationally, with underrepresentation ranging from 50-70%. This article addresses two questions that are at least as old as gifted education itself: Why are diverse students underrepresented, and how can we recruit and retain more diverse students in our gifted programs? Factors contributing to the persistent underrepresentation of Black students in gifted education are presented, along with suggestions for changes. The central premise of this article is that deficit thinking held by educators about diverse students hinders access to gifted programs for them.*

**A** LONG-STANDING CONCERN of researchers and practitioners has been the underrepresentation of Black students in gifted programs, namely those with high intelligence test scores who were not formally identified as gifted. Educators and organizations have discussed the myriad consequences associated with gifted Black and other diverse students not being identified and served.

---

*Donna Y. Ford is a professor of education at The Ohio State University; Tarek C. Grantham is an assistant professor of education at the University of Georgia.*

Few large-scale reports exist on cultural diversity in gifted education identification and placement. However, the U.S. Department of Education (1993) noted that Black, Hispanic, and Native American students are underrepresented in gifted education. This was also the more recent finding of the National Research Council's Committee on Minority Representation in Special Education (Donovan & Cross, 2002). Despite such concerns, reports, and even legislation (e.g., *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954), the percentage of diverse students in gifted education programs does not match their representation in U.S. schools. For example, Black students represented 16.2% of public school students in 1993, but only 8.4% of students in gifted programs; Hispanic students represented 9% of public school students, but only 4.7% of those identified as gifted (USDE, 1993). Both groups tend to be underrepresented in gifted programs by 50%.

The premise of this article is that the underrepresentation of diverse students in gifted education is primarily a function of educators holding a deficit perspective about diverse students. Deficit thinking exists when educators hold negative, stereotypic, and counterproductive views about culturally diverse students and lower their expectations of these students accordingly. Until deficit thinking becomes dynamic thinking, the unnecessary underrepresentation of diverse students in gifted education will continue.

### Deficit Ideologies: Limiting Access and Opportunity

Reactions to differences among students manifest themselves in various ways, and they exert a powerful influence in educational settings.

Storti (1989) raises several relevant questions for teachers working with gifted and culturally diverse students: What are their perceptions of gifted students? How do they define giftedness? How do such definitions and perceptions affect their referral of students for gifted programs? Likewise, how culturally competent are teachers? What are their personal and professional experiences in working with culturally diverse populations? What stereotypes and misperceptions do they hold?

Perceptions—negative and positive—about racial backgrounds influence the development of definitions, policies, and practices. Gould (1981, 1995) and Menchaca (1997) noted that deficit thinking contributed to past (and current) beliefs about culture, race, and intelligence. Gould demonstrated how *a priori* assumptions and fears associated with different racial groups, particularly African Americans, led to conscious fraud—dishonest and prejudicial research methods, deliberate miscalculations, convenient omissions, and data misinterpretation among scientists studying intelligence. These early assumptions and practices contributed to the prevailing belief that human races could be ranked in a linear scale of mental worth, as evidenced by Burt, Broca, and Morten's research on craniometry (Gould, 1981, p. 86).

Later, as school districts faced increasing racial diversity, educators resorted to increased reliance on standardized tests—biased<sup>2</sup> standardized tests. As Gould (1995), Hilliard (1992), and others noted, the tests measured familiarity with American culture and English proficiency, not intelligence. This almost guaranteed low test scores for immigrants (and culturally diverse groups) who were unfamiliar with U.S. customs, traditions, values, norms, and language.

The deficit orientation was recently revived by the publication of *The Bell Curve* (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) and in the works of Jensen (1984) and Rushton (2000). Menchaca (1997) also traced the evolution of deficit thinking, and demonstrated how it influenced segregation in schools (e.g., *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1896) and resistance to desegregation

during the Civil Rights era and today. For instance, some scholars conclude that educators continue to resist desegregation, and they use tracking and ability grouping to resegregate students racially. That is, some educators argue that the underrepresentation of culturally diverse students in gifted education relates, in many cases, to efforts to perpetuate school segregation (e.g., Ford & Webb, 1995; Hilliard, 1992). These symptoms and suggested treatments are discussed below.

### Deficit Thinking 1: Intelligence

Little consensus exists among educators regarding how to define the terms *intelligent* and *gifted* and how to do so equitably. Since 1970, there have been five federal definitions of *giftedness*, the most recent definition in 1993. Sternberg and Detterman (1986) presented two dozen definitions; some were biological and some behavioral. Likewise, Sternberg and Davidson (1986) shared the many and diverse viewpoints of scholars. Despite inconsistency and a lack of consensus, most definitions of intelligence and giftedness are IQ-based and test-driven. These definitions suggest that a "gifted or intelligent" person has a high IQ (130 or higher) and that a person is high, average, or low in intelligence based on an IQ score.

The most insidious aspect of issues surrounding intelligence is the debate over the relative contributions of nature versus nurture. At one extreme, advocates of nature contend that intelligence is a function of heredity or genetics; you are either smart or not. At the other extreme, advocates of nurture contend that intelligence is a function of the environment; one's intelligence can change based on educational experiences and opportunity, family and teacher expectations, and so forth. The nature advocates believe that intelligence is static, while nurture advocates believe that intelligence is dynamic.

More than any other racial group, Blacks are in the center of the nature-nurture debate. Some authors conclude that Blacks are intellectually inferior, while others contend that the lower performance of Blacks on intelligence tests rests extensively in problems with the tests (i.e., test bias). Without question, those holding the nature position are not likely to refer diverse students to gifted education screening and placement.

### Dynamic Thinking 1: Intelligence

Definitions, perceptions, and theories of intelligence and giftedness based exclusively or extensively on intelligence tests have closed many doors for diverse students due to their narrow and unidimensional focus. Few definitions and theories consider that different cultures view intelligence and giftedness in different ways; what is valued as gifted in one culture may not be valued as gifted in another culture (Sternberg, 1985).

Many theories of intelligence and giftedness exist, but two appear to capture the strengths, abilities, and promise of gifted diverse learners. Sternberg's (1985) Triarchic Theory of Intelligence proposes that intelligence reveals itself in at least three ways: (a) componentially, (b) experientially, and (c) contextually. Componential learners are analytical and abstract thinkers who do well on standardized tests and in school. They are more likely than other students to be recruited and retained in gifted programs. Experiential learners value creativity and enjoy novelty. They dislike rules and follow few of their own, seeing rules as inconveniences meant to be broken. Contextual learners readily adapt to their environments, a skill that IQ tests fail to measure. They are street-smart survivors, socially competent and practical, but they may do poorly in school.

Gardner (1983) distinguished among seven types of intelligences—linguistics, logical-mathematical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, bodily kinesthetics, spatial, and musical—each of which entails distinct forms of perception, memory, and other psychological processes. In his *Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, Gardner defined intelligence as the ability to solve problems or to fashion products valued in one or more cultural settings. Students whose intelligence is in the linguistics and logical-mathematical areas are more likely than the remaining students to be recruited and retained in gifted programs.

These two inclusive theories contend that giftedness is a social construct that manifests itself in many ways and means different things for different cultural groups. The theorists acknowledge the multifaceted, complex nature of intelligence and how current tests (which are too simplistic and static) fail to do justice to this construct. In addition, the USDE's (1993) most recent definition of gifted also broadens the notion:

Children and youth with outstanding talent perform or show the *potential* for performing at remarkably high levels of accomplishment when compared with others of their age, experience, or environment. These children and youth exhibit high performance capacity in intellectual, creative, and/or artistic areas, and unusual leadership capacity, or excel in specific academic fields. They require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the schools. *Outstanding talents are present in children and youth from all cultural groups, across all economic strata, and in all areas of human endeavor.* (p. 19, emphases added)

The italicized passages should appeal to school personnel responsible for recruiting culturally diverse students into gifted education. First, the notion of talent development is a major focus of the definition. It recognizes that many students are diamonds in the rough who have had inadequate opportunities to develop and perform at high academic levels. For example, some gifted Black students, especially those who live in poverty, may lack exposure to books and other literature, they may not visit libraries or bookstores, and they miss out on other meaningful educational experiences.<sup>3</sup> The definition also recognizes that some students/groups face more barriers in life than others, namely discrimination.

The inclusion of the word *potential* in the federal definition acknowledges our obligation to serve those students who have social, cultural, or psychological problems, yet to manifest their abilities and interests. These students may include underachievers, minority students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with special education needs. Finally, the definition reminds educators that giftedness exists among all socio-demographic groups.

### Deficit Thinking 2: Testing and Assessment

The use of tests to identify and assess gifted students is pervasive in education. More than 90% of school districts use test scores for placement decisions (Colangelo & Davis, 1997; Davis & Rimm, 1997). This nearly exclusive reliance on test scores keeps the demographics of gifted programs resolutely White and middle class. While traditional intelligence tests more or less effectively identify and assess White students, they have been less effective with culturally diverse students. This reality raises the question, why do we continue to use these tests so exclusively and extensively?

Educators can choose from at least three explanations for the poor test performance of diverse students: (a) the fault rests within the test (e.g., test bias); (b) the fault rests with the educational environment at home and school (e.g., poor instruction and lack of access to high quality education); or (c) the fault rests with (or within) the student (e.g., he/she is cognitively inferior, genetically inferior, or culturally deprived).

Educators who select the first two viewpoints feel an obligation to make substantive changes in assessment and educational practices. These views consider the influence of the environment on test performance, thus adhering to dynamic thinking and the belief that intelligence is malleable. However, the last explanation rests in deficit thinking. It is an example of blaming the victim. Educators who support this view abdicate any responsibility for minority students' lower test scores (see Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Jensen, 1981; Rushton, 2000) because of the belief that genetics determines intelligence, and that intelligence is static or fixed.

### **Dynamic Thinking 2: Testing and Assessment**

Much data indicate that intelligence tests are effective at identifying middle-class White students as gifted but can ignore those students who (a) perform poorly on paper-and-pencil tasks conducted in artificial or lab-like settings; (b) do not perform well on culturally loaded tests (Kauffman, 1994); (c) have learning and/or cognitive styles that are different from White students (Shade, Kelly, & Oberg, 1997); (d) have test anxiety (Ford, 1996); or (e) have low achievement motivation (Ford, 1996).

Until such issues as these are resolved, the most promising instruments for assessing the strengths of Black students include nonverbal tests of intelligence, such as the *Naglieri Non-Verbal Ability Test* and *Raven's Matrix Analogies Tests*, which are considered less culturally loaded than traditional tests (see Kaufman, 1994; Saccuzzo, Johnson, & Guertin, 1994). Accordingly, these are more likely to capture the cognitive strengths of Black students. Saccuzzo et al., for instance, identified substantively more Black and Hispanic students using *Raven's* than a traditional test, and reported that, "50% of the non-White children who

had failed to qualify based on a *WISC-R* qualified with the *Raven*" (p. 10). They went on to state, "the *Raven* is a far better measure of pure potential than tests such as the *WISC-R*, whose scores depend heavily on acquired knowledge" (p. 10).

Educators should understand that nonverbal tests assess intelligence nonverbally. This is not to say that students are nonverbal; rather, the tests give students opportunities to demonstrate their intelligence without the confounding influence of differential language, vocabulary, and academic exposure.

### **Deficit Thinking 3: Policies and Practices**

Procedural and policy issues also contribute to the underrepresentation of minority students in gifted education. Specifically, teachers systematically underrefer minority students for gifted education services (Saccuzzo et al., 1994). Ford (1995) found many Black students with high achievement scores (e.g., 95th to 99th percentile) were underrepresented in gifted education because teachers did not refer them for screening. In other words, when teacher referral is the first (or only) recruitment step, gifted minority students are likely to be underrepresented. Other policies relate to the items included in matrices and how they are weighted. For instance, some schools include attendance as one criterion. This information may be used even if minority and White students have different attendance patterns; the same applies to other criteria (e.g., behavior, number of failing or low grades). Some districts even have sibling policies—students get points toward identification if they have a sibling who has been identified as gifted! Finally, schools can boast of using multiple criteria to make placement decisions, but IQ or achievement test scores may count for 50% or more of the total possible points. In this regard, the matrix becomes pseudoscientific, a smoke screen.

### **Dynamic Thinking 3: Policies and Practices**

A significant number of articles contend that minority students are poorly represented in gifted programs due to poor test performance, a significant contributor to this problem. But schools cannot hide behind test scores; instead, they must also examine how policies and procedures disparately impact the recruitment of minority students. Perhaps



as much as tests, teacher referrals serve as an effective gatekeeper, hindering minority students from even beginning the process of screening and assessment. These policies must be evaluated, changed and, if necessary, eliminated, if we are to open, rather than close, doors to gifted education.

#### **Deficit Thinking 4: Teacher Preparation in Multicultural Education**

Few teachers are exposed to multicultural educational experiences, multicultural curriculum and instruction, and internships and practicum in urban settings (Banks & Banks, 1995). At institutions of higher education, most students graduate with a monocultural or ethnocentric curriculum that ill-prepares them to work with culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse students. Consequently, they misunderstand cultural differences among diverse students relative to learning, communication, and behavioral styles. And educators may perceive these differences as deficits (see Storti, 1989, 1998). Teachers who hold stereotypes about diverse students are not likely to create a culturally responsive learning environment.

#### **Dynamic Thinking 4: Teacher Preparation in Multicultural Education**

People often believe or assume that classrooms that lack racial diversity are homogeneous. There is no such thing as a homogeneous classroom, for students in classrooms differ by gender, race, socioeconomic status (SES), achievement, interests, and so forth. With forecasts projecting a growing minority student population, teachers will have to bear a greater responsibility for demonstrating multicultural competence (Ford, Grantham, & Harris, 1998; Ford & Harris, 1999; Ford, Howard, Harris, & Tyson, 2000). Multicultural education preparation among all school personnel—teachers, counselors, psychologists, administrators, and support staff—may increase the recruitment and retention of minority students in gifted education. Substantive and comprehensive preparation must reeducate teachers so that deficit-oriented philosophies no longer impede diverse students' access to programs and services. To become more culturally competent, educators must (a) engage in critical self-examination that explores their attitudes

and perceptions concerning cultural diversity, and examine the influence of these attitudes and perceptions on minority students' achievement and educational opportunities; (b) acquire accurate information about various cultural groups (e.g., histories, historical and contemporary contributions, and their preferred learning styles); (c) learn how to infuse multicultural perspectives and materials into curriculum and instruction to maximize the academic, cognitive, social-emotional, and cultural development of students; (d) learn ways of advocating and negotiating for diverse students; and (e) build partnerships with diverse families, communities, and organizations. As Figure 1 illustrates, educators are most responsive to diverse students when they are competent or striving to become competent in the students' culture. Just as teacher incompetence in a subject area hurts students so, too, does multicultural incompetence.

#### **Deficit Thinking 5: Teacher Preparation in Gifted Education**

Research on teacher diversity in gifted education is miniscule. Ford (1999) surveyed minority teachers about their decisions to enter the field of gifted, general, or special education. Many teachers reported having little exposure to gifted education in their teacher preparation programs. Most teachers, including those who held degrees in special education, also lacked any formal preparation in gifted education. This lack of preparation in and sensitivity to the characteristics of gifted students, a lack of understanding of the social and emotional needs of gifted students, and a lack of attention to underachievement among gifted students<sup>4</sup> all hinder teachers' abilities to make fair and equitable referrals. The data, in short, indicate that teachers who lack preparation in gifted education are ineffective at identifying gifted students (see Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985). Teachers who are not prepared to work with gifted students may retain stereotypes and misperceptions that undermine their ability to recognize strengths in students who behave differently from their expectations. Teachers often use the behaviors of White students as the norm to compare diverse students, and deviations from this perceived norm are unlikely to result in referrals to gifted education.

**Dynamic Thinking 5: Teacher Preparation in Gifted Education**

The National Association for Gifted Children (2002) has proposed standards related to teacher preparation in gifted education. All teachers who work with gifted students must have formal training to do so in order to avoid the pitfalls just described. At minimal, such preparation must focus on testing and assessment, instructional strategies and models, social-emotional needs and development, underachievement, culturally diversity, and working with families. All organizations and institutions providing such training must consistently address the needs and issues of diverse students.

**Deficit Thinking 6: Teacher Preparation in Testing and Assessment**

Because teachers take direct responsibility for providing services to gifted students based on assessed needs, they require formal preparation in testing and assessment. But many teachers are not familiar with the tests used to guide identification and placement decisions, nor can they reliably interpret intelligence and achievement test scores. Teachers lacking assessment preparation are not likely to provide high-quality gifted education ser-

vices because they will not be able to match services to needs.

When one adds the dynamics of race, culture, and language to the abovementioned issues, teachers may know even less. Yet teachers must understand the impact of culture on test scores in order to interpret the scores meaningfully. They must understand how culturally loaded tests can hinder minority students' test scores. Given that Black, Hispanic, and Native American students tend to score lower on IQ and achievement tests than White students, how can teachers interpret and use test scores responsibly? What explanations can they give for the differential test scores? What alternative instruments and assessment practices can they adopt?

**Dynamic Thinking 6: Teacher Preparation in Testing and Assessment**

Teachers need not become psychologists or psychometricians to understand the purpose, advantages, and limitations of test scores. Multicultural assessment is a growing field and teachers must be educated in this area. Multicultural assessment training should focus on (a) understanding the purpose(s) of testing and assessment; (b) understanding factors that contribute to test bias;

	Incompetence	Competence
Unconscious	<p><b>Blissful Ignorance</b></p> <p>You are not aware that cultural differences exist between you and another person. It does not occur to you that you may be making cultural mistakes or that you may be misinterpreting much of the behavior going on around you.</p>	<p><b>Spontaneous Sensitivity</b></p> <p>You no longer have to think about what you are doing in order to be culturally sensitive (in a culture you know well). Culturally appropriate behavior comes naturally to you, and you trust your intuition because it has been reconditioned by what you know about cross-cultural interactions.</p>
Conscious	<p><b>Troubling Ignorance</b></p> <p>You realize that there are cultural differences between you and another person, but you understand very little about these differences. You know there's a problem, but don't know the magnitude of it. You are worried about whether you'll ever figure out these differences in others.</p>	<p><b>Deliberate Sensitivity</b></p> <p>You know there are cultural differences between people, you know some of the differences, and you try to modify your own behavior to be sensitive to these differences. This does not come naturally, but you make a conscious effort to behave in culturally sensitive ways. You are in the process of replacing old intuitions with new ones.</p>

**Figure 1.** Levels of cultural awareness and competence (Storti, 1998).

(c) understanding how to interpret subgroup norms and scores based on cultural information (e.g., learning styles, cultural styles, language needs); (d) understanding how teaching influences students' test performance; and (e) being familiar with fair testing standards, specifically those of the American Psychological Association and American Education Research Association.

### **Deficit Thinking 7: Communication/relationships With Diverse Families and Communities**

Family involvement in the educational process enhances student achievement. However, if a deficit orientation is present among educators, they may not communicate with culturally diverse families about gifted education services and other opportunities. Further, if this mindset exists, diverse parents might view schools with suspicion and doubt the school's commitment to their children. Such parents are unlikely to involve themselves in school settings because of the belief that they are not valued as a resource and member of the school community. Teachers often prefer to work with students whose parents are involved in schools rather than with students whose parents are not. How are students privileged by teachers when their parents/families are involved? How are students hindered by teachers when their parents/families are not involved?

### **Dynamic Thinking 7: Communication/relationships With Diverse Families and Communities**

In theory, school districts consider family involvement central to student achievement. In practice, few schools consistently and aggressively build partnerships with Black families (Ford, 1996). Teachers and administrators must be proactive and aggressive in building trust, dialogue, and relationships with diverse families. They must make sure that minority families know that the school district offers gifted education services, understand referral and screening measures and procedures, and know how the placement decisions are made. Just as important, minority families must understand the purposes and benefits of gifted education. School personnel must avoid "drive-through teaching"; they must go into the community (e.g., visit homes), attend minority-sponsored events, and seek the support of minority churches, organizations, and businesses in order to build home-school-community partnerships.

Equally important, efforts should focus on family education—holding workshops and meetings designed to educate diverse parents/families on why they must advocate for their gifted children. Diverse parents need strategies for helping their children cope with peer pressures and social injustices, maintaining achievement, and staying motivated and goal-oriented. Essentially, diverse families must have strategies to be effective advocates for their children in school settings.

### **Deficit Thinking 8: Students' Perceptions About Gifted Education**

Perhaps the worst consequence of deficit thinking among educators is the impact it has on the social, emotional, and psychological development of students. Fordham and Ogbu (1986) and others have found that many gifted or high-achieving Black students internalize the deficit-thinking orientations held of them by others. Many highly capable Black students question their own abilities and then sabotage their own achievement. For example, some Black students assume the role of class clown or athlete to hide their academic abilities and achievements, and they refuse to participate in gifted education programs. These students may also succumb to negative pressures to avoid achievement, particularly from their peers; and they come to associate or equate academic achievement with "acting White." Further, Steele and Aronson (1995) found that the test performance of Black students can be hindered by what he calls "stereotype threat," when Black students are overcome by anxiety during test-taking situations and their performance suffers. Thus, gifted African American students may underachieve deliberately, refuse to be assessed for gifted education services, and refuse placement if they meet the criteria.

### **Dynamic Thinking 8: Students' Perceptions About Gifted Education**

Self-perception is a powerful motivator and a powerful de-motivator. Teachers, counselors, and school psychologists must work together to address the affective, psychological, and social development of minority students. Affective programs and activities are needed to help diverse students cope with negative peer pressures and help with poor racial identities. Further, schools must promote a

learning environment in which all students believe that success knows no color. Small group counseling, multicultural curriculum and instruction, multicultural literature clubs, mentoring programs, and conflict resolution programs are but a few examples of proactive initiatives that can be adopted to address the various needs of minority students.

### Conclusion

To more effectively recruit and retain diverse students in gifted education, educators must eliminate deficit thinking. This attitudinal or philosophical change increases the probability that educators will adopt contemporary theories and definitions of giftedness, use culturally sensitive instruments, identify and serve gifted underachievers, provide all their students with a multicultural education, provide all staff members with multicultural preparation, and seek strong home-school partnerships.

The success schools achieve at recruiting and retaining diverse students in gifted education depends heavily on critical self-examination and a willingness to move beyond deficit thinking. First, the school district should examine its philosophy of gifted education and its definition of giftedness. More specifically, its philosophy and definition need to be inclusive. Second, assessment instruments and practices must be equitable—the measures must be valid and reliable for diverse students, and ethnic, cultural, and gender biases in the selection process should be eliminated.

Third, students in gifted programs should closely represent the community's demographics. That is, students of diverse backgrounds should be equitably represented according to criteria such as ethnicity and socioeconomic status. The reasons for the disparities must be evaluated and eliminated. Similarly, there should be evidence of increasing diversity among professionals in the gifted program.

Fourth, the school district should provide opportunities for continuing professional development in gifted and multicultural education. More specifically, faculty members and other school personnel must be encouraged and given opportunities by administrators to participate in workshops, conferences, university courses, and so forth. Likewise, there must be a library for teachers and students that

contains up-to-date multicultural resources (e.g., newsletters, journals, books, activities).

Fifth, there should be services that assess and address the affective and psychological needs of minority students (e.g., social and emotional needs, racial identity, environmental and risk factors).

Sixth, schools will need to examine how much families are involved in the formal learning process. Diverse families need to be encouraged to become and remain involved.

Seventh, curriculum and instruction need to be grounded in multiculturalism. The curriculum needs to be pluralistic (i.e., it should reflect diversity relative to ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and other sociodemographic variables). The curriculum should provide genuine options for all students to understand themselves and diverse cultures. Finally, policies should be in place to support multiculturalism and diversity. Published policies regarding multiculturalism are needed, and school personnel must be held accountable for implementing these policies.

At no time during its history has the field of gifted education been able to boast of having a representative number of minority students in its programs. Solutions have varied, but outcomes have been the same—minority students continue to be underrepresented. Perhaps it is time to look for other explanations and other solutions to this dilemma. Students' pedagogical clocks are ticking. How much longer must diverse students wait to be recruited and retained in gifted programs? How much longer must they wait to have greater access to gifted education programs?

### Notes

1. This article is a revision of Ford et al. (2002), *Beyond deficit thinking: Providing access for gifted African American students*.
2. Many scholars now acknowledge that the older tests were biased but maintain that current, revised tests are now bias-free.
3. Accordingly, the federal definition recognizes that students coming from high SES homes are likely to have such opportunities, which is likely to contribute to the demonstration of their giftedness.
4. Teachers are often surprised to find gifted students underachieving. They equate giftedness with achievement and productivity; they believe that gifted students *should* have high grades because their IQ or achievement test scores are high. Concomitantly,



when students with low test scores are doing well, teachers report that these students are overachieving, but are not gifted.

## References

- Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A.M. (Eds.). (1995). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Colangelo, N., & Davis, G.A. (1997). *Handbook of gifted education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. (1985). *Educating able learners*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Davis, G.A., & Rimm, S.B. (1997). *Education of the gifted and talented*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Donnovan, M.S., & Cross, C.T. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ford, D.Y. (1995). *A study of underachievement among gifted, potentially gifted, and general education students*. Storrs: National Research Center of the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.
- Ford, D.Y. (1996). *Reversing underachievement among gifted Black students: Promising practices and programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ford, D.Y. (1999). Factors affecting the career decision making of minority teachers in gifted education (CRS99212). Storrs: National Research Center of the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.
- Ford, D.Y., Grantham, T.C., & Harris III, J.J. (1998). Multicultural gifted education: A wakeup call to the profession. *Roeper Review*, 19, 72-78.
- Ford, D.Y., & Harris III, J.J. (1999). *Multicultural gifted education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ford, D.Y., Harris III, J.J., Tyson, C.A., & Frazier Trotman, M. (2002). Beyond deficit thinking: Providing access for gifted African American students. *Roeper Review*, 24(2), 52-58.
- Ford, D.Y., Howard, T.C., Harris III, J.J., & Tyson, C.A. (2000). Creating culturally responsive classrooms for gifted minority students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 23(4), 397-427.
- Ford, D.Y., & Webb, K. (1995). Desegregating gifted education: A need unmet. *Journal of Negro Education*, 64, 52-62.
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting white'." *The Urban Review*, 18, 176-203.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gould, S.J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.
- Gould, S.J. (1995). *The mismeasure of man* (revised ed.). New York: Norton.
- Herrnsterin, R.J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hilliard III, A.G. (1992). The pitfalls and promises of special education practice. *Exceptional Children*, 49(4), 168-172.
- Jensen, A.R. (1981). *Straight talk about mental tests*. New York: Free Press.
- Jensen, A.R. (1984). Test bias: Concepts and criticisms. In C.R. Reynolds & R.T. Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on bias in mental testing*. New York: Plenum.
- Kaufman, A.S. (1994). *Intelligent testing with the WISC-III*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Menchaca, M. (1997). Early racist discourses: The roots of deficit thinking. In R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking* (pp. 13-40). New York: Falmer.
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2002). *Pre-K-Grade 12 Gifted Program Standards*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Rushton, J.P. (2000). *Race, evolution, and behavior: A life-history perspective* (3rd ed.). Port Huron, MI: Charles Darwin Research Institute.
- Saccuzzo, D.P., Johnson, N.E., & Guertin, T.L. (1994). *Identifying underrepresented disadvantaged gifted and talented children: A multifaceted approach* (Vols. 1 & 2). San Diego: San Diego State University.
- Shade, B.J., Kelly, C., & Oberg, M. (1997). *Creating culturally responsive classrooms*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Steele, C.M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African-Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Davidson, J.E. (Eds.). (1986). *Conceptions of giftedness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R.J., & Detterman, D.K. (Eds.). (1986). *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Storti, C. (1989). *The art of crossing cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Storti, C. (1998). *The art of crossing cultures* (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: Author.

