

The social perspective of the issues of raising and teaching talents: View and analyze reading network

By

Dr. Meriem Kaddouri

Assistant Professor at City University of Ajman - United Arab Emirates

ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9236-4885>

Email: m.kaddouri@cu.ac.ae

Abstract

This paper is a proposal for a diverse discussion from a social science perspective on the subject of education directed to the talent category, based on the assumption that this category as a social group has a distinct performance that must be developed, although the classic theses such as Grace and Lewellyn (1963) were She considered “talent” to refer to “a child’s present or past performance, not to their future potential (which may hold little or no promise), but despite this perspective, today it is undeniable that there is a need for schools that value the uniqueness and talent in all children and respect and nurture talent wherever it is found, The gifted child/student is ahead of his peers/colleagues because he learns more quickly from experience and puts his knowledge to work. The gifted is often considered practical with his information, even if it is limited, and he needs the availability of methodologies, tools, knowledge and environments that help in growth, development and refinement, and there are many examples of that. Among what is presented in this paper for discussion is what is related to multidisciplinary research, which had another word, other than the limited classical proposition, since during the analysis of the topic of talents and education for the distinguished and talented, the idea of moving from the minute levels within the individual (organic, cellular, neurological, that stem from analyzes and studies of neurosciences, molecular biology, perhaps physics, etc., and even what is related to intelligence and its tests, to levels external to the individual related to him as a psychological and social structure and the impact of societal, cultural, political and legislative environments...etc. This position, in which we find diverse social and human sciences, makes this transition in analysis between levels make a significant contribution to understanding the nature and differences of talent and talent development on the one hand, and also the ability to explore the contextual social and economic influences on gifted minds.

Second: Talent and Talent Education

Talking about talent is not the result of a modern and contemporary historical moment, but rather dates back to previous civilizations, at least dating back more than 3000 years (Heller, 2001), where interest in talent existed among many cultures, extending to the eras of the monotheistic religions and Greek and Chinese traditions, until the twentieth century when the scientific interest in the subject increased for practical and scientific purposes as well as social details. Lewis M. Terman's study is the most comprehensive on the subject of giftedness, through his project 'Genetic Studies of Giftedness' in California in 1922-1923 and several subsequent published works on the same topic (Terman, 1922; 1931).

Interest in talents and psychological and social research about them is the result of historical events and an international competition on the one hand (Sputnik Project in the United States / Cultural Revolution in China ... etc.). The issue of equality was vigorously presented, at a first stage, but later it became the issue of excellence, especially with the emergence of new concepts related to human capital and human resources...etc. The concepts

Published/ publié in *Res Militaris* (resmilitaris.net), vol.13, n°2, January Issue 2023

and objectives changed, and were also affected by the change in the economic map and the so-called end of the glorious thirties and the Fordist era, where economic demand became trending for diversity and quality, and here activating human resources through gifted education has become the focus of every project.

According to Heller, these circumstances prompted states and societies to enhance their programs for the gifted, and increased interest towards applied and experimental research, but this increased the development of basic knowledge on the subject, and gave new dimensions to the concepts of creativity, talents, and special education ... etc.

Talking about gifted individuals, does not necessarily mean that it is related to specific social, cultural and ethnic affiliations, nor necessarily physical abilities, as Kearney and others (2008) went to, we must realize first of all that talent is a mixture between what the individual possesses, what he is born with and what his social environment refines, as well as the sum of opportunities available to develop and invest in his talents.

Attempting to inventory the various definitions or concepts related to talents, may lead us to a variety of approaches with the multiplicity of specializations of its people, their viewpoints, and sometimes their social and political positions, or, as Miller (2008) says, based on an explicit (research) or implicit (personal) understanding of the term.

But let's try to suffice with considering that talents are the category of individuals who show high ability across a wide range of learning fields, or more accurately, they are those who have distinctive and high abilities in specific educational fields, to quote (Kaufman & Sternberg, 2008), as it is in the same proposition The National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), based in Washington, D.C., considers talents to be individuals who display outstanding levels of ability (defined as exceptional ability to think and learn) or aptitude. (Documented performance or achievement in the top 10% or less) in one or more areas, including areas and activities with its symbol system (such as mathematics, music, language) and/or a range of sensory skills (such as drawing, dancing, and sports).

Accordingly, after identifying talents, focus must be placed on the processes of developing ability or competencies and talent, which is a life-long process, and this is important because various factors can either enhance or prevent the development of these capabilities and the process of demonstrating and expressing them, according to the expression of the aforementioned association (NAGC, 2011).

Gagné (2001) argues that talent is a normative concept, as it is determined on the basis of population groups that differ from the norm and the norm, and therefore good definitions of normative concepts must be determined on the basis of how much the target population differs from the normal base of people / population and what this means Where it is located and spread.

Third: The sociological attempt to understand and analyze “talents” and “the issues of raising and teaching talents.”

In his seminal work on the sociology of elites, C. Wright Mills expresses the theme and concept when he says that persons of merit are averse to believing that they are merely their own; they easily define themselves as inherently worthy of what they have; Thus, they believe that they are the "natural" elite; In fact, it is a reimagining of their faculties and privileges as natural extensions of their own as the elite. (Mills, 1956: 14)

In fact, the analysis behind this is based on the distinction between belief in faculties and talents that are the result of the component of intelligence, the biological genetic component, and thus the individual is endowed with being part of the family of talents, and the consequent social function.

From here a different kind of position and discussion is formed about talents and talent education, in which several social processes overlap, and according to each perspective, interpretation and analysis come.

The Weberian perspective based on the individual and the space of freedom in front of him and the meanings given to the social action, the rationality of the act and the exploitation of resources (subjective, social, economic, cultural...) presents us with a completely different position from the Marxist perspective based on relations of production, conflict and domination, and the resulting inequalities based on property Materialism, and in the same analysis we find a sociological point of view that focused on cultural capital, the reproduction of social ranks, and the reinforcement of inequality, which is the Marxist proposal of Pierre Bourdieu to some extent in this analysis, in contrast, the proposition of a descendant of Weberian analysis, It is the theory of equal opportunities for Raymond Beaudon, where the individual is faced with rational choices through it and on the basis of which he chooses the appropriate opportunity for his social path, and not the social system is what determines this in advance.

This general conclusion shows us that sociological analysis does not provide one or at least a socially based understanding of talents. His behavior and practices, and among those who focus on the environmental, social and cultural dimension that controls and is the source of the behavior of the individual, and the latter and his faculties are nothing but a product of the nature of the social system.

Intelligence racism is a dominant class racism characterized by a set of characteristics of what is commonly referred to as racism, i.e. petit-bourgeois racism which is the central target of most classical criticisms of racism, beginning with Sartre's most classic criticism of it.

This racism is peculiar to the dominant class whose reproduction depends in part on the transmission of cultural capital, an inherited capital which has the property of being embedded capital, and thus appears natural, innate. The racism of intelligence is what the dominants aim to produce 'a theodicy of their own privilege', in Weber's words any justification for the social order they control, it is what makes the dominants feel superior" (Bourdieu, 2004: 24)

The researchers proceed from the central argument of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu that what happens in educational systems is that the pre-existing privilege of those who already possess it is certified as superior and thus deserving of their social position. Bourdieu's Symbolic Violence, as the main forms of symbolic violence appear in routine assessments of intelligence and academic ability, These mechanisms are found to occur in major educational institutions, where some individuals are supported and praised and in ways of speaking, thinking and behaving, so that knowing when and how to be silent and understanding when and how to respond are elements that are shaped by the cultural and social capital of individuals (children) and thus are praised, mainly , socially and culturally and the physical space in which they were born and learned to use key cultural tools, which are not universally available.

“Perhaps most importantly, young people learn at home how to use their bodies in institutional settings and, more generally, how to carry themselves around. How do they know?

How do they do this?" they say. It is precisely the subconscious that Bourdieu argues is the primary currency of schools (Ras Cultural money) that can be converted into credentials, and then later into privileged employment and economic capital, and this is what makes inequalities invisible and legitimized, and the various "institutionalized" and "de-institutionalized" capitals become convertible to another type of capital that makes it what it is It is a flexible value and a medium of exchange at the same time.

So, we will not deny the role of social analysis of talents from different angles of view, but epistemology, talent as a cognitive structure is nothing but a sociological problem that is inseparable from the rest of the social problems and issues, and therefore addressing the various angles and rationales contributes to strengthening the epistemological code from different angles of view, perspectives and positions of its owners and their theoretical backgrounds cognitive and even ideological.

Fourth: Talent Education and the Problem of Equal Opportunities

Against the background of sociological analysis and its multiplicity of paradigms, many questions arise about whether gifted education perpetuates social inequality and social injustice by favoring those who are already privileged, or is it just the opposite?

Persson Roland (2014) raises fundamental questions regarding the issue of the needs of the gifted and the needs of society, and only, does gifted education affect societal inequality, and does societal inequality suppress and/or distort the development of high capacity?

By returning to the knowledge blog for many academic disciplines as well as those related to political discourse, according to the researcher, it allows us to explore the use of various terms used to describe those with high abilities. On the one hand, it appears that the social function plays an important role in determining the nature of differentiation that exists in society, more than the descriptions offered by the various theories that work on "people with high capabilities".

In contrast, another particular issue was raised at the broad context level, exploring the contextual social and economic influences on gifted minds through a project on the impact of rising inequality on the gifted and highly able (Cross, 2013).

Cross notes the duality of benefits and harms associated with different social inequalities, especially income, and this involves the issue of talent education, where it becomes an attempt to understand which practices or traditions contribute to inequality, since, in some circumstances, students of gifted education programs benefit from advantages not available to all. Students, especially since everyone can benefit from it, on the other hand, and as a solution to the inequality generated by practices related to social inequalities and the talent education system, researcher Cross concludes with an important recommendation, which is the abolition of age classification, as he considers it a practice that prevents the development of potentials for many children, including That's gifted children.

In the same context, James Borland, editor of Rethinking Gifted Education, published in 2003, asserted that changes in gifted education were not entirely intentional and voluntary, and often faced a lot of resistance from many actors in this system, both professionals and parents. Gifted children who would like to retain the traditional gifted education model and see it as necessary for gifted children to reach their full potential, critics inside and outside the gifted education system proceed from the fundamental idea that it is still largely an inequitable,

self-sufficient education system of enrolling white middle-class and upper-middle-class students' (Borland, 2003:02) while continuing to enroll minority students.

Furthermore, they argue that the concept of giftedness, like that of intelligence, is socially constructed, and "gains its meaning, even its existence, from the interactions of societies, particularly through their discourse" (Borland, 2003: 107), and thus continues to perpetuate the privilege. Inequality in education for certain pre-determined classes and groups.

These arguments, the subject of several discussions by researchers such as David Feldman, John Feldhusen and other scholars, have tried to consider that it is time to critically reconsider the prevailing theories and practices in talent education, although many in this field disagree. And they resist skillfully and forcefully.

In principle, and through a review of many literatures, it becomes clear to us that the more the analysis turns to its political dimension, the more the belief is in favor of social injustice, and the more the analysis turns in its scientific, procedural and theoretical dimension, the more it is based on the idea that education and education directed to the gifted is a scientifically based procedure and that even if it is Talent is in fact conferred socially, as such education contributes to giving opportunities to everyone according to the existing capabilities and distinctions, and therefore the outputs are what make the process more fair and perhaps more socially important (outputs of creative talents that produce ideas, creation and invention, and this is for the benefit of society and humanity).

From this point of view, the analysis on the education of the gifted leads to a reference to the historical role of consolidating attention to individual and not social disparities. For example, by returning to the essence of human development, the education and education of the gifted provides the optimal elements for increasing social justice, and expanding human benefit from outputs related to the concepts of intelligence. Stimulation and creativity.

Social analysis should not be separated from the current outcomes and results about the processes that affect the development of high abilities, and the results of neuroscience research, especially when applied to understanding and talent development, but it always remains that a better understanding of talent is by considering it as a product of dynamic interactions and processes (Psychological / nervous... etc), float and disappear and contextual (family, societal, cultural, political ...etc).

It is also worth noting that the educational process directed to talent, in and of itself, is no less important than trying to understand talent and its paths, as the interest in this process and the implications for educational practice contributes to understanding how various changes affect the programming and psychological and social practices of actors and the development of their performance (teachers/administrators), and the resulting opportunities for optimal exploitation and development of talented individuals and their education system from the family to institutions and society as a whole.

Conclusion

Our goal, through this presentation and this paper, is to try to build a social cognitive accountability regarding the issue of talents and education and talent education, as it was a diverse presentation and carries with it several problems that are raised, discussed and provoked when it comes to social, psychological and historical intervention...etc.

It remains that the topic arouses the interest of policy makers and economic institutions and those interested in the issues of creativity and development, in a distinctive way due to the economic and social benefit of the outputs of the training and education programs for talents and people of distinction. And creativity and everything that goes around that and that's the essence of competition.

These details that everyone knows are what create cognitive and sociological bets that make specialists, professionals and those interested in the knowledge resulting from dealing with such topics and categories, make them active in the midst of this bet and cognitive accountability.

And the subject remains for a long dialogue related not only to the available reading networks, as much as it can be made available in the future and constitute knowledge ruptures and revolutions, and this is the most important part within the relevance of dealing with such topics.

List of references

- Borland, J. H. (2003). Rethinking Gifted Education. Education and Psychology of the Gifted Series
- Bourdieu, P. (2004): « Racisme de l'intelligence », le monde diplomatique, (accès libre, avril 2004) // <https://www.monde-diplomatique.fr/11113>
- Corbett, M., & Corbett, N. (2018). Giftedness: A sociological critique from a rural perspective. *Critical Education*, 9(1), 1-15.
- Cross, J. R. (2013). Gifted education as a vehicle for enhancing social equality. *Roeper Review*, 35(2), 115-123.
- Gagné, F. (2001), Gifted and talented individuals: Developmental and educational overview, in : Smelser, N. J., & Baltes, P. B. (Eds.). (2001). *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (Vol. 11). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Grace, H. A., & Lewellyn, L. W. (1963). The gifted child in a sociology of knowledge. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, 36(7), 325-334.
- Heller, K. A. (2001). Giftedness, Psychology of, in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001.
- Kaufman, S. B., & Sternberg, R.J. (2008). Conceptions of giftedness. In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children: Psycho educational theory, research, and best practices* (pp. 71–91). New York, NY: Springer
- Kearney, A., Bevan-Brown, J., Haworth, P., & Riley, T. (2008). Inclusive education: Looking through the kaleidoscope of diversity. In S. Brown, J. O'Neill, & A. St George (Eds.), *Facing the big questions in education: Purpose, power and learning* (pp. 109–120). Melbourne, Australia: Cengage Learning.
- Miller, E. M. (2008). Conceptions of giftedness. In C. M. Callahan & J. A. Plucker (Eds.), *Critical issues and practices in gifted education: What the research says*. (2nd ed., pp: 107–117). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Mills, C. W. *The Power Elite*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2011). Redefining giftedness for a new century: Shifting the paradigm. Retrieved from <http://www.nagc.org/sites/default/files/Position%20Statement/Redefining%20Giftedness%20for%20a%20New%20Century.pdf>
- Roland S. Persson (2014) *The Needs of the Highly Able and the Needs of Society: A Multidisciplinary Analysis of Talent Differentiation and Its Significance to Gifted*

Education and Issues of Societal Inequality, *Roeper Review*, 36:1, 43-59, DOI:
10.1080/02783193.2013.856830

Terman, L. M. (1922). A new approach to the study of genius. *Psychological Review*, 29(4).

Terman, L. M. (1931). The gifted child.