TRAINING OF GENIUS TO MERITOCRACY AND ELITISM

Dr. Selma DÜNDAR
Zürich University
Institute für Erziehungswissenschaft
Freistrasse 36, 8032
Zurich, SWITZERLAND

ABSTRACT

One of the most controversial issues in the history of education is training of genius or cognitive (g) superiority. Together with enlightenment, democratic community, which based on achievement, converted to the school systems. Hence, the meritocracy thesis, which defends social inequalities are an inevitable result of individual differences, has begun to rise. Some of the anti-theses, which use some terms such as meritocracy, IQism, and g-centrism, have hampered the classifying of education according to aristocracy of intelligence. From this point of view, aim in this study is not ignoring individual differences or equalizing neurological differences, but on the contrary, unlike approaches considering humans as simple, measurable/gradable beings, emphasizing that human being is complicated. At this point, genius or cognitive superiority requires a discussion within on the basis of equality of opportunity. Because, the cognitive superiority and giftedness issues are not only particular concern for pedagogy, but also field of interests of education economy and educational sociology. Thus; in this study, firstly, development of the subject in the literature for the elite is questioned, then (2) how elitism was contextually turned into IQizm in modern period is discussed historically and conceptually, and finally (3) by looking at the situation in Turkish educational system, the probable results of a model, which had previously proposed, have been discussed.

Key Words: Giftedness, meritocracy, elitism.

INTRODUCTION

Man has learnt to survive against severe nature conditions first. Since he started to live in groups, the desire to be superior on the others has existed in the power concept. This power has expressed itself in a series of ways from physical ways to witchcraft or more complicated methods such as displaying some powers the others have not had.   Phenomenologically in the name of power, there has even been a tendency to put oneself in a place between God and human being. Caste and slavery systems can also be said to have been nurtured from mans desire for superiority over the others and have continued to exist in a way, in the form of a social contract. Today's modern class/strata system on the other hand includes softer but more complicated power and superiority components. At this point; when considered in a psychological dimension, it can be said that the issue has become a problem that should be treated multi dimensionally in sociological sphere not whether there has become a change/progress in human beings' desire to be superior or not. Here, evolution of democracy ideal and aftermath with enlightenment period, developments in the society has been influential. Thus, two ways were opened for the formation of class/strata in the society. First, is wealth by inheriting/ superiority based on property, the second is meritocracy, superiority gained through skills or intelligence**.**

In a context apart, the concept "superior" that precedes intelligence in Turkish Language Institution (Türk Dil Kurumu=TDK) Dictionary also denotes "higher", "upper" or being higher compared to similar ones or exceeding them. Antonym of the word connotes ordinariness. "Superior" proceeding above mentioned intelligence and desire to be superior to have power don't have the same context. Yes. On the other hand, when I consider the pure race projects, or projects for arranging the race, this subject leads to a very controversial field. From this standpoint, the period before and after Second World War is an important date that shows how far Eugenism's results can go. In this period, IQ measurements and strictly following these measurements which were time to

125

time used by Eugenics caused for a while an elitist understanding such as intelligence aristocracy, but on developments, it started to be intensively criticized after the Second World War.

From this point of view, aim in this study is not ignoring individual differences or equalizing neurological differences, but on the contrary, unlike approaches considering humans as simple, measurable/cathegorizable beings, emphasizing that human being is complicated. So, contrary to the explanations to be produced for the systems running on action-reaction principle, it is emphasizing that individuals or communities individually differing and getting more complicated can not be classified as to their mental characteristics in clear and accurate intervals on a scale. Aim is emphasizing that classifying neural functions with fixed, permanent intervals has various drawbacks and those problems caused by marking humans with rigid measurements and expressing its problems exist in education. Every person has improvable sides and provision of proper conditions suitable for mental development is a topic expressed in several fields. So, whatever individual differences and characteristics are, equality of man originating from his existence, considering and respecting this is an issue easy to talk but in fact it is a seriously difficult stage of struggle. If such a struggle had not been necessary such approaches as disintegrated rights (rights for mentally impaired ones, rights of the black people, women rights) wouldn't have been the need.

At this point, genius or cognitive superiority requires a discussion within on the basis of equality of opportunity. Because, the cognitive superiority and giftedness issues are not only particular concern for pedagogy, but also field of interests of economy of education and educational sociology. Thus; in this study, firstly, development of the subject in the literature for the elite is questioned, then (2) how elitism was contextually turned into IQizm in modern period is discussed historically and conceptually, and finally (3) by looking at the situation in Turkish educational system by years, the probable results of a model which previously proposed have been discussed.

WHAT DOES THE ELIT LITERATURE SAY?

"Elite" (Latin: eligere: to choose) defines the people with extraordinary skills (functional elite) or social groups in power or sovereign (ruling elite) in a society. The concept it is as old as systematic thoughts related to social order (Cevizci, 2007). According to historical and archeological records, "nobility, elitism" seen in communities from Antic Babylonia to Persia, Hebrew, or Antic Greece is formed from hierarchical components like rich, poor, strong, weak, free, slave (Tumin, 1967). Even in City State of Athens, which had founded people's ruling called democracy, only members of the high stratum (of the free ones) were entitled to get education. Furthermore, in Platon's –who systematically wanted to change this system- book 'State', three strata of society were determined, the peasants, artisans, and workers from the third stratum were said not to need education (Ergün, 1997). Through feudality and feudal classes elitism continued in the middle ages.

What French bourgeois demanded during 18th century social struggles by shouting "we want the elites" was the desire that talented ones coming from the society should govern France, in lieu of aristocracy, clergy and noble land owners (traditional elites). It was ending governing rights passing from father to son and enabling talented, hardworking individuals rising from the society to come to power (Arslan, 2010).

One of the trailblazers of this period, J.H Pestalozzi's thoughts, who gave preference to social dimension of education in 1700's were contradictory with his time. He aimed to enable the poor social strata to improve their power and skills with education and reach moral perfection through economic well-being. Another outstanding personality was J.J. Rousseau. In his pedagogical thoughts he revealed in his book "Emile", he opposed the education to be in service of any formation including church and state.

In modern social sciences "elite" and "elitism" are also considered as the basis of a criticism of society, as well as they are approached in an unprejudiced way. The concepts previously used to define the selection and training of "elite troops", were discarded from military terminology in the beginning of 1900's and they were

126

based on the notion of "political class" with G. Mosca. In the modern state and social order grown with enlightenment, choosing "bests" of the society for sovereignty and community duties became a current issue in a new way (Cevizci, 2007), and the concept started to be mentioned with liberty and equality parameters. Then, with V.F. Pareto the expression, 'distinguished' was used in two ways: Distinguished as the emphasis on unequal individual skills in every corner of life, is the first use. Second use was the section consisting of lower stratum -the ordinary/undistinguished ones- dividing the society basically into two and the section consisting of distinguished administrators and other distinguished ones (Bottomore, 1997). Revising forms of elitism, R. Arslan (2010), states the following for the development of this theory basically depicting the relationship between the administrator and the administered, and enriched with the class theories and class conflicts which were put forward by K. Marks, and came into fashion again with G. Mosca and V.F. Pareto: Traditional elites who lost their power in economic circle to trade and industry bourgeois[4] in 18th century, did not have any arguments left to convince the society, as they backed fascist and authoritarian administrations before Second World War and this backing brought their end after the War. These sections can continue to survive by taking part in neo-conservative parties. Political and social milieu formed aftermath the Second World War caused democracy to replace fascist administrations, and in a parallel way in USA (Power Elites became determinant) debates on elitism started again. As debates on modern elitism went on, the concept of pluralist elites (Funktions und Leistungseliten) was also developed. Since 1970's the term 'elite' has been a name given to people rising from the society, exceeding the masses only with their skill and talents (functional elites) and the capable people who have been able to climb to the highest ranks in NGO's, enterprises and public institutions. These are economists capable of driving the economies, well known doctors, distinguished scientists or charismatic political leaders. For example private companies transfer modern elites and bring them into company administrations whatever their races, nationalities, religions are. Thus, the concept started to mean small and selected groups of people who wanted to be superior for future, who wanted to have a consciousness related to merits. After World War II, an elite conceptualization –that is still approved- has been reached, in Germany on the other hand where the concept was defined with "superior race" and "superior men" careful effort has been made to purify the term from this context (O. Stammer and R. Dahrendorf's studies are given as examples for this effort). For example, O. Stammer has described elites as functional elites whose "existence, ways of formation, and the ways they are selected, one by one depend on their functions they perform in political influence mechanism in administrators' section". It became possible to take the issue functionally after the idea that functional elites could reach their positions through selection mechanism and equality of opportunities had to be valid for every human being became clear (Cevizci, 2007). As it is emphasized under the IQism sub-heading, and as A. Cevizci (2007) cited from O. Stammer (1962), since 1960's with the rise of educated people, a waste majority of population has become professionally more qualified and solubility of the elite problem in democracy has started to be discussed intensively.

As seen, *elite* concept is used to define and to understand large groups of people like "sovereign class", "the richest", "the most educated" (Cevizci, 2007). *Class* is an economic definition. Being sovereign is political. That is why; the term sovereign includes the theory 'an economic class governs politically'. T.B. Bottomore, calls C.W. Mills' power elites concept inefficient claiming that it doesn't include military elite adequately (Arslan, 2010).

M. Reuchlin (1964) summarizes the period as of enlightenment as follows: With enlightenment period starting in 1790's and industrialization that comes aftermath class based society was dissolved. Modern educational systems started to be built in Europe. While school-designing systems previously replicated the social strata system[7], new class/stratum society is school. Together with enlightenment, democratic community model based on achievement converts into school systems. While social division of labor causes the professions to separate from each other, technical division of labor enables different employees to take part to produce a good. Sciences separated from philosophy in parallel. For the existence of people with different skills, and to produce these individual differences, differential pedagogy (= paedagogie différentielle) develops. This development proposes adaptation of studies on teaching to children. The idea; even individual characteristics

127

of children in the same classroom are different, becomes an important educational motto. Today, this case is treated under the sub-heading of economic function of education in literature. From this point, it is taken as the subject matter of guiding students to different positions in economy/ society (Hesapçıoğlu, 2009).

In the ideological dimension, which is effective during democratization of schools, until recently the three line vertical system of schools, the idea that abilities should be based on "trinity psychology" (Trinitätspsychologie der Begabungen) was also effective. According to this idea supporting old skills approach, skills definitely exist in three forms: (1) Theoretical skills, (2) practical skills, (3) mixture of theoretical and practical skills. These three forms of skill form the natural, hereditary, innate data. This traditional idea on skills is based on social Darwinism. According to social Darwinism, the three main forms of skill represent these three main classes: (1) theoretical skills; higher classes, (2) practical skills; lower classes, (3) mixture of theoretical and practical skills; middle classes. Just like the idea that *splitting the atom was impossible* in physics in 19th century, in the science of psychology, this trinity idea of skills also had absolute validity. Social Darwinists take social hierarchy as a result of skill accumulations that have come true after hundreds of years. Thanks to these accumulations, only specific forms and types of skills have survived (Aytaç, 1975). So, with capitalism, aristocracy based on land ownership has weakened by time, and the opportunity to promote to middle classes, with the help of a more mobile arrangement has allowed *aristocracy of intelligence*. This order of democratic mobility has come into existence in a very long process lasting hundreds of years (Kurtkan-Bilgiseven, 1987). School reforms have had to respond to the rapidly growing industrial formation and new structures of profession (Aytaç, 1975). For example education for the privileged had been constructed for the children from the higher social classes until Education Act was passed in 1944. Some sociologists called this method of education as education with two ways. This was because two completely different education environments were designed, one for the children from the higher social classes and one for the ordinary people's children. In USA, an equal opportunities model for the white was in question. It is said that opportunities similar to the one in England were also provided in France, and after 1., especially 2. World War idea of equality of opportunities was adapted rapidly. Trend towards individual liberties were inflamed in Germany with 1830 and 1848 revolutions, and it was suppressed by Nazi dictatorship and until thoughts for equality of opportunities based on large industries grew, practice of education with two ways had kept on. Education for the privileged was in question in some socialist countries such as Soviet Russia too. Like A.H. Moehlam, there are people who claim; on condition that primary education is compulsory, for the secondary education the privileged people of the communist party are said to have replaced dignitaries of the tsar era. In Ottoman Empire, apart from western world, a class of the privileged, Enderun Schools came into existence. But similar to western world children from higher classes and children of ordinary people were not educated in the same schools. The most explicit example of this case is the existence of Şehzdegan Mektebi (School for Princes), affiliated with the palace, where boys and girls from the imperial family were educated (Kurtkan-Bilgiseven, 1987).

Even under ideal democracy conditions, such biological, hereditary differences (vital inheritance) have not removed this case of "the administrator" and "the administrated". This is the core of the argument. Although there were developments from elitism towards democracy in modern era, elitism left its place to elitist IQism by legalizing and converting itself with the mission of measuring academic skills. But, as A. Kurtkan-Bilgiseven (2004) put it, when genius is considered as timeless, not limited with a location, an individual power which is capable of grasping and articulating feelings, philosophical and social realities valid in all times and all locations; wisdom and intelligence (biology and environment) can play a role in this articulation process. Although, we see test-tube babies thanks to biology, this doesn't guarantee the giftedness, and spiritual power (intuition) principle cannot be overcome.

IQISM: A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON MODERN ELITISM

Firstly, as L.M. Cohen et al. (2000) said, the principle is that: context of the gifted education involves large school systems and socio-ecenomic, political and cultural aspects of the society. The study to be considered with this perspective will begin with defining openings:

Since 19th century when giftedness was regarded as a scientific concept, that strong indicator of giftedness has been intelligence concept, and IQ tests regarded credible for measuring IQ. In resources (for instance Flynn, 2009; Sternberg, 2004) making definitions through intelligence tests, gifted is defined as an individual who gains repeatedly 130 points or over for his intelligence group. R. Plomin and T.S Price (2002) puts that meaning of intelligence is cognitive skill (g), and this is measured for example, verbal, spatial memory skills on tests. General cognitive skill was defined as 'g' by Spearman in 1904 to avoid negative connotations of the giftedness concept. Giftedness is also a component of general skills, personal thoughts, and motivations in definitions made independently, without linking it to intelligence tests. From the point view of perceiving and transferring emotional, cognitive experiences, it is displaying awareness, sensitivity, and skill compared to his/her peers (Feldhusen, 1986; Flynn, 2009)). School system has become a scanning tool in modern period to differentiate more intelligent one from less intelligent. Use of the school as a scanning tool this way is defined as IQ'ism by new Marxists, and as *credentialism* by a group of sociologists like J.J Macionis (2003). R.Collins, who gives the most comprehensive explanation for *credentialism* in his book, *The Credential Society*, sets out with M. Weber's idea that educational documents are used to restrict the number of candidates for positions of socio-economic superiority and to keep these positions in the hands of patent (diploma) owners' hands (cited by Tan, 1990). H. Gardner, a defender of Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory, on the other hand, defines this over-dependence on IQism *as g-centrism* (Tannennbaum, 2002), and believes "everybody is intelligent" in his Multiple Intelligences Theory (MI) (Tannenbaum, 2002). Today, as D. Goleman (from 1995, cited by Plomin and Price, 2002) expresses, *g* doesn't guarantee neither achievement at home and work nor individual motivation and social skills that refer to emotional intelligence. D.Y. Ford (2002) compares these beliefs, which are defined as positivist and post-positivist in some records, with a historical perspective as follows:

Table 1: A comparison of traditional versus contemporary beliefs and practices.

Traditional beliefs and practices	Contemporary beliefs and practices
Identification – Focus is on a convergent ansver. Is the child gifted? (yes/no response required)	Assessment – Focus is on a divergent ansver. How is the child gifted and what are his / her needs? This is diagnostic and prescriptive.
Identification – Focus is on students earning a certain number on an intelligence or achievement test.	Assessment – Focus in on developing a profile of students' strenghs and shortcomings.
Giftdness – Represented by a high IQ score or achievement percentile	Giftedness – viewed as multidimensional.
Measurement – The best (most valid and reliable) measure of giftedness is a test(s).	Measurement – Giftedness must be assessed in multiple ways due to its multimodal nature.
Measurement – one measure / test is sufficient.	Measurement – Multiple soruces are essential to develop a profile.
Ability is rewarded	Effort and achievement are rewarded.
Ability must be demonstrated	Talent development and potential are recognized.
Etiology – Genetics primarily determine giftedness	Etiology – The environment and genetics determine giftedness. We must look at characteristics.
Students are in a gifted program. Gifted education is a place.	Students receive gifted education services. Gifted education is not a place.
Excellence versus equity debate.	Excellence and equity are not mutually exclusive.

Gifted education is a privilege.	Gifted education is a need.

Sources: Donna Y. Ford. (2002). Equity and excellence: culturally diverse students in gifted education. *Handbook of Gifted Education*. USA: Allyn & Bacon. p. 513.

L.M.Cohen et al. (2000) who treats the subject with its philosophical dimensions, reports the similar table as follows:

Table 2: Root-metaphorical worldviews: their tenets, limitations, and influences on conceptions of giftedness.

World View	Organicism	Contextualism	Formism	Mechanism
Root metaphor	Organism developing through stages towards a particular end	Ongoing event within its context	Similarity	Machine
Connections with philosophical traditions	Absolute or objective idealism, existentialism (Hegel, Husserl)	Pragmatism (Pierce, James, Dewey)	Platonic idealism and some realism (Plato, Aristo)	Materialism, Realism, naturalism (Descartes, Locke, Hobbes, Hume)
What the world view highlights	Coherence and totality of systems (the whole transcending its parts) Integrative connections Long-term development	Contextual influences Unpredictable emergence of novelty	Paterns of similarity in diverse phenomena	Reduction of the whole to its component parts Precision, detail Linear causality objectivity
Weaknesses of the perspective	Limited applicability beyond the system under study Misses detail of the moment	Imprecision	Imprecision	Obscures context and systemic interconnections
Prefered mode of inquiry	Postpositivist	Postpositivist	Postpositivist	Positivist
Examples of research projects primarily influenced by the world view	In case study of a creative individual, a researcher seks ways in which intrasystemic, mutually shaping interactions among cognitive subsystems promote long-range purpose	Qualitative researcher seeking effects of socioeconomic influences on talented minority children who show resilience in dealing with unpredictable environments	Complexity theorists discovering patterns of similarity in the Dynamics of human brains .. Philosophical analysis of metaphors that underpin research in gifted education	Experimental, quantitative analysis of effects of instructional strategy on students' achievement scores
Perspectives on intelligence and	Social construction paradigm	Social construction paradigm	Social construction paradigm	Natural inequality

130

Sources: Cohen, L.M., Ambrose, D. & Powell, N. (2000). Conceptual foundations and theoretical lenses fort he diversity of giftedness and talent (Eds. Kurt. A. Heler, Franz J. Mönks, Robert J. Sternberg, Rena F. Subotnik). *International Handbook of Giftedness and Talent*. New York: Pergamon p. 333.

As seen, there have been changes of paradigm in the education for the gifted. As Cohen et al. (2000) said: the *traditional paradigm* in gifted education was based on assumptions of clearly defined, measurable, culture-transcendent intelligence and the selection and labeling of the gifted (usually through IQ tests) for their inherent abilities. The *second paradigm* was derived from special education emphases on individual educational plans and least restrictive environments based on assessments of students' individual needs. Aspects of the as yet ill-defined *third paradigm* shift seem to include emphases on multidimensional talents, multidimensional and context-sensitive conceptions of intelligence, awareness of diversity and societal context.

Now, time to analyze factors forming basis for the development of these approaches with a historical perspective:

In various eras, it has been expressed -by thinkers including Aristo and Platon- that human beings are not equal about their intelligence skills. In the literature where *whys* and *hows* of social stratification this subject has been treated voluminously. But, about the conceptualization of the subject matter as a kind of biological differentiation, there has been a progress towards the theorists of pure race, starting with G.V de Lapouge and O. Amon's theories. From this point on, we should note F. Galton's concept which also resources of the formation of elite concepts. First opinion backing heredity, in his work Hereditory Genius (1869) -though luck seems effective for the emergence of intelligence, was first proposed by F. Galton who is trying to prove that it is more probable for highly intelligent children to be born when father is gifted (Kurtkan-Bilgiseven, 1987). F. Galton (Plomin & Price, 2002) asserts that giftedness (or high intelligence) is a *matter of heredity* rather than environmental factors. F. Galton, being directly influenced by C. Darwin's views, calculated natural intelligence (giftedness) levels in the society, and claimed that individual differences and privileges were created by environmental and hereditary factors. In his theory, he asserted that people from higher or lower strata in the society were not equal for capacity, higher strata in the society produced more gifted people in number than lower strata, and these privileges could be attributed first to hereditary then environmental factors (Sorokin, 1994). In this road from natural selection to race based superiority, F. Galton defending genetically amelioration of human race in stead of leaving evolution to develop on its own, supports the systematic breeding of human beings to reach the results sooner and effortlessly (Coşkun, n.d.). His reanimating eugenism (eugenics) brings out F. Nietsche's "superior human" (uber mensch) goal, and A. Hitler and his team's transhumanism (post-human) (Dündar, 2010). M. Hesapçıoğlu reports how these viewpoints - in fact not proposed by C. Darwin himself- act in social psychology (Vexliard, 1969) as that: Generally racisms accepts the Darwinian theory of survival of the fittest. During this progress, the least fit ones disappear (natural selection). Contribution of these thoughts to human groups brought out racisms. This viewpoint, which had been, was dominant until II. World War, as cited by M. Tan (1987), was opened to reforms basically defending talents of children from lower strata were wasted over time. In 1960's while debates taking environmental factors into consideration for educational achievement strengthened, "innate intelligence" concept was attacked. In this period, human capital approach rose, and when it was 1970's, these hopes for education caused critical pedagogs like I. Illich to define education as "secular religion".

IQism and naming of it, in the process called g-centrism, was strongly linked to the idea that intelligence could be measured with IQ tests with high validity and reliability, and IQ was believed to be the only factor in educational, professional, economic, and social efforts (Dündar, 2010; Dorling, 2010). As it is treated comprehensively in the chapter for *Elitism*, H. Radnor et al. (2007 cited by Dündar, 2010) proving that meritocracy has brought out an elitist practice, puts that intelligence and skill are modern invention covering

131

elitism in education as a social structure. Meanwhile, C. Jenkins' points emphasizing luck, as a factor should be noted here. According to the author, who emphasizes luck in inequalities, and harshly criticizes liberal models and all concepts linking fortunes of life to family roots, intelligence level, or cognitive skills links, fortune of life is related to fortune, personality and professional efficiency (Husén, 1974; Tan, 1987). J.H. Austin (1978 cited by Tannenbaum, 2002) points that factor of luck is never ignored or neglected in skill studies. W. Müller and K.V. Mayer (cited by Ergün, 1997), in their study aiming to prove that if it is possible to provide equality of fortunes through education, grouped the correlations among education, profession, and social background. That is why it is important what you mean by saying "achievement". If success, with its largest definition; is the distance individuals cover to reach their goals/results, this distance covered, /phases passed become true in a context effected by the factors in and out of individual's control.   Though educational achievement is quite a complicated issue in regards to factors, as it will be treated here, achievement has an economic dimension. In this dimension meritocracy model in which selection and opportunity concepts are interwoven comes first, thus school/ academic years and after school years emerge as a matter of either quality or quantity. In this scope, two opinions in conformity with IQism are *meritocracy thesis* and *explanations submitted by traditional elitist model*: *Meritocracy thesis,* defends that social inequalities are an inevitable result of individual differences (intelligence and skill). R.J Herrnstein, who theorized the thesis exposes this hypothesis as follows: "If all of the people are intelligent enough to dig trenches but half of the people are intelligent enough to be engineers, society makes use of this intellectual resource sparingly by valuing and rewarding engineers" (Ulusoy, 1996). *Traditional Elitist (Conservative) Model*: It supports children of privileged classes to be more intelligent and successful and go to elite schools. So, an education system limiting opportunities is inevitable, and reform trials having potential to spoil the unity of elitist, privileged, special schools should also be avoided. As in fundamentalist model, it asserts that intelligence is a social characteristic not a natural characteristic. Among the researchers who contribute to the consideration of IQ or achievement problem from an economic point of view, works of R.J. Hernstein, A.Jensen, C. Murray, C. Jencks, S. Bowles and H. Gintis stand out. We also see that the term "desire to achieve" social mobility through education is used in some sources. For example D.C. McClelland, in his book The Achievement Society in which he treats the relationship between human beings' desire to achieve and economic growth, he has reached different findings for developed and developing countries. From the point of cultural factors at first, R. Jacobs criticizes this research several points of view. One of the factors igniting the debates of considering matter of IQ or achievement economically most is: R.J. Hernstein and C. Murray who collected their researches aiming to find out whether the rich are more intelligent or not, in the book '*The bell Curve Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life'* in 1994.

N. Chomsky, treating R.J. Herrnstein's Bell Curve idea in 1972, criticized the economic proposals submitted by the idea and defined it as racist. He asserted that R.J. Herrnstein's ideas were full of mistakes, and they protected only the benefits of the elite. Chomsky proposed these contradicting views in his *'Chomsky on IQ and Inequality':* (1) People do not choose professions based only on personal gains, (or social prestige) free from individual tendencies. (2) Society always rewards the people who become a part of a useful social service. And N. Chomsky adds: "according to R.J. Herrnstein's logic, if bakers and woodsmen obtain the highest gains in the society, over time, the ones with the highest IQ occupy these positions. And I have no doubt that R.J Herrnstein will become a woodsman or a baker to make more money that way. In this discussion, C. Murray (1997), supports meritocracy approach, which backs R. J Herrnstein's bell Curve showing range of intelligence scores. Referring to siblings sample, he also defends that class differentiations have formed free from the individuals' socio-economic accumulations. In his research, C. Murray (1997) illustrating the importance of education asserts that: average length of education for people with normal intelligence scores equals to 13.4 years. Length of education or people with brighter intelligence scores equals to 16.4 years. Average length of education for people with lower than normal intelligence score equals to 11.6 years (normal length of regular education is 12 years). School years make sense when we see that; while 19% of normal group have a university/college diploma, 82 % of students with brighter intelligence scores (16.4) have a diploma (quadruple of the normal group). Besides, 50% of students with brighter intelligence scores compared to normal ones (1.5 times as high as the normal ones) have good graduation degrees. While 3% of students with normal

132

intelligence scores have low graduation degrees, none of them have very low graduation degrees. As for job choice, in 1992, rate of students with normal intelligence scores choosing law, medicine, academics, engineering, accountancy and science for career is 2%. Rate of bachelors is 23%, rate of postgraduates is 8%. Rate of graduation with low degree is zero. But this result implies that IQ solely doesn't affect job choice through education. Furthermore, we can see that children with same financial and emotional support in the same family have different career choices. By providing a longer/better education for their fortunate children, families can't guarantee the relation between job choice and income (Murray, 1997). On geneticists' view that "growth of children is a combination of environmental and genetic caharacteristics", C. Murray (1997), in his study, notes that before all, Bell Curve doesn't underrate environmental factors. It is stated that a person's intelligence can be developed 15 points through environmental factors. Leading factor in this development is explained with family factors (e.g. socio-economic status, divorce, literacy). Theme of this study is that: IQ is passed genetically, so family is the most determining factor in a person's economic income. But, because of the researches about the siblings, it is emphasized here that IQ is an independent factor in a person's economic income, free from the economic status of the family.

In this group, A. Jensen, together with meaningful significance of relation between IQ and economic income (0.4), adds that the other effective factor is age. That is because, people especially in their middle age, their potential reaches its highest level in their career. In general, in the emergence of the approach called as IQism by S. Bowles and H. Gintis, studies of above mentioned researchers R.J. Hernstein, C. Murray, A. Jensen, R.J. Rushton and E.W. Rushton correlate IQ positively with professional prestige, access to education, creativity, physical health, mental health, brain size, lifespan, and transmission speed in neurons.

This correlation is negatively related to crime rate, weakness, chronic need for care, unemployment, divorce and single parenthood (Jones & Schneider, 2006). On the other hand, in order to depict correlation between class roots and academic achievement, Robbins Report, published in England in 1963, revealed that chances of higher education were equal for the most intelligent children from the lower strata and the least intelligent children from the higher strata (Ergün, 1997)[1].

As seen, mechanistic thinking, which was explained in detail above, is still based on dominant culture concepts. As Passow and Fraiser (cited by Cohen et al., 2000) cites; skills and intelligence of the gifted children were neglected because of excessive demand for standardized tests, restricting definitions of intelligence, failure to understand apparent behaviour in cultural context, lack of orientation, and lack of dynamic assessment in learning opportunities. It is this way, in addition to studies in 60's and 70's, although researchers like Frasier, Garcia, Passow, Ford, Harris, Maker, Schiever, Peterson attempted to define intelligence in different groups, and respond to different children, this dominance is as it is. Also taking these shortcomings into consideration, new Marxist thinking, as noted by S. Bowles and H. Gintis (1976) found the factors related to a person's income apart from IQ as the person's family, location, genetic health, ethnic roots, and education. Furthermore, they also found that these factors were more influential than IQ in determining the income. To sum up; *in the process of competition in schools, with defeats and victories, students are made to be compatible with their social status*. Thus, objective educational system deepens meritocratic perspective towards popular culture and social sciences method. Obtained high-test scores mean -as an instrument- high-income expectation. Only a minor part of noteworthy statistical correlation between academic achievement and economic success is responsible for school role for developing or curtaining cognitive skills. However, the economic function of schools is not limited to develop or determine skills this way. Primary economic function of education is to develop or select intellectual skills. For this reason, differences in pure cognitive test scores can't explain the correlation between educational process and economic success. T. Hertz et al. (2007), parallel to S. Bowles and H. Gintis's study, found a direct relation between socio-economic status of the family and children's education

---

[1] There are severel research in Turkey related to topic. For example: Ö. Sayın (1989) Tatlıcan (1990), B. Özgen (1996) T. Çavdar (1976), V. Gülmez (1988).

133

and income level. In the analyses they did, they found that the effect of educational level of the families on children increased in the last fifty years. Similarly, M.L. Patrick (2008) point out that class status of the parents is determining factor in mobility between generations.

DISCUSSION

As some of the researchers carrying out researches in giftedness or gifted education areas indicate, the idea that treating unequal ones as equal ones causes another inequality submits a viewpoint exactly parallel with the liberally characterized equal opportunities idea in education. Likewise, the goal is to provide each individual with possibilities to access opportunities in accordance with his/her abilities. But, elitist way of thinking here ironically contradicts with the liberally characterized equal opportunities idea. Demanding privileged opportunities for the gifted or privileged individuals, whose giftedness or superior skills were determined after some measurements, means that equality of opportunities ideal approaches to elitism again and although it is not stated directly, this is intelligence based aristocracy. Egalitarian point of view in the model, which had already proposed as PC (Pedagogical Cooperation) by Hesapçıoğlu and Dündar (2011), has emphasized equal treatment to human beings because of their human beings. In this model, increasing available opportunities for development is emphasized, due to variations in individual interest and abilities. With pedagogical cooperation approach it is emphasized to increase experience environments available for the students whose abilities and interests differ. The probable results of the proposed model (original model shown in italic) can discussed as follows:

Philosophical origin: Turning back to the Ancient Age, as it is seen in Socrates' Schola, school without walls.

Pedagogical perspective: Life long learning approach, alternative education, UNESCO-Project Schools

Interaction/Cooperation: Universities, research centers, laboratories, research-development institutions, school types, non governmental organizations, foundations, associations, application centers, councils, media corporations, factories, conservatories, art centers, sports organizations and institutions, etc. Requirement: There should be at least one educational consultant in the institution and organization cooperated to organize the educational program suitable to the project submitted by the student.

Environment: Active participation of students' in the natural process; transformation of distant and near environment into a learning center/area.

Program: *Program is based on the project submitted by the student*. Student manages the process in accordance with project methodology in the direction of his interest and needs. Student receives consultancy required both during the preparation phase of his project (from school) and cooperation (from institution/organization). The goal here is, as it is frequently mentioned in the literature, not developing program models applied in gifted education (like: multiple intelligences, holistic education, high scope Purdue middle education program, autonomous learning program, C3, Reggio Emila, The Grid Matrix, Integrated Program, or collecting all models under three basic headings as grouping, accelerating, and enriching). PC, pedagogical cooperation makes these approaches possible to apply in direction of suitable place, time and building on the basis of system. Difference is that; program is open to all children whose projects are accepted. Here discrimination between superior student or normal student is not in question.

Education: *PC, doesn't submit special teaching methods (like: education in special classrooms, starting school at earlier age, accelerating, program enriching, educating in single ability groups, individual education)*. It provides environments where student learning is possible happen. For example:

- In university, research center, laboratory (in an institution or organization), an educational coordinator/specialist employed for this purpose determines the suitable lesson and activity types for the project he is submitted by the student.
- Working with the student, choosing subjects among these lesson/activity types, a suitable program is developed for the student.
- In direction of the project, student is responsible to carry out these activities/lessons for the predetermined period of time, and organize the outcomes of the project in specified time.
- In this frame, an individual GANT (timetable for activities) table is determined.
- For easy monitoring/ evaluating purposes, institutional timetable is prepared by the education coordinator/specialist.
- Student is responsible to inform the school/institution with which he is affiliated about his individual GANT.
- Together with the student, school is responsible to form the program at school (presentation, evaluation, observation, sharing with other students in meetings) in accordance with this individual timetable.

Evaluation: Multiple evaluation methods: Assessment by the student, assessment by the educational coordinator/ specialist, school/institutional observations and evaluations, approaches of monitoring results are considered.

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESS OF AUTHOR

Selma DÜNDAR has been working as a doctor at Educational Science Department of Faculty of Atatürk Education, Marmara University in Istanbul, Turkey. Currently, she has been carrying out her post-doc research at Institute of Educational Science, Zurich University, Switzerland. She has also experiences as classroom teacher and school manager (in Turkey).

Her research interests include equality of opportunity, science philosophy, alternative education, education systems, and ethics in education.

Dr. Selma DÜNDAR
Zürich University
Institute für Erziehungswissenschaft
Freistrasse 36, 8032
Zurich, SWITZERLAND
E. Mail: sduendar@ife.uzh.ch

REFERENCES

Arslan, R. (2010). *Elitizm teorisi ve teorisyenleri*. Bursa: Dora Yayınları.

Aytaç, K. (1975). *İngiltere, İsveç, Fransa ile Federal Almanya'da okul reformları ve okul kuruluş sistemlerinde demokratlaşma temayülleri (mukayeseli bir eğitim araştırması)*. İstanbul: Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi.

Bottomore, T.B. (1997). *Seçkinler ve toplum*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America aducational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. USA: BasicBooks.

135

Cevizci, A. (2007). *Felsefe ansiklopedisi 5*. Ankara: Ebabil Yayıncılık.

Cohen, L.M., Ambrose, D. & Powell, N. (2000). Conceptual foundations and theoretical lenses fort he diversity of giftedness and talent. In A.H. Kurt, F.J. Mönks, R.J. Sternberg, R.F. Subitnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness and talent* (pp. 331-344). New York: Pergamon.

Coşkun, G. (n.d.). Evrimcilerin "üstün insan" hayalleri. Retrived November 30, 2011, from http://www.yaklasansaat.com/dunyamiz/canlilar/evrimcilerin_ustun_insan_hayalleri.asp.

Dorling, D. (2010). The return to elitism in education. *Soundings*, 44, 35-46.

Durkheim, E. (2006). *Toplumsal işbölümü*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Dündar, S. (2010). *Eğitimde fırsatların eşitliği ve postmoderndeki dönüşümü: Türkiye örneği*. Unpublished dissertation, Marmara University.

Ergün, M. (1997). *Eğitim sosyolojisine giriş*. Ankara: Ocak Yayınları.

Flynn, J.R. (2009). *What is intelligence: Beyond the Flynn effect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, D.Y. (2002). Equity and excellence: culturally diverse students in gifted education. In N. Colangelo, G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (pp. 506-520). USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Herrnstein, R.J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: intelligence and class structure in american life*. New York: Free Pres.

Hertz, T., Jayasundera, T., Piraino, P., Selcuk, S., Smith, N., & Verashchagina, A. (2007). Intergenerational economic mobility around the world. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 7 (2), 1-46.

Hesapçıoğlu, M. (2009). Eğitim sistemlerinde yönlendirme çalışmalarının felsefî/yönetimsel temelleri. *Eğitime Bakış*, 2009, 5-10.

Hesapçıoğlu, M., & Dündar, S. (2011). *Türkiye'de eğitimde fırsat eşitliği ve postmodernizm*. Konya: Eğitim Kitabevi.

Hesapçıoğlu, M., & Dündar, S. (2011). Giftedness in Turkish educational system In a context of globalization and elite education: An egalitarian model proposal (=Pedagogical Cooperation). *Excellence in Education 2011: Giftedness, Creativity, Development*. Istanbul, Turkey, 6-9 July.

Husén, T. (1974). *Talent, equality and meritocracy: availability and utilization of talent*. Netherlands: Plân Europe 2000 Project1.

Jones, G., & Schneider, W.J. (2006). Intelligence, human capital, and economic growth: A bayesian averaging if classical estimates (base) approach. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 11, 71-93.

Kurtkan-Bilgiseven, A. (1987). *Eğitim sosyolojisi (kavramlar-teoriler-eğitim yoluyla kalkınmanın esasları)*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.

Kurtkan-Bilgiseven, A. (2004). Anı yazıları: Demokrasi, fırsat eşitliği ve seçkinler. *Sosyoloji Konferansları* (ss. 95-109). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Metodoloji ve Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Merkezi.

Macionis, J.J. (2003). *Sociology*. New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Murray, C. (1997). IQ and economic success-intelligence quotient. *The Public Interest*, 22, 21-35.

Patrick, M.L. (2008). Intergenerational mobility and interracial inequality: The return to family values. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*, 51-80.

Plomin, R., & Price, T.S. (2002). The relationship between genetics and intelligence. In N. Colangelo, G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (pp. 113-123). USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Radnor, H., Koshy, V., & Taylor, A. (2007). Gifts, talents and meritocracy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (3), 283-299.

Reuchlin, M. (1964). *Psikoloji tarihi*. İstanbul: Anıl Yayınevi.

Rousseau, J.J. (2009). *İnsanlar arasındaki eşitsizliğin kaynağı*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Sorokin, P.A. (1994). *Çağdaş sosyoloji kuramları I*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Sternberg, R.J. (2004). *International handbook of intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, M. (1987). Eğitsel fırsat eşitliği (sosyolojik bir kavram olarak gelişim). *Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20 (1-2), 245-259.

Tan, M. (1990). Eğitim sosyolojisinde değişik yaklaşımlar: İşlevselci paradigma ve çatışmacı paradigma. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23 (2), 557-571.

Tannenbaum, A.J. (2002). Nature and nurture of giftedness. In N. Colangelo, G.A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (pp. 45-59). USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tumin, M.M. (1967). *Social stratification: the forms and the functions of inequality*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Ulusoy, M.D. (1996). Eğitim ve sosyal eşitlik. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13 (1-2), 59-86.

Vexliard, A. (1969). *Sosyal psikoloji* (Compiler: Muhsin Hesapçıoğlu). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi 1968-1969 eğitim öğretim yılı ders notları (çoğaltma).