



G UNDERSTANDING OUR GIFTED®

Dedicated to helping gifted children reach their full potential

March—April, 1992

Volume 4, Issue 4

Don't Throw Away the Old Binet

Linda Silverman, Ph.D.

Katheryn Kearney, M.A., Ed.

The *Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Form L-M)* is the only measurement tool that can adequately assess extraordinarily gifted children; yet, it is in danger of extinction. Newer tests, newer conceptions of intelligence, and newer normative samples make the "old Binet" appear hopelessly antiquated. Among the misunderstandings about testing is the widely held belief that *newer is better*, with no consideration of the fact that a test may be better for some populations but not for others. In this article, we will discuss the deficits of the old Binet as well as its strengths, problems with the use of newer instruments for the exceptionally gifted population, and recommendations for when it is advisable to administer the *Binet L-M*.

Why We Need the Old Binet

Before those of you who are knowledgeable about testing begin, "But the L-M is so..." we hasten to assure you that we are well aware of myriad flaws in the old Binet: it is sexist, morbid, outdated; men no longer make \$20 per week; it uses terms that children no longer hear and describes experiences children no longer have; it has 20-year-old norms; it is highly verbal; it generates only one

(Continued on page 8)

global IQ score; specific strengths and weaknesses cannot be compared easily; it is not user-friendly, etc. So why bother?

We bother because it is all that we have. We have worked with over 200 children who test above 160 IQ on the *Stanford-Binet (L-M)*. Some of them were misunderstood by both their families and communities and assigned to totally inappropriate school placements until they were assessed appropriately and found to be exceptionally gifted and out of place. It has been key for both the family and the school to realize how gifted these children really are, and how different they are from their chronological age-peers and even from other, more moderately gifted children.

Within the top 1% of the IQ distribution, then, there is at least as much spread of talent as there is in the entire range from 1st to 99th percentile. Moreover, those we might call the "supergifted," (those with IQs 4 or more standard deviations above the mean) tend to be as unlike the "garden-variety gifted" (with IQs 2 or 3 standard deviations above the mean) as the "garden-variety gifted" are unlike children with scores clustered within 1 standard deviation of the mean of the population. (Robinson, 1981, p. 71)

Further, Robinson points out "that there are many more truly exceptional young children in the population than would be predicted on the basis of the normal curve alone" (p. 73) and that children in the very highest ranges of intelligence "may not fare as well in many respects as those with more moderate gifts" (p. 75). Without the tools to find such children, the children themselves remain doubly at risk. Nothing has come along to replace the *Stanford-Binet (L-M)* for this particular population. We eagerly greeted every recently released new test and revisions of the old ones, hoping they would correct all the woeful aspects of the L-M, only to find that not one of them was designed with the highly gifted in mind.

Why? In order for the testing industry to survive, it must focus all of its energies on creating tests that are as culturally unbiased as possible, excellent diagnostic tools for learning disabilities and retardation, easy to administer and applicable to the majority of the school population so that they will be economically feasible to produce.

In constructing a cognitive abilities test you are always faced with constraints. You have to produce an instrument that will adequately appraise the full range of individual differences in a chronological age group from the very slowest level of development to the most rapid. At the same time, you have to produce an instrument that can be administered fairly easily and within a reasonable amount of time. The compromise is to produce an instrument that is most effective in the range of ± 4 s. d.'s: therefore you can't use tasks that are successfully completed by 99.99 percent of an age group or that are failed by 99.99 percent of an age group. In the construction of the Binet [Revision IV], I was working with some nonverbal items that could only be solved by children who were in classes for the gifted. You can't put items like that in an intelligence test because they aren't functional for a wide enough group. (Hagen, in Silverman, 1986, p. 171)

This helps to explain why newer tests, like the *Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition* or the *WISC-III*, are inadequate for highly gifted children. When an item can be solved only by children enrolled in a gifted class, it is removed from the test. Differentiating exceptionally from moderately gifted children was never a goal of current test makers.

Deflation of Scores in the Gifted Range

We have been blithely going along using all of the newer instruments to make placement decisions about gifted

students without paying attention to the lack of representation of these students in the normative samples. Few studies of the gifted are reported in the technical manuals and no studies of the exceptionally gifted appear at all.

In order to fit IQ scores into the normal curve of distribution, the scores in the highest ranges have been systematically depressed for the last 2 decades (Silverman, 1989). There has been a loss of 31 IQ points in 31 years, almost 2 standard deviations of intelligence. Scores in the gifted range dropped 10 to 14 points from the 1960 norms of the L-M to the 1972 norms. Another 13.5

Nothing has come along to replace the *Stanford-Binet (L-M)* for this particular population.

points on average were lost for moderately gifted children between the 1972 L-M norms and the 1986 norms of the *Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition*. The *Fourth Edition* correlated closely with the *WISC-R* for children in the 116 range (surprisingly labeled "gifted" in the technical manual). The *WISC-III* manual reports that scores in the gifted range average 5 to 6 points lower than on the *WISC-R*. The average Full Scale score on the *WISC-III* of 38 children who were independently identified as gifted on other measures was 129, low enough to just miss the cut-off score for most gifted programs! "Five of these 38 children obtained FS [Full Scale] IQ scores less than 120 on the *WISC-III*" (*WISC-III Technical Manual*, p. 210). Instead of taking these losses seriously, the deflation is waved away in the technical manual in one sentence: "These differences are expected because the *WISC-III* norms are more contemporary than *WISC-R* norms" (*WISC-III Technical Manual*, p. 211).

However, the discrepancies cannot be explained simply in terms of the entire population getting brighter over time. The rise in intelligence in the general population is reflected in differences

in scores in the average range of only 8 or 9 IQ points during the same time period. Differences in the gifted range are more than 3 times the differences in the average range (Silverman, 1989), and even greater in the highly gifted range.

Seven of the children in the Maine group who had been tested on the WISC, WISC-R, WPPSI, or K-ABC intelligence tests scored between 139 and 155, with only two scoring above 145. They were then given the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale [Form L-M]...On this test, these same children scored between 169+ and 194. One child's score showed a discrepancy of more than 50 points between the K-ABC and the Stanford-Binet (143 as opposed to 194); another had a similar discrepancy between the WISC (139) and the Stanford-Binet L-M (187+). In the Colorado group...only one child in the 170+ range scored above 150 on the WISC-R, and another scored as low as 135. (Silverman & Kearney, 1989, pp. 47-48)

Disparities of this magnitude continue to be discovered. One child was found who scored 182 on the *Stanford-Binet (Form L-M)* and 127 on the *Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition*. Another scored 187 on the *L-M* and 139 on the *WISC-III*. The most remarkable difference was a child who scored 137 on the *WISC-R*, and a year later tested 229+ on the *L-M*, at the age of nine missing only two items on the entire test!

This "test artifact" amounts to discrimination against the highly gifted, and has major implications for identification and placement of gifted students. The situation is alarming, but no one appears to be noticing because the highly gifted are not of central interest to test constructors. In contrast, the gifted and highly gifted were definitely important to Lewis Terman, who constructed the original *Stanford-Binet*. Terman planned to use the test to find potential "geniuses," so he created a difficult examination with a high enough ceiling to permit their discovery.

The Structure of the Old Binet

Terman's *Stanford-Binet* was constructed in a different manner from current tests. Tasks are organized by age level from ages 2 to 14, with four additional adult levels culminating in the Superior Adult III level. The items at each age level are organized to tap different mental processes and to assess the child's flexibility in going from one type of task to another. By comparison, the Wechsler tests, the *Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition*, and the *Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC)* are all organized in subtests. The child stays with one type of item until he or she reaches a ceiling (cannot accurately complete a certain consecutive number of questions). The rapid movement from one kind of task to another in the old Binet appears to keep children interested in the assessment, and, therefore, likely to do their best. Vernon (1987) notes that

Certainly tests of the Wechsler type have many advantages, but I believe that a strong case can still be made for retaining the L-M, with its apparently haphazard arrangement of items, since it gives the tester greater flexibility...the shortness of the Binet items and their great variations in content help the tester to catch and hold the child's attention. (p. 253)

The *Stanford-Binet (Form L-M)* provides mental ages, which are no longer used in modern testing. One reason they have been abandoned is that they appear derogatory and invalid when applied to the functioning of retarded children. However, mental ages help parents and teachers understand why gifted children are bored with the regular curriculum and why their friends are often several years older. In addition, the mental age permits the extrapolation of both deviation and ratio IQs for the highly gifted range, which cannot be done with the newer tests.

Paradoxically, the *Binet (L-M)* honors multiple intelligences better than its successors. Even though it produces a global IQ score, a child can attain the very highest level of the test on *one or two skills alone*, such as vocabulary or verbal reasoning or spatial orientation. Test scores are not unduly affected by lack of fine motor coordination. All of the newer instruments that purport to be sensitive to different types of intelligence still produce composite or Full Scale scores which penalize children for every one of those intelligences that they do not demonstrate.

The most frequent complaint we have heard about the old Binet, ever since the *Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition* was released in 1986, is that it has "outdated norms." Ironically, those who voiced this complaint continued comfortably using the *WISC-R*, even though the norms for the *WISC-R* were from 1974, only two years later than the 1972 norms for the *Binet (L-M)*.

Needs of Highly Gifted Children

Extremely gifted children and their families face unique and difficult academic, cultural, and social adjustment issues; indeed, this is a population that is truly "at risk" in many ways. There is little academic challenge for these children in contemporary American schools. Highly gifted children must deal early and continually with dramatic discrepancies in development, the long-term consequences of which we still do not understand very well. (See the last issue of *Understanding Our Gifted*). As early as 1930, Terman noted that "The child of 180 IQ has one of the most difficult problems of social adjustment that any human being is ever called upon to meet" (Burks, Jensen, & Terman, 1930, p. 265). It is safe to say that if any other special population of children was at risk in similar ways, we would use whatever effective tools were available in order

to identify them and provide appropriate services for them. For this particular population, an older tool (the *Stanford-Binet Form L-M*) is more effective than newer ones. In today's schools, assessment of the gifted is often done only as a means for entrance into a gifted program. For extraordinarily gifted children, it is important to take a much broader view of assessment, since the concomitants of extreme intellectual giftedness markedly affect individual development in all areas, and the entire family system as well.

Recommendations

Therefore, we recommend the following:

1. Entrance requirements for gifted programs should be lowered to 120 to take into account the lower norms on newer instruments.
2. Gifted children should be tested initially with one of the more recent tests (*Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition*, *WISC-III*, or *K-ABC*) solely to meet whatever requirements exist at their schools for entrance into gifted education programs.
3. Whenever a child obtains three or more subtest scores at or near the ceiling of any current instrument (such as a 17, 18, or 19 on three or more *WISC-R* or *WISC-III* subtests), he or she should be retested on the *Stanford-Binet (Form L-M)*.
4. The *L-M* should also be administered as a supplemental test whenever there are marked discrepancies between strengths and weaknesses that might artificially depress the child's Full Scale IQ score.

In this case, the *L-M* is being used as a supplemental test to obtain further information about the child, and to tie that information to the 75-year research history regarding the extraordinarily gifted, which used this test and its predecessors extensively for identification. Using standard formulas (Pinneau, 1961), scores

should be extrapolated for any child who scores beyond the norms in the manual, in order to obtain a rough estimate of the child's ability.

One of the common criticisms of the *L-M* is that it is too "verbally loaded." Yet, for children whose greatest strength is their abstract and verbal reasoning ability, the *L-M* is the best measure to capture this strength in early childhood. Vernon (1987) states that

There are two special groups for whom the L-M is often preferable to the Wechsler scale: the potentially gifted who are being considered for special classes or enrichment programs, and severely retarded...children or adults. Neither the four verbal subtests in WISC or WAIS nor the four NS [Stanford-Binet: Fourth Edition] verbal subtests give as much opportunity as the L-M for gifted children to display their fluency, imagination, unusual or advanced concepts, and complex linguistic usage. (p. 256)

Use of the *Stanford-Binet (Form L-M)* enables appropriate intervention to be implemented in the critical early childhood and elementary years, providing a chance to avert academic and adjustment difficulties. It is best to administer the old Binet to children under the age of 12. Even at age 9, highly gifted children may surpass the ceiling on the *Binet L-M*, and a sufficient ceiling is necessary to capture the full strength of the child's abilities. When they are of middle school age, these students can be encouraged to participate in the national talent searches and take the SAT as an out-of-level test.

We need to share these recommendations with school psychologists so that the old Binet kits are not discarded. The release of the *WISC-III* last August places the *Stanford-Binet L-M* in even greater danger of disappearing. It must be preserved so that it can be used as a supplemental test for the highly gifted; otherwise, we have no assessment tools with the

range and sensitivity necessary to distinguish these children from their more moderately gifted peers.

Perhaps our best hope in saving the old Binet lies in the fact that it is also more accurate in identifying children in the moderately and severely retarded ranges. The newer tests have both lower ceilings and higher floors, making them appropriate for children closer to the mean. But when children veer 3 standard deviations from the mean in either direction, the newer tests are of limited value. Vernon (1987) recommended that "psychologists who wish to continue using the third edition (*Form L-M*) with 2-6 year olds, or with likely gifted children, should do so..." (p. 257). We concur, and urge readers to share this article with all those who might be in a position to save the *Stanford-Binet (Form L-M)* from extinction.

REFERENCES

- Burks, B. S., Jensen, D. W., & Terman, L. M. (1930). *Genetic studies of genius, Vol. 3: The promise of youth*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pinneau, S. R. (1961). *Changes in intelligence quotient: Infancy to maturity*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Robinson, H. B. (1981). The uncommonly bright child. In M. Lewis & L. A. Rosenblum (Eds.), *The uncommon child* (pp. 57-81). New York: Plenum Press.
- Silverman, L. K. (1986). An interview with Elizabeth Hagen: Giftedness, intelligence, and the new *Stanford-Binet*. *Roeper Review*, 8, 168-171.
- Silverman, L. K. (1989, October). *Lost: One IQ point per year for the gifted*. Paper presented at the NAGC 36th Annual Convention, Cincinnati, OH.
- Silverman, L. K., & Kearney, K. (1989). Parents of the extraordinarily gifted. *Advanced Development*, 1, 41-56.
- Vernon, P. E. (1987). The demise of the *Stanford-Binet* scale. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 28 (3), 251-258.
- Wechsler, D. (1991). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children III Manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.

Kathi Kearney, M.A.Ed., is Founder of the Hollingworth Center for Highly Gifted Children in South Casco, ME, and a doctoral candidate at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Linda Silverman, Ph.D., is a licensed psychologist and Director of the Gifted Child Development Center in Denver, Colorado.