

Editorial

Identifying and Supporting Giftedness and Talent in Schools—Introduction to a Special Collection of Research

Kirsi Tirri ^{1,*}  and Valerie Margrain ²

¹ Department of Education, University of Helsinki, 00100 Helsinki, Finland

² Department of Educational Studies, Karlstad University, 651 88 Karlstad, Sweden; valerie.margrain@kau.se

* Correspondence: kirsi.tirri@helsinki.fi

This Special Issue on “Identifying and Supporting Giftedness and Talent in Schools” contains 19 articles from differing international contexts: Australia, Austria, Finland, France, Greece, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, Turkey, and the USA. The content includes theoretical articles and qualitative, mixed-method, and quantitative empirical research.

While educational contexts and policies vary, schools and preschools all over the world can effectively engage with gifted learners and develop talent. By sharing differing approaches with one another, we can learn and be inspired as to how to deliver quality educational experiences for gifted children and students. Diverse approaches to identification include broad (even ‘fuzzy’), multi-categorical, and curriculum-specific opportunities for talent to emerge within enrichment programmes. Diverse approaches to gifted education support include differentiated teaching or curriculum content, such as the use of trans-disciplinary, holistic education; acceleration; ability-grouping; special programmes; and enrichment opportunities. Alongside these considerations are why we engage in gifted education, specifically the needs and educational rights of children and students. Children and students have the right to learn and fulfil their individual potential [1], which goes far beyond simply being present in early childhood and schools. While gifted students are often described as marginalised and misunderstood [2,3], several articles in this Special Issue take up the most at-risk groups of gifted students.

The theoretical articles discuss the contexts of identification and recognition of gifted students in different countries. In the article from Turkey by Ugur Sak, the Fuzzy Conception of Giftedness is introduced and three components to identify and educate gifted students are discussed, including intellectual and non-intellectual dispositions, stimulus conditions, and interaction. The USA article by Don Ambrose brings the perspective of interdisciplinary phenomena into a discussion on the identification of gifted students and advocates and takes the big picture into account in developing giftedness and talent in gifted education.

The article from Scotland by Margaret Sutherland and Catherine Reid provides a national perspective on gifted education policy with an emphasis on inclusion and how this approach provides opportunities to support gifted students in Scotland. In a mixed methods study from Norway, Gila Hammer Furnes and Gunnvi Saele Jokstad investigate Norwegian primary teachers’ attitudes towards gifted students and gifted education and discuss their potential impact on their pedagogical practices. The Swedish article by Valerie Margrain and Jorjyt van Bommel explores how assessment is presented in Swedish early years’ steering documents and considers risks for young, gifted children in relation to assessment or a lack of it. In her article, Michelle Ronksley-Pavia from Australia sets out to explore the fallacy of using the national assessment program—literacy and numeracy (NAPLAN) results to identify giftedness in high-potential students in her country, outlining reasons why the NAPLAN is unsuitable as an identification instrument for giftedness. The Finnish study by Laura Niemi, Jari Metsämuuronen, Markku S. Hannula, and Anu Laine presents longitudinal data on top achievers in mathematics following students from



Citation: Tirri, K.; Margrain, V. Identifying and Supporting Giftedness and Talent in Schools—Introduction to a Special Collection of Research. *Educ. Sci.* **2023**, *13*, 1205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121205>

Received: 23 November 2023

Accepted: 29 November 2023

Published: 3 December 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

third grade in primary school to the end of upper secondary school. They investigate how accurately top achievers at the end of secondary school can be identified in the third, sixth, and ninth grades using national tests.

Eight articles discuss classroom teaching practices for gifted students. In the Norwegian article by Astrid Lenvik, Lise Øen Jones, and Elisabeth Hesjedal, adapted education for gifted students in Norway is described from teachers' and students' perspectives and enrichment strategies are identified as important ways to meet the needs of gifted students. In the literature review from the USA, Rena F. Subotnik, Paula Olszewski-Kubilius, Susan Corwith, Eric Calvert, and Frank C. Worrell present a talent development megamodel as a guide for leaders and school administrators in making fiscal and programmatic decisions that maximise short- and long-term impacts for individuals and society. In another article from the USA by Jenny Yang, Gülnur Özbek, and Seokhee Cho, the dynamic interplay between teachers' beliefs and practices for the quality of instruction and talent development for gifted students is investigated with a case study of two elementary teachers.

The Greek article by Dimitrios Moustakas and Eleftheria N. Gonida explores alternative motivational profiles of high achievers in mathematics within the framework of the Situated-Value Theory. The study identifies five motivational profiles among high achievers and discusses differences among students in these profiles. The article from South Korea by Juah Kim, Hyunjung Im, Doehee Ahn, and Seokhee Cho examines whether the inquiry-based instructional approaches experienced by students predict their creative productivity and whether their effects are mediated through co-cognitive factors, school engagement, and school GPA. The French article by Christine Sanchez and Nathalie Blanc examines the extent to which a whole-class art enrichment program delivered to both gifted and non-gifted children benefits both student populations with respect to their school well-being. The Finnish study by Sakari Tolppanen, Jingoo Kang, and Kirsi Tirri compares the climate competencies of gifted and average-ability high school students from five Finnish high schools and found that academically gifted students show more climate competences than average-ability students. Moreover, gifted students who attended the school for gifted students show more climate competences than the gifted students who attended general education schools. The study from Austria by Gregor Jöstl, Sara Hinterplattner, and Silke Rogl presents a school profile of talent development including model classes. The study evaluated the impact of the actions taken by the school and compared the effects of both the model classes and the regular classes, with a school without a special focus on talent development. According to the findings, the model classes had significantly higher scores in terms of school satisfaction, class climate, self-efficacy, mastery goal orientation, and in hope of successes, as well as scoring significantly lower on classroom pressure. The school profile was shown to be successful in catering to gifted students without compromising the quality of the regular education.

Four articles in this Special Issue address under-representation in gifted education. In the article by Trista M. Kuykendall from the USA, intersectional program evaluation is discussed by considering race, class, sex, and language in gifted program effectiveness. In another USA article, Karen B. Arnstein, Ophélie Allyssa Desmet, Kristen Seward, Anne Traynor, and F. Richard Olenchak present the Bull's Eye Model for Affective Development-Expansion (BEM-e), an innovative framework designed to address the representation gap in gifted and talented education. The Finnish article by Jessica Stargardter, Sonja Laine, and Kirsi Tirri presents a case study from a Finnish teacher training school on how the needs of non-native gifted students are met in this school based on interviews with students, parents, and teachers. The differentiation of education in inclusive classrooms is identified as the main teaching strategy to address non-native gifted students in this school. The Swedish article by Anna-Carin Holmgren, Ylva Backman, Viktor Gardelli, and Åsa Gyllefjord shares a case study of a year seven twice exceptional student in Sweden, who is gifted and has ADHD. The findings highlight the complexity of perceptions and understanding, examples of misunderstandings, and challenges to equal opportunity within schooling.

We take a holistic approach to education in schools and early childhood education that includes cognitive, emotional, social, and moral domains concerning giftedness and talents. This means that all aspects of the gifted learner are important, not only academic achievement. We increasingly understand that gifted child and student well-being is tied to the identification and support they receive in schools and early childhood services. We also know that neither identification nor support operate independently of each other; both are critical to consider [4,5]. A theme across several articles in this Special Issue is the consideration of teacher beliefs, which underpin the extent to which giftedness is defined, students are identified, and support programmes implemented. Belief in the worth of gifted education to transform student experience, well-being, and society underpins the work that we do in this field.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. United Nations. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. 20 November 1989. Available online: <https://www.ohchr.org/en> (accessed on 10 November 2023).
2. Pinxten, W.L.F.-V.; Derksen, J.J.L.; Peters, W.A.M. The psychological world of highly gifted young adults: A follow-up study. *Trends Psychol.* **2023**, 1–27. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Vialle, W.; Heaven, P.C.; Ciarrochi, J. On being gifted, but sad and misunderstood: Social, emotional, and academic outcomes of gifted students in the Wollongong Youth Study. *Educ. Res. Eval.* **2007**, *13*, 569–586. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Gubbins, E.J.; Siegle, D.; Ottone-Cross, K.; McCoach, D.B.; Langley, S.D.; Callahan, C.M.; Brodersen, A.V.; Caughey, M. Identifying and Serving Gifted and Talented Students: Are Identification and Services Connected? *Gift. Child Q.* **2021**, *65*, 115–131. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Rutigliano, A.; Quarshie, N. *Policy Approaches and Initiatives for the Inclusion of Gifted Students in OECD Countries*; OECD Education Working Papers, No. 262; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2021. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.